

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

**THIRTY-NINTH SESSION**

**Official Records\***



IN LIBRARY

DEC 10 1984

**FIRST COMMITTEE**  
**58th meeting**  
**held on**  
**Tuesday, 4 December 1984**  
**at 3 p.m.**  
**New York**

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH MEETING**

**Chairman: Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil)**

**CONTENTS**

**AGENDA ITEM 67: STRENGTHENING OF SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)**

**AGENDA ITEM 68: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (continued)**

**AGENDA ITEM 69: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)**

**AGENDA ITEM 143: INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF STATE TERRORISM AND ANY ACTIONS BY STATES AIMED AT UNDERMINING THE SOCIO-POLITICAL SYSTEM IN OTHER SOVEREIGN STATES (continued)**

**CONSIDERATION OF AN ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTION ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEM 53 (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.1/39/PV.58**  
**5 December 1984**  
**ENGLISH**

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 67 TO 69 AND 143 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE, CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. HOANG BICH SON (Viet Nam) (interpretation from French): Three weeks of general debate in the General Assembly have painted a fairly complete picture of the present international situation. If we look back over the year that has elapsed since the thirty-eighth session we can see that East-West relations have continued to deteriorate and that the situation in various parts of the world is more tense than ever. And, looking back over the 40 years that have elapsed since the founding of the United Nations in the aftermath of the Second World War, there has never before been so much tension as there is today, when the human race is faced with the threat of nuclear catastrophe. In that context our debates on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security take on even greater significance.

It should be stressed at the outset that the present situation is actually only the inevitable result of the policy of conquest and military supremacy, of intervention and the use of force, being pursued by warmongering Western circles.

Indeed, the policy of military supremacy embarked upon by the American Administration has given rise to a crisis in East-West relations, flying as it does in the face of the wishes and joint efforts of the international community as a whole. With the largest military budget in American history, the White House is implementing a programme of massive armament, particularly in the field of nuclear weapons. It has given first priority to the trio of American strategic weapons with several series of first-strike nuclear weapons such as the MX missiles, B-1 bombers and Trident nuclear submarines, and it is on the verge of extending the arms race to outer space. Washington's deployment of its new nuclear missiles on the territory of a number of West European countries has led to the suspension of Soviet-American negotiations.

(Mr. Hoang Bich Son, Viet Nam)

Because of America's policy of intervention and the use of force against other peoples, existing regional conflicts have been aggravated and new confrontations are breaking out. It is particularly dangerous that the United States has arrogated to itself the right of intervention and the conduct of aggression in any part of the world where it appears to it that there is some threat to American interests. In fact the military bases, the rapid deployment forces and American fleets are now all standing at the ready to implement the gunboat policy being pursued by the United States throughout the world.

The end of 1983 was marked by a tragic event in Central America: the American aggression in Grenada, an island which is one thousandth of the size of the United States. Spurning the good will of Nicaragua as well as the efforts of the mediators in the Contadora Group, Washington is continuing its undeclared war and total blockade of Nicaragua, supporting the reactionary forces there in order to topple the Government in that country. As far as the hostile policy of the United States against the Republic of Cuba is concerned, it has not changed at all.

In the Middle East, enjoying the aid and encouragement of the United States, Israel stubbornly persists in its expansionist policies of aggression and occupation of Arab territories. In the last few years Washington has been increasing its military assistance and its supplies of arms to regional reactionary forces as well as its direct military presence in order to intervene in the affairs of that region. Furthermore, the White House continues to pose a threat, inter alia, to both Libya and Syria.

In the area of southern Africa, the South African racist Government is continuing and stepping up its policy of systematic military aggression, economic pressure and terrorist and subversive acts against the independent countries in that part of the world. It should be recalled that a portion of Angolan territory is still under South African occupation. Everyone is perfectly well aware that there is strategic co-operation between the United States and South Africa and that the White House turns a blind eye to the activities of Pretoria.

Turning now to Asia and the Pacific, Viet Nam, like the other countries in that region, is gravely concerned because of the feverish activities being indulged in by the United States at the present time. Actually, what the United States is doing now is setting up a military alliance in North-East Asia and intensifying its military presence in the Korean peninsula.

It is quite easy to see that the acts I have just described are part and parcel of a policy which has remained constant since the Second World War up to the

(Mr. Hoang Bich Son, Viet Nam)

present day: that is, State terrorism, which is helped along by the forces of international reaction, thus contributing to the deterioration of the overall international situation.

Over the last four decades, the independence, peace and stability of the nations of South-East Asia have been constantly threatened and subjected to sabotage by the colonialist, imperialist and expansionist forces. The countries of Indo-China have always been subjected to domination by those forces and have thus had to suffer successive wars. Throughout that process, external forces have constantly sought to sow dissension among the States of South-East Asia and used some of them as an instrument for opposing others in the region.

The common victory won by the three peoples of Indo-China in 1975 ushered in a new era in the struggle for peace and stability in South-East Asia. Setting aside the past, Viet Nam took the initiative, in the interests of the joint security of the entire region as well as of the entire world, of seeking friendly relations among all countries of the region and these interregional relations have in fact now taken a turn for the better.

Nevertheless it was just after the end of the second war in Indo-China that the peace and security of South-East Asia were once again threatened by the hegemonist and expansionist forces of Peking. Since the end of the 1970s, that threat has been further increased by the return of American imperialism to the regional scene. At the present time there is virtual collusion between the expansionist, imperialist and militarist forces aimed at thwarting all efforts to bring peace, security and stability to South-East Asia and at undermining the security of the countries of Indo-China.

For its part, Viet Nam is prepared to sit down at the negotiating table with other countries of the region in order to resolve regional problems without any outside interference, on the basis of mutual respect for each other's independence and national sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, to serve the cause of security for all States in the world.

In view of its policy of peace, the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam is gratified that the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is being implemented, as well as the efforts to prepare society for a peaceful life, the principles of which we find very laudable and the very positive contents of which are worthy of being acted upon. Our country attaches considerable value to the efforts which have been made to maintain and strengthen international security and declares itself ready to do its best to work towards that end.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): As we have said in the past, we value this annual discussion, as it gives us a chance to review, albeit briefly, the world situation. However, we are somewhat concerned at the apparent nonchalance which has been allowed to creep into the consideration of this item over the past few years. Sterile confrontation and repetition of divergent East-West approaches have in a sense stifled the debate and shaped it into an apparently unchangeable ritual which seems to end with the set adoption of a repetitive resolution, long on words and short on intentions, because unfortunately too often its provisions are no sooner solemnly reaffirmed than they are subsequently transgressed.

The debate is predominantly predicated on the perceptions of a perpetually adversary relationship between the two major military alliances. The concept of security is inflexibly based on massive military power of frightening dimensions - its nuclear component in particular, but equally disturbing in its conventional aspect.

The main preoccupation seems to be to justify the alleged need for more lethal arms for the super-Powers and their allies and for supplying more sophisticated conventional weapons to their preferred client States. It is in fact the arms level that is consistently strengthened, not security, despite the title of the item.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

In these circumstances all nations are held hostage when spheres of influence have been extended by the major Powers to cover all corners of the world.

The evolution of history, the advances of weaponry, the pleas of humanity are seemingly overlooked in our debate. The role of the United Nations receives scant attention and no serious attempts seem to have been made to evolve a new pattern, an alternative approach of restraint and co-operation.

And yet it has become necessary as never before to reverse this militaristic outlook and seriously to seek ways to co-operate in preventing and resolving disputes while minimizing the possibilities of direct and confrontational super-Power involvement with its inherent dangers.

Let me supplement my layman's line of thinking with a quotation from a more scientific presentation. The report of the Conference on the Long-Term Biological Consequences of Nuclear War, held on 31 October in Washington, has been reproduced in a book entitled The Cold and the Dark. The opening sentence of a foreword by Lewis Thomas reads:

"The scientific discoveries described in this book may turn out, in a world lucky enough to continue its history, to have been the most important research findings in the long history of science".

On the basis of consensus among 40 biological scientists, Mr. Thomas later asserts:

"It is a new world, demanding a new kind of diplomacy and a new logic. Up to now the international community of statesmen, diplomats, and military analysts has tended to regard the prospect of nuclear war as a problem only for the adversaries in possession of the weapons. Arms control and the endless negotiations aimed at the reduction of nuclear explosives have been viewed as the responsibility, even the prerogative, of those few nations in actual confrontation. Now all that is changed. There is no nation on Earth free of the jeopardy of destruction if any two countries, or groups of countries, embark upon a nuclear exchange. If the Soviet Union and the United States, and their respective allies in the Warsaw Pact and NATO, begin to launch their missiles beyond a still-undetermined and ambiguous minimum, neutral States like Sweden and Switzerland would suffer the same long-term effects, the same slow death, as the actual participants. Australia and New Zealand, Brazil and South Africa, have nearly as much to worry about as West Germany if a full-scale exchange were to take place far to the north."

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

This, I submit, in itself is enough reason to start - to use the words again of Mr. Thomas - "a new kind of diplomacy, a new kind of logic". Besides, there are many other factors which should induce, and in fact facilitate, adoption of a new approach in the common interest. Let me mention but a few.

In the first place the majority of countries attaining independence and joining the United Nations over the past 40 years are comparatively small. They pose no threat to the major Powers and their allies. Today almost two thirds of the United Nations membership can be classified in the category of small countries, posing no threat whatsoever to international stability as seen by the major Powers. In addition, all these countries have themselves deliberately steered clear of joining military alliances. Their security concerns have no relationship to those of the military alliances and centre almost exclusively on the United Nations. And yet the concerns of these countries have scarcely received adequate consideration.

On the contrary, and what makes matters much worse, the major Powers, in their competitive quest for strategic and political influence in the third world, have each tried to secure narrow advantages from the vulnerability of these much weaker countries. As a result the third world, for all practical purposes, has become the outlet - quite often, even the arena - for the use of the sophisticated conventional forces of the major Powers.

A second major feature of post-war history is that in the final analysis no significant relative advantages have been gained by either of the two major alliances at the expense of the other. What is, of course, much more serious than the resultant disappointment of the major alliances is that the suffering and destruction in the third world have been immense.

Perhaps I may recall that it is calculated that 20 million people have died through conflicts since 1947. So far, some 150 undeclared conventional wars have been waged over the past four decades, to the detriment of international peace and security and, of course, economic development. Current calculations reveal that 45 countries - 28 per cent of the United Nations membership - are at present embroiled in violent conflicts, generously fed by arms supplied by the major Powers or their allies. The cost of war, as we all know, is incalculably ruinous and its repercussions, again as we all know, are not limited only to the protagonists.

In the light of evidence that there has been no visible benefit, either to the countries concerned or to the super-Powers, and even less to the cause of peace from this antagonistic confrontation, it is in my view deplorable that policies

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

based on massive armaments or arms supplies continue to prevail, especially since war remains increasingly the most barbaric and least effective way of resolving differences between States, more especially so in this the nuclear age.

The third feature of the post-war period, consequently, is that the rest of the world outside military blocs - and this constitutes the majority of mankind - still looks with hope tempered with realism on the capacity of the United Nations to play an effective role in safeguarding security and preventing future conflict. This plea deserves much more sympathetic consideration than it has so far received. The major Powers themselves not only have the responsibility, but also a vested interest, to respond to this need.

Another feature of the past that has in my opinion been overlooked in our debate is that we have tended to concentrate at the United Nations almost exclusively on long and repetitive condemnation of actions or events after they happened. We do not seem to have given sufficient emphasis to recent efforts at persuasion and reassurances in attempts to bring about reconciliation between parties in dispute before conflict actually erupts.

This latter approach deserves to be given at least equal prominence in our efforts for the future. In the past we seem to have had only limited success in containing conflicts after they had already erupted. We can presume that the conflicts of the future need not occur if the Security Council acts with unity and determination in time, especially if its prestige is restored enough for the Council to be seen - as it should always have been seen - as an objective, independent and unified defender of justice and peace.



(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

Permit me to observe one final feature of the post-war period that, in my opinion, deserves mention, that is, the greater involvement of public opinion in international affairs owing, of course, in no small measure to the revolution in instant communications.

Disappointment, even disillusionment, with both the practices of the past and the current state of affairs, is currently rife. The popular urge for change is strong and is progressively becoming more urgent. The First Committee - all of us - should capitalize on this public insistence on positive change and we should respond to it while the movement is at its peak. We should also endeavour to strengthen the movement and provide it with the means to understand more and to insist more effectively on positive change. For instance, the report on the effects of nuclear war to which I referred a minute ago is a commendable effort in this direction. So is the recent report by the Aspen Institute. I am glad to note that the press has given publicity to both those reports and to other equally deserving ones.

All those factors combined should only lead us to confirm from actual experience what was foreseen in 1945, namely, that there is a common interest in exploring avenues for developing an alternative security approach. Surely the time is already overdue for the matter resolutely to be taken up in practice now.

This conviction can be reinforced only by the abundant and cumulative evidence not only that the antagonistic super-Power relationship seems doomed to produce a stalemate but also that it has entered its most alarming phase. It is wholly negative, counter-productive and dangerous in the extreme. It cannot be allowed to deteriorate further. We are glad to note that the need for change has now been recognized by the leaders of the major Powers themselves.

Nevertheless, it still seems to my delegation that the change contemplated by the major Powers does not go far enough. They are still looking at international security on the basis of concepts which are far too rigid. The fashionable idea these days is to reduce the chances of conflict by concentrating on so-called confidence-building measures. As I mentioned in my statement under the disarmament items, my delegation really sees this approach as a deviation from concentration on arms-control agreements and, in a way, as a means of legitimizing the continuing massive display of military might.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

These "confidence-building measures" in fact provide another perfect illustration of the concentration by the major Powers on their own perceptions of security, to the complete exclusion of the concerns of the majority of the countries and peoples of the world.

In some cases, for instance, the number of troops engaged in manoeuvres or military exercises - shrugged off by the major Powers as being insignificant for each other's preoccupations - are in fact almost as large as the entire adult population of some small countries. What is worse, those measures make no provision whatsoever for the notification of military manoeuvres or movements which include naval or aerial contingents. Yet these contingents are obviously the most alarming for small countries. And since, as I mentioned before, these spheres of influence of the major Powers now encompass the entire globe, it follows that the security concerns of most small countries around the world are being completely ignored. Yet those measures are by definition supposed to build "confidence" - some confidence, I might add.

That is why my delegation made specific proposals at the Stockholm Conference for at least extending the concept of confidence-building measures in a way which makes them really worthy of that name, at least as far as the Mediterranean region is concerned. As is the case for other regions, the Mediterranean provides commercial sea and air routes to all countries. Those routes are adversely affected by the arrogant ways and the ambitious, selfish interests of the super-Powers in their usage of those routes. In a semi-enclosed sea like the Mediterranean, taking into account in particular the density of shipping in that central sea, it seems only fair that peaceful commercial activities by all countries should prevail over naval war games by a few.

We therefore hope that confidence-building measures designed in the future will live up to their name and cover the preoccupations of the majority of countries, not serve only the perceived interests of a few.

In addition, I wish to repeat our long-standing call for a new spirit of mutual accommodation and understanding to be exercised at the United Nations. We have to learn from our experience. We cannot overlook the evolution of history. We have to work through the United Nations system from within and use it efficiently to resolve the problems that will otherwise cripple even the major Powers themselves. The Charter remains a unique document which has stood the test of time; it is the only key to a safe and secure world.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

Over the past two years my delegation participated actively in the discussions in the Security Council on strengthening its effectiveness. We feel that positive results are possible. We feel also that the exercise on which we have embarked is promising and should be continued. The work is serious and the objective noble. It proceeded without interruption even during the most acute period of strain between the major Powers.

As we all know, in terms of Article 24 (1) of the Charter, the Members of the United Nations agree that "the Security Council acts on their behalf". We - all of us - have to make a conscious effort not only to live by the Charter provisions - particularly as regards the peaceful settlement of disputes, because that by itself would be our biggest single contribution to the maintenance of peace; we also have a residual responsibility and a vested interest in helping the Council in the exercise of its collective responsibility on our behalf.

I therefore believe that the General Assembly - and this Committee in particular - should encourage the Council in its work and, in fact, work hand in hand with it. All of us have a common and vested interest in a successful outcome; the security of all countries would stand to benefit. We all have to work together by the best available means to search for our common security in an increasingly vulnerable and interdependent world. I have accordingly ventured to put down some ideas in the form of a brief draft resolution, which I hope will be adopted without a vote when the idea has matured. I feel it is essential, in this day and age in a shrinking and fragile planet, that we should start concentrating our attention on our common security.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

The contents of the draft resolution are self-explanatory. It is a message of concern over the arms race but of hope and common determination that this danger be overcome. It notes with appreciation the information on the discussions held so far in the Council conveyed by its President; it notes that discussion has proceeded from the general to the specific, stresses a renewed commitment to the Charter by all Members, recognizes the different functions of the Council and its representational nature and encourages the Members to continue their efforts.

My delegation is not wedded to the wording of the draft resolution, although we feel it has been carefully drafted to gather support from all sides. So we are open to suggestions in order to ensure unanimity and would welcome additional sponsors from as many regions and countries as possible.

We shall of course continue, as in the past, to support the omnibus draft resolution on strengthening international security. But we feel that this time it needs to be supplemented by something more concise, more fundamental, more action-oriented and more suitably placed before the Security Council, the principal organ in the United Nations for the preservation of international peace and security.

Mrs. TNANI (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): Last year in resolution 38/191, the General Assembly underscored that there was a growing tendency among States to resort to the use of force, interference and intervention in international relations, thus ignoring the Charter and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, contained in General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV).

This disturbing situation has not substantially improved, as our Minister of Foreign Affairs noted last September in his statement before the General Assembly to this effect:

"It is not succumbing to discouragement to emphasize the steady deterioration of the environment in which we live and the virtual inability of the international community to alter the dangerous course of events in any way." (A/39/PV.15, p. 28-30)

How can we break the vicious circle which international relations have entered, a vicious circle where we see suspicion and feelings of insecurity pushing us into an arms race, and the arms race in turn aggravating the suspicion and insecurity? In recent weeks, however, we have learned with a sense of relief that

(Mrs. Tnani, Tunisia)

the two largest nuclear Powers intend to undertake new negotiations with a view to reaching a mutually acceptable agreement or agreements on the range of problems regarding nuclear and space weapons. We should like to say how much we wish for the success of these new negotiations, because it appears evident to us that the maintenance of international peace and security depends essentially on agreement between the two major Powers.

In this regard, it is significant to recall the terms of paragraph 4 of resolution 33/73 of 15 December 1978, according to which:

"Every State, acting in the spirit of friendship and good-neighbourly relations, has the duty promote all-round, mutually advantageous and equitable political, economic, social and cultural co-operation with other States, notwithstanding their socio-economic systems, with a view to securing their common existence and co-operation in peace ..."

In this perspective, it is no longer Utopian to talk about nuclear disengagement and the establishment of zones of peace in several parts of the world, including Europe itself.

The Mediterranean countries which are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, for their part, are stepping up their efforts to make the Mediterranean a zone of peace, security and co-operation in conformity with decisions of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries taken in March 1983 and in conformity with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, notably resolution 38/189 of 20 December 1983. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Mediterranean countries recalled this recently in their Valletta Declaration on 11 September 1984.

In resolution 38/189, the General Assembly recognizes that the security of the Mediterranean is closely linked with international peace and security and we should like to place special emphasis on the specific links that exist between the security of the Mediterranean and that of the European continent as a whole. It is worth recalling in this connection that a chapter of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is devoted to questions of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean. We should like also to recall that Tunisia, like other countries of northern Africa, was represented at the Helsinki Conference and later at the Madrid Conference, where Malta distinguished itself in defending the security of the Mediterranean. Tunisia was also represented at the Stockholm Conference at the beginning of 1984.

(Mrs. Tnani, Tunisia)

Finally, it seems to us especially worth noting, as is indicated in the Valletta Declaration of 11 September 1984 that the Mediterranean countries are determined to give the highest priority to seeking viable and lasting solutions to outstanding problems among them without resort to force or the threat of force. It is in this perspective that threats to peace must be uprooted and just and peaceful solutions to the conflict in Palestine and throughout the Middle East must be found.

I do not wish to conclude my statement without underscoring, as was done in resolution 38/191, that fundamental approaches to genuine security include the strengthening of the Charter system of collective security.

But we must acknowledge, as was done in resolution 38/191 of 20 December 1983, that the provisions of the Charter relating to collective security measures have not been fully implemented. Allow us on this occasion once again to quote our Minister for Foreign Affairs, who in his statement last September to the General Assembly said:

"It is also disturbing to note the paralysis which is steadily gripping the United Nations in the vital sphere of the maintenance of international peace and security, for which this Organization is responsible under the Charter."

(A/39/PV.15, p. 28-30)

The chief function of the United Nations, especially through the Security Council, is to maintain international peace and security. In this regard, the responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council is especially important and we hope that this will be better perceived in the future, in the climate of détente that we hope for.

But the United Nations, and especially the Security Council, it cannot be overemphasized, has the duty as part of its prerogatives to take effective measures not only to remove threats to peace and to repress all acts of aggression, but also and increasingly to prevent such threats to international peace and security.

Mr. ERDENECHULUUN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): The Committee has just begun its consideration of the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly on the initiative of the socialist countries. If we look back at the course of events since then, we see even more clearly the importance of that historic document, which speaks about the need for regular consideration of progress in the implementation of its provisions.

The situation today is such as to require persistent and deliberate efforts by all States to halt and reverse the dangerous trend that has led to a further increase in the threat of a nuclear war breaking out. The statements of the heads of delegations of most countries in the general debate were marked by growing concern about the fate of the world and their determination to ensure the peaceful development of mankind and to protect the right of peoples to peace. Strong evidence of that determination is given by the numerous resolutions adopted in this Committee concerning the most urgent problems of preserving peace and international security and removing the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

The responsibility for the present situation lies with the more aggressive circles of imperialism, primarily the United States, whose policy is to undermine the political and military détente and break existing agreements and treaties, in order to achieve military supremacy. They do everything possible to give a material basis for Washington's notorious crusade against socialism, with the expenditure of billions of dollars on new series of military programmes. Imperialist intervention in the affairs of independent States, political terrorism and violence have exacerbated existing sources of tension and created new ones. They are attempting to impose their will on other sovereign States through various sanctions and a policy of diktat.

The pseudo peace-loving rhetoric used to disguise those activities cannot deceive anyone. Declarations of good intent should be backed up by real deeds and a serious, constructive dialogue having regard to the security needs of all countries. In this connection, it is extremely important that there be strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security, rather than an attempt to impose clearly unacceptable solutions. This very position is the basis of the constructive initiatives of the socialist countries, reflected, inter alia, in the

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

Political Declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, adopted at the session of the Political Consultative Committee held in Prague on 5 January 1983, and the Declaration resulting from the high-level meeting of representatives of member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in Moscow last June.

As a result of the deployment of American intermediate-range nuclear missiles in a number of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries, beginning at the end of last year, the level of nuclear confrontation has been considerably increased. It is therefore imperative to end the build-up of new nuclear devices in Europe and subsequently to reduce them until the continent is completely free of nuclear weapons, both tactical and medium-range.

We believe that an important element in consolidating peace would be action on the proposed treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations between the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the member countries of NATO. The creation of a climate of mutual trust would be considerably assisted if the nuclear States that have not yet done so undertook not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and if they imposed a qualitative and quantitative freeze on such weapons. This has been the subject of repeated appeals by the General Assembly.

It is also in that context that we regard the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

There is general recognition of the extreme importance of relations between the nuclear Powers in the maintenance of international peace. Existing nuclear realities require that those relationships be subject to specific norms. That is why we support the proposal of the Soviet Union on the matter. It is important that the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, finally end its fruitless discussions and get down to practical work, drawing up treaties and agreements on the vital issues on its agenda. Here I refer primarily to a whole range of questions relating to the prevention of nuclear war and to nuclear disarmament. It is high time that negotiations be concluded on a general and complete nuclear-weapons-test ban and the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons.



(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

The Conference on Disarmament should immediately get down to talks on the prevention of the arms race in all its aspects in outer space. In our view, a constructive basis for solving this important problem would be the most recent initiative of the Soviet Union, proposing that outer space be used exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind, which has received broad support at the United Nations.

The Mongolian delegation wishes to refer particularly to the importance of the forthcoming new round of talks between the Soviet Union and the United States to reach generally acceptable agreements on a broad range of issues relating to nuclear and space weapons. We hope that the talks will yield positive results. A successful outcome would be in the interests of all the peoples of the world.

The Soviet Union took an extremely timely and fitting initiative when it proposed that at its present session the General Assembly should consider the question of the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States. The pursuit of a terrorist policy in international affairs involves a direct threat to the free and independent development of sovereign States. State terrorism has been revealed in its most baleful form in the policies and actions of Washington against the peace-loving people of Nicaragua. If people are to enjoy peace and security, all States must necessarily base their relations on strict observance of the Charter and the generally recognized principles and norms of international law. In our view, the General Assembly must condemn the policies and practices of State terrorism as a method of dealing with other States and peoples.

The situation on the continent of Asia is extremely complex and tense. Wherever one looks, it is difficult to find any part of Asia that has not in some way been affected by American "vital interests". That fact must be seen as underlying all those actions aimed at sharply escalating the United States military presence in various regions of South-East Asia.

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

Actions are being undertaken to create new military political groupings in order to give a military slant to regional economic organizations. It is also extremely dangerous that that part of the world has once more shown evidence of overt militarist and revanchist tendencies.

The harsh lessons of history show the pointlessness of policies that rely on brute strength in international relations. Cannot the same thing be said about the sources of tension that are today devastating various parts of the world, particularly the continent of Asia?

Let us take as an example the long-drawn-out crisis that persists in the Middle East. The aggressive and annexationist actions of Israel with the direct support and encouragement of the United States have further complicated an already explosive situation in that part of the world. We hold the well-justified view that a comprehensive solution to the Middle East problem can and should be sought by means of collective efforts on the part of all the parties concerned - that is, by holding an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations.

In this connection the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic would like to express its support for the proposals of the Soviet Union on a Middle East settlement put forward on 29 July of this year, which indicated ways and means of achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Because of imperialist and hegemonistic circles that are reluctant to be reconciled with new realities, a very tense situation still persists in South East Asia. Hostile acts are still being undertaken against the countries of Indo-China. Everything is being done to resist a growing tendency in favour of dialogue between the ASEAN countries and Indo-China. The Mongolian People's Republic has consistently supported the constructive efforts made by Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea to ensure that South-East Asia will be made into a zone of peace, stability and good neighbourliness. Unsavory attempts to make use of the United Nations as a sort of shield to indulge in intervention in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea simply serve to tarnish the authority of our Organization.

Improvement of the situation in Asia would be facilitated by reaching a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan on the basis of the well-known proposals made by that country. We support dialogue between the representatives of Afghanistan and Pakistan with the mediation of the representative of the Secretary-General, and it is our hope that those efforts will yield positive results.

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

We cannot but be seriously concerned at plans to locate medium-range nuclear missiles, particularly neutron weapons, in the southern part of Korea. In this connection the Mongolian People's Republic once again expresses its support for the proposals made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aimed at improving the climate on the Korean peninsula and bringing about a peaceful and democratic reunification of the country without any outside interference.

Our country has consistently favoured the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and the implementation of the Declaration of 1971 on this particular point. We can only regard it as reprehensible that certain Western countries have systematically proved an obstacle to the convening of an international conference on the Indian Ocean.

The desire to strengthen the foundations of security in Asia underlies the proposals made by Mongolia on the conclusion of a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between States of Asia and the Pacific, which was put forward in May 1981. Its purpose is to strengthen the principle of non-use of force with respect to the Asian continent. Along the same lines are the proposals made by other countries, particularly that made by the Soviet Union on confidence-building measures in the Far East and the development of good-neighbourly relations between States of that region.

A just and peaceful solution to the Cyprus problem requires that all foreign troops be withdrawn from Cyprus and that all foreign bases on that territory be eliminated. Separate actions undertaken by any one of the communities, in our opinion, simply hinder any solution to the problem. In this connection we should like once again to express our support for the good-offices mission of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

The Mongolian People's Republic has constantly favoured the efforts of the people of Namibia, who are struggling under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) for their freedom and independence. It condemns the manoeuvres of imperialist and racist forces aimed at perpetuating the colonial régime in Namibia, and it echoes the demands voiced by world public opinion that it immediately be given independence on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

The world situation cannot but have an extremely negative effect on the resolution of the problems of world economic development. We support the just demands made by the developing countries that global negotiations be started as

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

soon as possible on international economic co-operation for the purposes of development in accordance with United Nations resolutions.

In connection with the forthcoming fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, our delegation would like to express the hope that the commemoration of that anniversary will provide an excellent opportunity to further the efforts being made by this world Organization to perform its main function - that is, to remove the threat of another world war. For precisely that reason the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic put forward for consideration by the General Assembly at the present session the item of the right of peoples to peace. The Declaration recently adopted by the General Assembly in that regard was, as we see it, an important political act undertaken by the United Nations in order to mobilize and step up the efforts of world public opinion in order to remove the threat of nuclear war and to create a favourable climate for practical steps to be taken to limit and curb the arms race.

A few days ago our country celebrated the sixtieth anniversary of the proclamation of the Mongolian People's Republic, which marked the beginning of a new historic stage in the life of the Mongolian people. In his statement to the solemn meeting held in celebration of that jubilee, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the President of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic, Mr. Batmunkh, said:

"The revolutionary nature of our national structure predetermines the aims and principles of its foreign policy, which are to do everything possible to strengthen genuine socialism, to support the national liberation movements of peoples, to promote peaceful coexistence among States with differing social systems and to work actively for universal peace and security."

Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is speaking to explain its position on the proposal submitted by the USSR concerning the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States. Consideration of this proposal by the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session is extremely topical. As is well known, the international situation has been considerably aggravated, and the danger of war has increased. The stepped-up course of confrontation and arms build-up has led to the most serious threat to international peace and security since the Second World War.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic Republic)

Striving for military supremacy and hegemony over entire regions of our globe and to secure so-called spheres of vital interests, certain forces pursue policies, propound doctrines and increasingly engage in activities aimed at undermining the socio-political system of other States and to overthrow legitimate Governments.

More and more peoples are today being subjected to these policies of diktat, blackmail and terrorism, policies that have State sanction and that are organized by governmental organs. Particularly in regions in which peoples have embarked upon the road of social progress and taken their future into their own hands, forces are being activated in an attempt to impede or halt - and, if possible, reverse - such developments. Examples of such policies can be found in many regions of the world, whether in Central America or the Caribbean, in the Middle East or southern Africa or in South-East Asia. A sovereign State, a Member of the United Nations, was invaded. An outright crusade has been launched against other sovereign States in the region involving demonstrations of military power and political threat and defamation, as well as the recruitment, financing and equipping of counter-revolutionary forces.

Provocations are being staged on extremely flimsy pretexts to prepare the ground for armed raids and for direct invasion. The facts - among them the mining of ports, the permanent violation of airspace and territorial waters and, last but not least, the so-called manuals for psychological operations in guerrilla warfare - have amply demonstrated that those forces that pursue a course of threat, blackmail and economic boycott will stop at nothing. It just does not suit the plans of certain States and forces that more and more people, on the American continent as well, should take their destiny into their own hands and resolutely refuse to accept outside tutelage, let alone the role of world policeman. If such a course is raised to the level of official State and government policy, it inevitably leads to State terrorism, with all its dangerous consequences for international peace and security. In the Middle East the continued illegal occupation of Arab territories, the denial of the right of self-determination to the Palestinian people, the policy of aggression and threat pursued against Arab peoples and States and against national liberation movements - in particular the Palestine Liberation Organization - are nothing other than State terrorism.

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic  
Republic)

This policy of State terrorism is also manifest in colonialism and neo-colonialism, in racism and in apartheid. The apartheid régime destabilizes the situation in the south of the African continent, in particular through subversive acts against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of African States. These forces persist in their attempts to place impediments in the way of the implementation of the right to self-determination by the African peoples and to liquidate their achievements won in the fight for national and social liberation.

The German Democratic Republic resolutely condemns all acts by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system of other States. Such acts constitute a flagrant violation of valid norms of international law. The policy of State terrorism is contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which, as we all know, calls upon all Member States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

On 3 and 4 December - yesterday and today - a meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty took place in Berlin. The Foreign Ministers focused attention on the situation in Europe in the context of the international situation as a whole. In the communiqué that has just been published the following statement is made:

"The States represented at the meeting advocate the strict observance in intergovernmental relations of the principles of respect for independence and national sovereignty, of the inviolability of borders and of territorial integrity, the principle of non-interference in internal affairs, the renunciation of the use or threat of force and the peaceful settlement of all disputes between States by means of negotiations and the strict observance of the other fundamental principles of international relations."

At the same time the States participating in the meeting rejected any acts directed at undermining the social order in other States.

Every people has the inalienable right to determine their political, economic and social system free from any form of outside interference. The German Democratic Republic respects that right. The struggle of peoples and their legitimate Governments or national liberation movements against State-sanctioned terrorism is just and fully in accord with the Charter of the United Nations. In

(Mr. Ott, German Democratic  
Republic)

the future the German Democratic Republic will continue to display solidarity with and stand by the side of peoples striving for freedom, independence and social progress.

The preservation of peace requires that international relations be based on the strict observance of the United Nations Charter and on the generally accepted principles and norms of intergovernmental relations. Realism and commonsense must prevail so that healthy international relations can be restored, hot-beds of tension in various regions of the globe defused through peaceful negotiations and the emergence of new ones prevented.

The adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of a relevant draft resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States would be a weighty contribution to the creation of political guarantees of peace, to the strengthening of the security of States, to the consolidation of international security as a whole and thus to the building of confidence in relations among States.

Mr. PAPUCIU (Albania) (interpretation from French): The situation prevailing today in the Mediterranean basin constitutes a serious concern and a direct threat to the peace and security of the countries of the region, of Europe and of the world in general. That region has become a volatile zone of confrontation and tension between the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, between their military and political blocs, which may one day transform the Mediterranean into a theatre of destructive military operations. There is a great deal of talk today about the militarization of the Mediterranean basin and other problems deriving from the escalation of that process, but it should be emphasized that what is occurring in the Mediterranean is not a matter of a day or a year but the result of a policy long pursued by the two super-Powers and the other imperialist Powers. It is not difficult to identify them because in the waters and the skies of the Mediterranean the aircraft carriers, the cannons and the missiles of the United States and the Soviet Union are easily distinguishable as the monsters of war.

Although the United States and the Soviet Union are far from the Mediterranean they are present there at every moment; their military fleets come and go from one shore of the Mediterranean to another, displaying their military might and equipment. All of the arguments and efforts designed to justify the permanent presence of these large fleets in the Mediterranean basin can be explained simply by the aggressive designs of the two super-Powers and their rivalry to gain hegemony and carve up the Mediterranean into spheres of influence.

This situation is further complicated by the many conflicts that exist in this area between various countries but it must be said from the outset that behind these conflicts one can easily discern the interference and involvement of the American imperialists and the Soviet social imperialists, which are promoting those conflicts in accordance with their respective interests.

The prolongation of the Arab-Israeli conflict has effectively shown the expansionist design of the super-Powers. The pursuit of that conflict provides them with new opportunities to increase their acts of interference and make deals in order to expand their zones of influence in the Mediterranean.

At the same time the conflict between Iran and Iraq is another source of tension which has dangerous consequences for the Mediterranean. Developments in the Red Sea clearly show how the two super-Powers are using the situations created for their own ends. On the pretext of mine-sweeping operations, we now see a large fleet concentrated in those waters. The name of the one who laid the phantom mines



(Mr. Papuciu, Albania)

may remain a mystery, because even with sophisticated methods no mines have been found, mines that have destroyed many ships, but there is no mystery as to whose aims are served and especially who profits from the situation. This act serves the two super-Powers more than others, the super-Powers which are seeking once again to legitimize their military presence.

The dimensions of the rivalry between the two super-Powers in the Mediterranean and the dangers involved in their gunboat policy is rightly of concern to the various peoples of the Mediterranean. Before they come to a clash in the Pacific, the Atlantic and elsewhere, the American and Soviet Union battle fleets will have destroyed the whole of the Mediterranean and its entire seaboard.

The United States and the Soviet Union cannot fail to note this concern and that is why they exert efforts to mask their designs and conceal the truth, but even in these cases they resort to the instrument of demagoguery and try to show their military presence as a so-called element of stability, an indispensable way of guaranteeing the Soviet-American balance, while the presence of their military bases is presented ostensibly as a factor which helps the countries where they are installed. This year the Lebanese people had an opportunity to see the benefits of this presence when it received a rain of fire and steel from the United States Sixth Fleet, stationed in the Mediterranean. The Socialist People's Republic of Albania, as a Mediterranean country, follows with great attention and concern all the events evolving in the Mediterranean basin, because they are related to the supreme interests of its freedom and independence and, to the defence of the victories of socialism but also to the destinies of the other sovereign and freedom-loving peoples of the region. Socialist Albania has honourably done its duty by the other countries and peoples of the Mediterranean. It has publicly and repeatedly declared that it will never allow the establishment of foreign military bases on its territory. Likewise it will not allow anyone to threaten or impinge upon the national independence and freedom of the peoples and States of this basin through its territory.

Our attitude towards the situation and the course of events in the Mediterranean is quite clear. It is a position of principle, as is our entire foreign policy. Our country is interested in exerting every effort to contribute effectively to ensuring that the Mediterranean will be a free area of fruitful mutual co-operation. We strongly condemn the aggressive policy of the imperialist Powers, especially the United States and the Soviet Union, which by their war

(Mr. Papuciu, Albania)

fleets have become the most dangerous and destabilizing factor in the situation in the region. It is above all for that reason that all of the American and Soviet vessels should leave the waters of the Mediterranean.

The leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Enver Hoxha, has written in his recent book, Reflections on the Middle East:

"Time is now demonstrating that to refuse to receive foreign fleets in one's own ports is in the interests of the country rejecting them, and also in the interests of countries and peoples which wish to have good relations with others, especially with those of the Mediterranean."

Our country understands very well the concerns of the Mediterranean countries, and we fully appreciate the measures and initiatives they adopt with a view to safeguarding their sovereignty against the hegemonism of the super-Powers. We stand united with them. American imperialism and Soviet social imperialism will not of their own volition leave the Mediterranean despite the demagoguery they engage in; about that we must harbour no illusions. From what we can see the Mediterranean has become part of their plans for it as a militarized sea. It is for that reason that the Socialist People's Republic of Albania believes that only resolute struggle against the military presence of the super-Powers, the withdrawal of their fleets, the dismantling of all the military bases there and the prohibition of the supply of any manner of facilities is the approach that will ensure that the Mediterranean will truly belong to Mediterraneans and be transformed into a zone of peace and prosperity, free from threats and imperialist blackmail.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): I wish, on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, to address item 68 on our agenda, "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

The Charter of the United Nations was designed to maintain international peace and security in a world recovering from a prolonged period of conflict. The United Nations system agreed upon was intended, as the Charter tells us, to develop friendly relations among nations, achieve international co-operation in solving problems and be a centre for harmonizing the action of nations. We should not underestimate what our Organization has achieved in working towards those aims in the intervening years. The Secretary-General in his report to us this year on the work of the Organization lists many of these achievements, which took place during a period of enormous change in the world.

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

The Ten share the concern reflected in the Secretary-General's report on the work of the Organization that the past year has been a time of tension, in particular in East-West relations, tension accentuated by the lack of progress in disarmament and arms limitation. There have, in addition, been conflicts or threatened conflicts in several parts of the world.

We are all aware that, just as disarmament cannot thrive in a climate of tension, so promotion of trust helps to create a climate in which disarmament can make progress. Moreover, any advance in disarmament can promote a less tense international climate. It is the wish of the Ten to bring about genuine security by promoting an atmosphere of mutual confidence through use of the United Nations and through a growth in co-operation and exchanges between States. The Ten are conscious of the central role that a renewal and deepening of the political dialogue between East and West can play in this area. In this context the Ten welcome the forthcoming talks between the United States and the Soviet Union in Geneva.

All States are bound by the Charter to settle their disputes peacefully. Such peaceful settlement of disputes would be more easily achievable in a climate of trust. This undertaking applies to all States irrespective of their political, economic or social systems as well as of their size, geographical location or level of economic development.

The Ten deeply regret that the Charter is frequently violated, including by military interventions and the threat or use of force. That is why the aim expressed in the Preamble of the Charter that we should "unite our strength to maintain international peace and security" still remains a distant ideal.

The Charter clearly gives priority to dealing with the threats to international peace and security and to the commitment of all States to co-operate towards this end in the framework of the United Nations and in their relations with one another. The strengthening of international security requires measures that will contribute to the security and peace-keeping system as laid down in the Charter, but equally it encompasses other international instruments with regard to international conduct serving the objective of peace and security, including measures for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The Secretary-General has underlined for us in his reports over the past three years how the system of security envisaged by the Charter is often left aside. But

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

he has gone on to point out how he feels it could be used more effectively and has suggested practical measures to lead to this. The Ten support these efforts of the Secretary-General and welcome the fact that the Security Council, the organ on which the Members of the United Nations have conferred the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, continues to consider these questions.

An effective Security Council is essential to the operation of the United Nations and every effort to enhance its authority and its role in maintaining international peace and security, as envisaged by the Charter, must receive our full encouragement.

An example of how the Security Council has demonstrated its effectiveness is in the establishment of United Nations peace-keeping forces. Peace-keeping, by achieving and maintaining stability and by preserving peace in areas of crisis pending a just and lasting solution, can create an atmosphere conducive to the achievement of peaceful solutions. Member States of the Ten participate in all but one of the United Nations peace-keeping operations currently in the field.

The Ten are aware that social and economic factors can have a bearing on the general concept of security. Indeed, disarmament and security are closely related to development. Development at an acceptable rate is hardly possible to reconcile with the continuation of a global arms build-up. Substantial progress in the field of development is essential for the preservation of world peace and security.

In this context we are conscious of the fact that the present international economic situation has made it difficult for countries, especially for developing countries, to reduce their debt burden and lessen their economic problems. An improvement of these conditions would contribute to the strengthening of international security. Any balanced reductions in military expenditures must be sought. All parties involved in this process should do their utmost to use resources thus liberated to promote economic and social progress, particularly in the developing countries.

Equally, for the Ten, international security cannot flourish without universal respect for and the full exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms as well as the elimination of the violation of these rights.

The Ten believe that regional approaches to international security deserve particular attention. The Ten have been involved within the framework of the

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

Helsinki Final Act in striving to bring about conditions in which the peoples of the 35 participating States can live in true and lasting peace free from any threat to or attempt against their security. The Ten attach the greatest importance to progress towards the full implementation of the system for the maintenance of international peace and security provided for in the Charter and the entrenchment of confidence that the recognized principles of international law and norms of international conduct, such as those laid down in the Helsinki Final Act, will be observed.

There is a close link between peace and security in Europe and in the world as a whole. Given the military situation in Europe, the Ten have actively promoted the undertaking of a set of mutually complementary confidence- and security-building measures designed to reduce the risk of military confrontation in Europe. In conformity with the mandate agreed for the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, the Ten are actively pursuing, in a first stage, negotiated agreement on a set of militarily significant and verifiable confidence- and security-building measures covering the whole of Europe and designed to diminish the risk of military confrontation there. Success in this endeavour would pave the way for a second stage of the Conference, where the participating States would continue their efforts for security and disarmament in Europe, in particular by controlled reductions of armaments.

I need hardly repeat the commitment of the Ten made on many previous occasions to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. We have sought to contribute and will continue to contribute to the strengthening of security at both the international and regional levels.

The CHAIRMAN: The list of speakers for this afternoon's meeting on security items is exhausted.

The meeting was suspended at 4.50 p.m. and resumed at 5 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 53 (continued)

ISRAELI NUCLEAR ARMAMENT (A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1)

The CHAIRMAN: In keeping with the Committee's decision of yesterday, we shall now take up for action draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1, which was introduced yesterday by the representative of Iraq.

I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. TARI (Israel): The Government of Iraq, in keeping with its practice of the previous six years, this year introduced draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1.

In his reports to the General Assembly contained in documents A/38/199 of 1 September 1983 and A/39/435 of 28 August 1984, the Secretary-General of the United Nations stated that he:

"... has received no new information in this regard and consequently has nothing to add to his earlier reports to the General Assembly on the subject ..." (A/39/435, para. 2)

None the less, Iraq once again calls upon us to vote on this issue.

And, if I may refer to a term used here in the First Committee just a few days ago by the representative of Iraq himself during a bitter oral confrontation, I would also say that Iraq is juggling with amendments to its own ritual text. This is a fact which does not add much credibility or seriousness to its proclaimed intentions.

There is no justification for the continuous discussion in the General Assembly on item 53 and there is a definite need to put an end to the debate on this subject. Iraq's transparent exercise of submitting additional repetitive and outrageous resolutions does not serve the cause of peace in the Middle East and indeed is not intended to do so. The Iraqi persistence in pursuing this course can be understood only if viewed against the background of Iraq's unrelenting hostility towards Israel.

This draft resolution is also a very transparent attempt to divert world attention from the war unleashed by Iraq in the Gulf over four years ago, from the use by Iraq of chemical weapons and from the bombing by Iraq of the nuclear power plant at Busher.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1, like the previous draft resolutions introduced by Iraq under agenda item 53, is discriminatory. So was, from the beginning, the resolution that singled out Israel for investigation on a matter in which, in one manner or another, many Member States find themselves in the same position as Israel. The height of hypocrisy is reflected by the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1, or the list of the countries which in the past voted for similar resolutions. Many of them, including some Arab States, are not parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. While parties to the Treaty, some Arab countries have not fulfilled their obligations in accordance with the Treaty. Also, in signing the Treaty and various other disarmament treaties, a number of Arab States expressed reservations regarding Israel.

I wish now to refer to some specific aspects of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1. The Iraqi draft resolution is trying to involve the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), by way of anti-Israel discrimination, in a political matter which is clearly beyond that Agency's mandate and is incompatible with its statute.

IAEA is inherently a functional, not a political, body based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all members. The IAEA statute does not make membership in the Agency conditional upon a State's agreement to requirements such as those here addressed to Israel. If such a requirement existed many Member States represented here would be in violation of it. The Iraqi draft resolution also represents a clear attempt to provoke a blunt interference by the General Assembly into the affairs of IAEA and to corrupt yet another non-political international agency. Embroiling IAEA in extraneous political debates will not contribute to the solution of the problems facing it. Politicization exacerbates dissention and rancour within that organization. It erodes its authority as a responsible organization within the United Nations system and threatens to deprive it of its integrity and credibility as a technical organization.

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1, as compared with last year's resolution on the same subject, adds another element of bias. The Assembly is asked once again by Iraq and its supporters to spend more of the United Nations limited

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

resources on another report, at a time when the Organization is in such financial straits that it cannot find even smaller amounts of money to fund constructive projects. Within this context, the attention of representatives has been drawn to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30/Rev.1 concerning the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR). That draft resolution invites Governments to consider making voluntary contributions to that Institute and requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide it with administrative and other support. However, instead of being allowed to devote itself entirely to studies about disarmament, UNIDIR is asked to perform a task which makes it serve the political and partisan ends of Arab States, Iraq in particular, in their political warfare against Israel.



(Mr. Tari, Israel)

Finally, some remarks on the alleged nuclear and military co-operation between Israel and South Africa. Those who make the false and unsubstantiated allegations believe that, by repeating these lies often enough, they will be accepted as fact. Indeed, they deliberately ignore the study of the group of experts included in the Secretary-General's report in document A/36/431 of 18 September 1981, which on page 8, paragraph 13, in reference to certain anti-Israel rumours, dismissed them as unsubstantiated speculation.

These few examples demonstrate Iraq's misuse of the United Nations and of this Committee in particular by the repeated introduction of item 53. The contempt which Iraq and its supporters show for legality, for equality and for the principle of universality in international organizations seriously impedes our work. The current trend must be urgently arrested before it causes irreparable damage. The voting here should therefore be determined in the light of the misuse of the United Nations rostrum by Iraq.

Israel rejects the draft resolution in its entirety and calls upon all States to join us in opposing it for the sake of this Organization's future and for peace in the Middle East.

Mr. LIEBOWITZ (United States of America): I have asked to speak in order to explain the vote of the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1 on Israeli nuclear armament.

This draft resolution, much like those of previous years on this subject, is discriminatory. It singles out one Member State for criticism and condemnation while it patently ignores a number of other States which have neither become parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty nor placed their nuclear facilities under the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The United States would welcome a balanced provision calling for all non-nuclear-weapon States which have not done so to request IAEA, pursuant to article III A 5 of its Statute, to apply safeguards continuously to all their nuclear facilities. The application of safeguards to all peaceful nuclear activities in a State contributes significantly to increased confidence among neighbouring States as well as other States regarding the peaceful nature of such activities.

In fact, however, operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1, as did operative paragraph 3 of last year's resolution, ignores this principle of balance and moreover would represent an inappropriate attempt by the General Assembly to instruct IAEA on a matter which relates directly

(Mr. Liebowitz, United States)

to the interpretation of IAEA statutory provisions. We believe this is a function properly reserved to the IAEA Board of Governors and the General Conference, which alone are competent to determine whether or not a member State may have its rights and privileges of membership suspended in accordance with article XIX B of the IAEA Statute.

We are also concerned with the request in operative paragraph 7 of this draft resolution for a report providing data and other relevant information relating to Israeli nuclear armament and further nuclear developments. While this report is to take into account the Secretary-General's report of two years ago, we question the need for any new report.

Besides these substantive concerns, like the representative of Israel, we oppose the call for a report on financial grounds as well.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1 because we believe that its adoption will constitute a valuable contribution to efforts to avoid the dangers facing peace and security in the Middle East region.

However, I do wish to place on record that this does not affect the position of my country regarding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and that, in connection with the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1 regarding the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, my delegation was unable to be present when draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.30/Rev.1 having to do with that Institute, was considered. Had we been present, we would have voted in favour of that text, on the understanding that its adoption does not create a precedent for the financing of other bodies that work on the basis of voluntary contributions. I therefore request the Secretariat to take note of this point so that the vote of my delegation on that text can be duly reflected.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote, we shall now proceed to the vote itself.

A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraphs 3 and 4.

We shall take up operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Malawi, Nepal, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay, Zaire

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted by 73 votes to 23, with 18 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Greece, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Zaire.

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted by 68 votes to 26, with 23 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution

A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted by 85 votes to 2, with 36 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. CORTI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, because we consider that in outline and in its general objectives it is acceptable. However, the text that we have just adopted contains certain elements on which we should express reservations. I refer in particular to paragraphs 3 and 4, which address certain requests to the Security Council and request the International Atomic Energy Agency to suspend scientific co-operation with Israel, a policy with which my country cannot agree, for reasons of principle.

(Mr. Corti, Argentina)

I wish to reiterate emphatically my delegation's condemnation of all attacks on nuclear facilities of whatever nature or size, not only for political and legal considerations but also because of their harmful consequences to the life and health of the surrounding population.

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece) (interpretation from French): I should like to clarify the abstention by Greece in the voting on paragraph 4. I repeat that Greece is wedded to the principle of universality and therefore opposes expelling any Member State from the various bodies that make up the United Nations system.

Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution. We entirely support its main thrust. We emphasize that the Soviet Union has consistently favoured curbing Israel's nuclear aspirations, just as it has consistently favoured the enactment of effective steps aimed at preventing it from obtaining nuclear weapons and ending nuclear collaboration between any Western countries and Israel.

Tel Aviv's nuclear ambitions have often been condemned by the General Assembly, which has demanded that all its nuclear installations should be placed under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and has requested the Security Council to take the necessary steps to ensure that Israel complies with resolutions on the question of nuclear weapons. Israel's refusal to comply with those decisions is eloquent testimony to the fact that its real purpose is to acquire nuclear weapons in order to establish its domination in the Middle East. It is difficult even to imagine what consequences would flow from its adventuristic plans if they were not nipped in the bud.

In principle, we have no objection to the proposal in the draft resolution that the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, in consultation with the League of Arab States and the Organization of African Unity, should prepare a report on Israel's nuclear armament. However, the Soviet delegation has serious misgivings about the wording of paragraph 8, which might suggest a departure from the established method of financing the Institute's activities. In our opinion, those activities should be financed by voluntary contributions.

Mr. MSOSA (Malawi): I should like to take this opportunity to state my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51, in cluster 8, adopted by the Committee on 21 November. The voting record indicates that we voted in favour of the resolution. My delegation would appreciate it if the Secretariat could correct the record to reflect our intention to abstain.

Mr. SIMPSON (Ghana): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1 because we are opposed to strengthening Israel's nuclear capability, being aware that there is very close military and nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa, which we see as a threat to Africa. Israel's nuclear capability not only poses a threat to its immediate neighbours in the Middle East but threatens us in Africa, because its assistance to South Africa enables South Africa to increase its threatening and coercion of its neighbours in southern Africa.

Mr. SERAJZADEH (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to request that the vote cast by my delegation on 19 November on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.28 be changed from "yes" to non-participation.

Mr. REYES (Philippines): The Philippines voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1 because of its support for Security Council resolution 487 (1981) of 19 June 1981. The Philippines abstained on operative paragraph 4 because the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) contains specific provisions pertaining to the suspension of scientific co-operation with any member country. Moreover, the Philippines hopes that all States will find it possible to place all nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to explain its vote after the vote, I declare that action upon draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45/Rev.1 has been concluded.

Before we adjourn, may I remind the members of this Committee that the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions on all security items is 6 p.m. this evening. I would invite delegations that wish to introduce draft resolutions they have sponsored on security items to be ready to do so at our next meeting, on Wednesday afternoon.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.