



# General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.42  
21 October 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Monday, 21 October 1985, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. DE PINIES (Spain)

later: Mr. MOUSHOOTAS (Vice-President) (Cyprus)

- Commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations [39]  
(continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Daniel Ortega Saavedra, President of the Republic of Nicaragua

Mr. Abdou Diouf, President of the Republic of Senegal

Mr. Pál Losonczi, President of the Hungarian People's Republic

Sheikh Amine Gemayel, President of the Lebanese Republic

His Majesty Motlotlehi King Moshoeshoe II, Head of State of the Kingdom  
of Lesotho

/...

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

**A/40/PV.42**

**1(a-z)**

**Mr. Steingrímur Hermannsson, Prime Minister of the Republic of Iceland**

**Mr. Shimon Peres, Prime Minister of the State of Israel**

**Mr. Hans-Dietrich Genscher, Vice-Chancellor and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany**

**Mr. Mochtar Kusumaatmadja, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Special Envoy of the President of the Republic of Indonesia**

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 39 (continued)

COMMEMORATION OF THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will hear an address by the President of the Republic of Nicaragua, His Excellency Mr. Daniel Ortega Saavedra.

Mr. Daniel Ortega Saavedra, President of the Republic of Nicaragua, was escorted to the rostrum.

President ORTEGA SAAVEDRA (interpretation from Spanish): We cannot begin our statement without voicing the most vigorous rejection and condemnation of the inhuman decision of the apartheid régime to kill the patriot Malesela Moloise. We are convinced that the example set by that brave fighter and latest South African martyr and the blood that he has shed will inspire his people and the international community to redouble efforts to put an end to apartheid.

The United Nations came into existence 40 years ago, after the horrors of the war. The Organisation embodied mankind's aspirations, dreams and hopes for lasting peace.

The imprints of fascist brutality were still fresh; the blood shed by the millions of civilians and soldiers killed in the war imposed on humanity by fascism was also still fresh. The world was then being shaken by tears, pain, suffering and indignation, and in October 1945, through its mandataries, it solemnly pledged to refrain from resorting to the threat or use of force against any other State, not to interfere in the internal affairs of any other State, and to resolve international disputes by peaceful means without endangering peace, security and justice. The Charter of the Organization, which came in force in October 1945, was signed on the basis of these moral and legal principles.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

Forty years later, there has been an endless list of violations of those principles, but the warmongering escalation, now in the form of nuclear weapons, that threatens to wipe out all mankind is even more serious. The atomic threat must be eliminated. Hegemonistic attitudes must be put aside. The arms race must be stopped. The development of space weapons must cease. This is the universal demand.

Nicaragua, in line with this demand for judiciousness, backs the just and sincere peace proposals that have been made presented and the talks to be held between the Soviet Union and the United States, confident that they will constitute a constructive effort paving the way to international détente.

World peace must necessarily mean the peaceful solution of the conflicts today being kindled in different regions of the earth. There will never be peace on earth while people are oppressed by the criminal policy of apartheid in South Africa. There will never be peace as long as colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism, racism or any other form of exploitation and domination exists on earth and as long as attempts are made to legitimize the practice of State terrorism.

On this fortieth anniversary, as we review the basic principles of the United Nations Charter, we reaffirm our adherence to these principles that are now being systematically violated and disregarded by the present United States rulers in various regions of the earth. Nicaragua is especially concerned about the fact that the United States, by its military might, has ignored the basic principles of international coexistence through its Administration and Congress, thus promoting a policy of State terrorism against the people of Nicaragua.

Given these facts, we can only say the following.

Since 1981 the Government of the United States of America has attempted to destroy Nicaragua's democratic process and to deny the existence of a non-aligned Nicaragua in the Central American region. Thus, in 1981, the United States rulers

(President Ortega Saavedra)

suspended food credits to Nicaragua. They adopted a 10-point programme and earmarked \$19 million to set up a mercenary force. In 1982 the United States Government authorized covert operations against Nicaragua and vetoed a United Nations Security Council resolution banning the use of force or interference in the affairs of other nations.

In this context, the Contadora Group was established to curb tensions in the area, caused largely by United States aggression against the people of Nicaragua. But this did not stop the warmongering escalation or the economic aggression. In 1983 President Reagan described the terrorists as his brothers, the freedom fighters, and ordered a reduction of Nicaragua's sugar quota, an illegal act that was condemned by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). That same year, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) drew up plans to establish a terrorist force of some 12,000 to 15,000 mercenaries, ordered an air raid on the Managua international airport and carried out terrorist attacks against fuel deposits in Corinto, Nicaragua's main port.

In 1984, when world public opinion demanded a peaceful solution of the conflict, the CIA mined sea access to all Nicaraguan ports. That same year, owing to the serious situation caused by United States policies, Nicaragua submitted a demand to the International Court of Justice accusing the United States Government of carrying out military and paramilitary activities against its sovereignty and territorial integrity and asking the Court to order the United States to cease its aggression and to compensate Nicaragua for the damage it had suffered.

In violation of the law, the United States informed the Court that it did not acknowledge its jurisdiction in connection with Nicaragua's demand. However, the Court issued a provisional decision demanding that the United States stop mining Nicaraguan ports and cease all military and paramilitary activities damaging to Nicaragua's sovereignty and independence. The Court declared the demand pertinent and rejected the United States request that it be deleted from the list of claims.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

The United States Government rejected the Court's decision regarding the temporary protection measures, once again violating international law.

Secretary-of-State Shultz referred to the revised Contadora Act of 7 July of that year as a "simple piece of paper".

But the struggle for international law and legal order went on, and the International Court of Justice unanimously decided that it had competence over the case and that Nicaragua had a right to file its demand in view of the United States acts of aggression.

The reaction of the United States was to withdraw, abruptly and unexpectedly, from the process, thus taking an unlawful stand.

Secretary-of-State Shultz then wrote to the President of the Inter-American Development Bank threatening that institution with reprisals if it approved funds for Nicaragua.

The United States unilaterally suspended the talks that were being held in Manzanillo. The President of the United States publicly declared that his goal was to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua. And it has been confirmed that the Psychological War Operations Manual instructing mercenaries in political assassination and all kinds of terrorist activities was edited, published and distributed by the CIA.

This year the United States Government has declared a trade embargo against Nicaragua while allocating \$27 million to the mercenary forces, thus bringing the financing devoted to its terrorist policies against Nicaragua to more than \$100 million. It has also made known its proposal to recruit up to 30,000 mercenaries to continue attacking Nicaragua.

In the past four years 13 United States military manoeuvres have been carried out, openly threatening Nicaragua's sovereignty. In October of this year the United States Government started to disburse the \$27 million earmarked for terrorist actions.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

From 1980 to 4 September 1985 the forces organized and directed by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) have murdered 3,652 people, 146 of whom were women and 218 children under the age of 12. There have been 4,039 people wounded and 5,232 have been kidnapped. Over 240,000 Nicaraguans have lost their homes and 7,982 children are now war orphans. Moreover, thousands of peasants kidnapped, confused and deceived by the CIA are among the casualties of the counterrevolutionary forces: they are also Nicaraguans who have been victims of aggression - 7,599 dead and 1,326 wounded. Therefore, the number of Nicaraguans who have been victims of United States terrorist policies amount to 11,000 dead, 5,000 wounded, 5,000 kidnapped and a quarter of a million displaced persons. For a small country such as ours, with a population of only 3.5 million, this represents an incalculable toll in human losses and suffering.

If the country attacking us were today to face a proportional cost in victims, it would have suffered a total of 723,000 dead - that is almost three times the number of Americans killed during the Second World War, or the entire population of the city of Boston. It would have 373,000 wounded and 17,550,000 displaced persons - the equivalent of the entire population of the State of New York - and 9,000 women and 15,000 children under the age of 12 would have been murdered.

The terrorist actions of the United States rulers have caused the destruction of 321 schools and 50 health centres, machinery and construction equipment. The CIA mercenaries have levelled entire peasant co-operatives and even entire villages. The pressures and blackmail exerted by the United States Government in blatant violation of the status of multilateral organizations have led to the freezing of loans worth \$423 million. The total losses caused by direct and indirect actions of United States aggression exceed the figure of \$1.5 billion.

We have taken this testimony to the highest world and United Nations tribunal namely, the International Court of Justice at The Hague. In a tacit admission of its own guilt, the United States has declared that it will not accept the Court's

(President Ortega Saavedra)

jurisdiction nor abide by its findings. On the other hand, our presence in the Court constitutes a historic milestone in the defence of the sovereignty and self-determination of small nations.

We bring this testimony to the Assembly because we are concerned with the defence of this Organization which, on its fortieth anniversary, is being seriously threatened by those who, disregarding respect for the peoples' self-determination and sovereignty, as they did in Maurice Bishop's small island of Grenada, now threaten to destroy Nicaragua.

We have brought this testimony to the Assembly, encouraged by the understanding we have found when we have affirmed that no solution or document will be effective in Central America until the United States rulers totally cease to attack the people of Nicaragua, directly or indirectly, in a covert manner or by any other means.

The main and only obstacle to the peace efforts of the Contadora Group continues to be the policy of State terrorism that is encouraged, directed and financed by the United States Government against Nicaragua. The peace efforts of the Contadora Group and the appeals for a peaceful solution of the conflict made by the international community are still being rejected by the United States Government, which has stepped up aggression against Nicaragua and refuses to seek a negotiated solution in El Salvador. Therefore, United States aggression must cease in order that conditions may be created that will lead to a peaceful solution in Central America.

We cannot but refer to the economic situation and the problem of debt that are shaking the very foundations of an unjust international economic order that resembles the Rome of the Caesars where the oppressed peoples were forced to pay taxes. No one doubts that it is not possible for Latin America to pay its debt or that it is necessary to find new formulas for the debt to stop being the burden that curbs our peoples' development possibilities. All this is indissolubly linked



(President Ortega Saavedra)

to the establishment of new trade relations with the industrialized countries and bold forms of trade among the developing countries.

Under these circumstances Nicaragua will continue to defend the peoples' right to have economic relations with any country in the world, regardless of its political régime.

Ever since the profound economic crisis our country has been suffering due to the aggression of the United States rulers, Nicaragua has made great sacrifices to comply with its financial obligations with the international banks and multilateral organisations resulting from the debt we inherited from the Somoza régime and the debt we have contracted with friendly countries since 1979.

With the blood and the sweat of the Nicaraguan people we have in five years paid \$621 million in debt servicing; that is, in five years we have invested a total of two years of exports to meet some of our financial obligations.

Due to the continuation of the aggression committed by the United States, the situation has worsened to the point where, although according to the World Bank we should be exporting \$1 billion per year, we are only exporting \$300 million annually. As may be observed, we are facing an extreme situation which not only limits but eliminates our possibility to pay. Under these dramatic circumstances Nicaragua demands an urgent and concerted international solidarity; it demands decisive support from those countries with which Nicaragua has bilateral financial relations and a change in the attitude of the creditor institutions.

On this fortieth anniversary of the United Nations Nicaragua is a living example of a small nation that decided to be free and that is consequently resisting the blows of an irrational policy that intends to snatch that right away from us.

The policy of State terrorism being practised by the rulers of the United States will never bring Nicaragua to its knees. The strategy of terror cannot lead to peace and coexistence among nations.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

Nicaragua is no enemy of the United States. There is no reason for the United States to consider Nicaragua as such.

Nicaragua respects the principles of the Charter, and we wish to live in peace with all nations of the Earth, including the United States. Nothing in our revolutionary project is incompatible with normal and friendly relations with the United States.

Nicaragua therefore appeals from this lofty rostrum to the Government of the United States truly to abide by the norms of peaceful coexistence among States enshrined in the Charter, to cease its policies of aggression against Nicaragua and to declare on this anniversary if it is willing to respect the sovereignty and the right to self-determination of a small country, if it is prepared to abide by the provisional decision of the International Court of Justice dated 10 May 1984 and acknowledge the jurisdiction of that United Nations body and if it is ready to stop the war against Nicaragua and to declare peace.

We, for our part, will suspend the state of emergency we have been forced to impose owing to these acts of aggression as of the very moment when those acts of aggression effectively cease.

Thus, the President of the United States now has the floor. Let him respond on 24 October, when he addresses the Assembly, and say whether, as a tribute to the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, he is willing to normalize relations with Nicaragua, in conformity with the principles of the Charter and of international law. This is Nicaragua's peace challenge. The peace of Central America depends on his response.

The people of Nicaragua are shedding their blood to defend and demand the peoples' right to self-determination and sovereignty. With the blood of our workers and peasants, of our young people, of our elderly and even of our children, we are defending international law.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

We are defending the rights of the peoples and we are waging this battle with the militant solidarity of the peoples of the world. Nicaragua expects more forceful and determined action from the international community to help stop the genocide being carried out against my people by the present United States Government.

By demanding respect for international law and for the principles of the United Nations Charter and urgently demanding a new international economic order, we are fighting for peace and justice. And we are therefore demanding respect for the memory of the millions of human beings who died as victims of fascism in Auschwitz, Birkenau, Treblinka, Maidanek, Chelmo, Monowits, Bitburg, Dachau and in dozens of other concentration camps and crematoria.

The United Nations emerged as a hope following the holocaust. Let us not allow the revival of fascism. Let us not allow any violation of the United Nations Charter. Then, there will be hope of peace on Earth and the sacrifice made by those who died in the war will not have been in vain.

Justice and peace are the future of humanity.

Nicaragua shall survive.

Mr. Daniel Ortega Saavedra, President of the Republic of Nicaragua, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, President of the Republic of Senegal, who will also speak in his capacity as current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity.

Mr. Abdou Diouf, President of the Republic of Senegal, was escorted to the rostrum.

President DIOUF (interpretation from French): There are many reasons why I am delighted to be addressing this Assembly: first, I do so on behalf of mother Africa, for I have the honour of having been elected Head of our continental

(President Diouf)

organisation at the twenty-first Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU).

In addition, while each session provides us with the opportunity to cast a brief look at the past year, this session, which coincides with the fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the United Nations Charter, because of the solemnity we decided to vest in it, has given us the opportunity to draw lessons from and identify the prospects of our forty-year-old Organization.

Finally, I am delighted, Sir, that the General Assembly has unanimously elected you as President of its fortieth session. I am convinced that the ability you have demonstrated in numerous circumstances is a certain guarantee for success in our work. It is thus with great pleasure that I address my sincere and heartfelt congratulations to you on behalf of Africa.

Your predecessor, Ambassador Paul Lusaka, certainly deserves our gratitude for the way in which he guided the work of the thirty-ninth session. The talent he demonstrated, while familiar to us all, won him our admiration.

I should like to include in this tribute the Secretary-General of the United Nations as well as all his staff, by whose efforts our Organization acts at every level and in all parts of the world, and whose persistent activities daily help to translate into actual fact our common vision of the world as it was yesterday into what it will be tomorrow. The report he submitted this year analyses with vision and lucidity the merits and shortcomings of the Organization. That can be seen in his request, for example, that in the face of current challenges, States members of the Security Council fully assume their responsibilities under the Charter.

That can be seen also when he suggests measures to improve the quality of the political process in the General Assembly. It can be seen, finally, when he defends multilateralism - which, indeed, was central to the concerns he expressed in his report to the thirty-ninth session.

(President Diouf)

The presence of many Heads of State and Government - which has added luster to this session - attests more than mere words could do to the confidence and hopes that the entire world has placed in the United Nations and in this commemorative session.

Africa hopes that this fortieth session will send out a healthy shock wave to jolt our minds and highlight the true priorities that we face. Above all, Africa hopes that, after a clear and thorough analysis of the international situation, we shall take the decisions - all the decisions, even the painful ones - that are so necessary.

The United Nations is 40 years old. By making the purposes of the international Organization peace, freedom and development - that trilogy - the San Francisco Charter gave us a set of ideals that have always inspired man's imagination, nourished his dreams and sustained his aspirations; it is an absolute system since each purpose is linked to another and to the whole.

The principles in keeping with which these purposes were to be achieved - sovereign equality, the implementation in good faith of Members' obligations, the peaceful settlement of their disputes, non-intervention by the United Nations in the domestic affairs of States except for the application of enforcement measures that may be taken when there is a breach of international peace, and so forth - were the corollaries to the purposes.

The Organization's 40-year record in regard to these purposes and principles reveals certain undeniable accomplishments. Several previous speakers have given their own contrasting assessments of those accomplishments and I would like, with your permission, to revert only to some aspects of the record.

In the peace-keeping field, having for 40 years preserved mankind from another world war, when students of war consider that in 3,400 years of known and apprehended human history there have been only 250 years of peace, the United Nations has undeniably performed an essential task.

(President Diouf)

Let there be no mistake, however. The danger of wider conflicts has not been eliminated, given the localized clashes and conflicts in the third world, and it is far from being the case that peace is experienced by all.

Indeed, everything proceeds as if the great Powers, having become painfully aware of their common interest, after two world wars, in preventing generalized conflicts, had decided to continue to confront each other militarily by shifting their conflicts to the territory of others and acting through the intermediary of small and medium-sized Powers.

Relations of such a kind, even if they do spare mankind from atomic catastrophe, are obviously objectionable and are all the more to be condemned since their only victims are our peoples and our countries whose development efforts can only have the anticipated results in conditions of peace.

As for the equal rights of peoples and self-determination, the anti-colonial philosophy conceived, developed and implemented by the United Nations has had a direct influence on the decolonization process. Eighty countries or colonial Territories have, after all, obtained their independence. None the less, for the precise reason that freedom is the basic aspiration of all peoples without exception, the continued existence, at the end of this millenium, of a minority segregationist system of oppression and domination in the southern part of Africa under the hateful apartheid régime, and the denial of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination by a people whose history itself exemplifies the inevitable triumph of just causes, are an affront to the conscience of mankind.

Then, for the achievement of international co-operation, the United Nations has established a remarkable array of specialized agencies which provide our Governments with considerable assistance in the cultural, social, economic and humanitarian fields. In certain respects, the results have even been quite spectacular. I can mention, by way of example, the role of UNESCO in the

(President Diouf)

elimination of illiteracy, that of WHO in the eradication of major endemic diseases throughout the world and that of UNICEF in the protection of children.

We have, however, no alternative but to note that, in the development area, the rise of national egoism and of protectionism, its corollary, inhibits the spirit of solidarity and generosity in international co-operation and impedes concerted action to extricate the world economy from the crisis it is undergoing.

More generally, distrust, established as a matter of doctrine in relations between rival blocs, has nurtured an arms race that swallows up hundreds of billions of dollars while an infinitesimal part of such resources could radically change the economic development prospects of our young and impoverished nations.

Everything proceeds as if, 40 years after the establishment of the United Nations, the enthusiasm for a just, interdependent, peaceful and stable international order, to which together we gave definition, seems to have waned and the sense of having a common interest in preserving peace seems to have been dissipated in various confrontations.

The collective security system laid down by the Charter is constantly obstructed, since the normal functioning of the Security Council, the body having primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, requires as a prerequisite a minimum measure of agreement among the great Powers.

It is rare that the Council manages to take a decision on a question, and even with regard to such questions as it does decide on - as is tragically the case with Namibia, but also with the Middle East - it is incapable of implementing its own decisions.

Thus, although it was created in order to forestall conflicts and prevent tensions from escalating, the United Nations manages to do no more than strive to palliate the consequences of such conflicts, rather than being able to tackle their causes, because of the paralysis of the Security Council.

(President Diouf)

Hence, many are the States that are tempted to arm themselves, sometimes even to an extent beyond their means, ultimately only helping to increase general insecurity.

In reality, behind the façade of international meetings and concerted planning that has never in history been as extensive as it is today, the community that we go to make up seems gradually to be resolving itself into each of its national components.

The mixed record of these 40 years requires the rehabilitation of the United Nations by means of a new awareness - an awareness, in the first place, of the fact that no Power can now claim world hegemony, either by force or by ideology; an awareness, also, of the fact that the coexistence of all the Powers, large and small, is indispensable and that, without a modicum of agreement on the basic conditions for our collective survival, States will not be able to solve many of their political or economic problems; and, finally, an awareness of the danger of always reacting to the problems of the world in terms of confrontation - particularly the problems of the third world, the origins of which are for the most part linked more to the ills of underdevelopment than to ideological choices.

We call for this new awareness in order to emphasize the need to desist from attitudes and behaviour that lead to tension and insecurity. We do so, also, to stress the need not to give way to discouragement. For neither war nor poverty nor the denial of justice is inevitable, something to which we must resign ourselves. Mankind has in the past given us too many examples of its ability to meet constant challenges for us to have any doubts that it will be able to overcome those that beset it today. To do that, mankind need only be guided by the noble ideals and principles that it established for itself in the United Nations Charter.

Speaking on behalf of Africa, I now turn to some specific problems to which Africa attaches special importance.



(President Diouf)

Africa is convinced that the policy of détente will remain devoid of any real meaning if its geographical area and its scope remain limited. Peaceful relations among great Powers are certainly a necessary - indeed, essential - condition for international peace and security. But those peaceful relations cannot in themselves guarantee international peace and security; they must be accompanied by peaceful relations in the third world. That is why there must be a just and lasting solution, through the application of the principles laid down in the Charter and reaffirmed in the relevant resolutions of our Organization, to the conflicts in Asia - particularly in Cambodia and Afghanistan. Similarly, in Central America the political settlement of conflicts must be accompanied by regional guarantees of security and non-interference, in the context of respect for State sovereignty.

As for the situation in the Gulf, the international community must persevere in its efforts to get the leaders of Iran and Iraq to have recourse to peaceful means to settle the conflict, as advocated by the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the United Nations Charter.

In the Middle East, for 18 years now Arab territories have been occupied and the Palestinian people - which has seemed to be pursued at all stages of its history by a particularly unjust fate - is still homeless. Despite many wars and many settlement plans, the situation there remains grim and constitutes a constant threat to international peace and security. Lebanon is living in the midst of chaos, while in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza the resistance of the people is stifled by massive military repression.

These 18 years have made it abundantly clear to the various parties that military operations are useless; they have shown that so long as the Palestinian tragedy continues there will be no peace in the Middle East. Therefore, it is the duty of the international community, and in particular of the Members of our Organisation which have special responsibilities, to do everything to assist the

(President Diouf)

parties - all the parties - to negotiate a just and lasting peace on the basis of the principles and machinery that have already been laid down, and such a peace must be achieved through negotiations among all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organisation. Hence, we emphasise the need to convene as soon as possible an international peace conference on the Middle East.

I turn now to African political questions, such as Western Sahara, Chad and the Horn of Africa. The Organisation of African Unity, which has demonstrated its determination to deal with those questions in keeping with the letter and spirit of its constitution, will continue to exert its efforts to ensure the achievement of the appropriate solutions. I have not dwelt at length on these questions because they are fully familiar to everyone here. For Africa today, it is a question of giving concrete form to the political will that inspires it, by taking well-thought-out and forthright action in the appropriate directions.

The overriding question before this session remains the development of the situation in southern Africa, where the hour for decisions seems finally to have struck.

Namibia continues to be illegally occupied by South Africa, despite the United Nations decision to place that Territory under its own responsibility. There could be no more arrogant act of defiance than that.

It is true that the Security Council in its resolution 435 (1978) unanimously decided on a settlement, on which there was general agreement among the parties directly concerned and which had the backing of the international community. But Pretoria, with its intransigent attitude of defiance of the United Nations, persists in seeking to introduce into the peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem extraneous and unacceptable considerations that clearly jeopardize Angola's sovereignty. What is more serious, the South African Government is using Namibia as a springboard for perpetrating aggression against the front-line countries.

(President Diouf)

The failure and subsequent break-down of the Western contact group, along with Pretoria's obduracy towards all proposals, clearly show that South Africa has no intention of withdrawing from Namibia. Moreover, the Pretoria régime, emboldened by the paralysis of the Security Council, which has been unable to implement a solution in keeping with international law, has installed in the Territory, through a so-called multi-party conference, an "interim government", which has been unequivocally rejected by the international community.

Through me, Africa reaffirms that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the sole framework for the settlement of the question of Namibia. It remains for the United Nations to bring about its complete and unconditional implementation, thus protecting the process of the decolonisation of the Territory from any attempts to change its character. In this connection, it should be recalled that Namibia is in no way a question of East-West relations, as some would have us believe. It is purely a matter of decolonisation.

In South Africa we see the strangest of paradoxes: the only remaining Nazi-inspired régime in the world - and we should have the courage to recognize that - it nevertheless enjoys the almost unconditional support of certain countries, countries which at the same time proclaim themselves to be the tireless champions of respect for and promotion of human rights. It is because of the multinational corporations and the support of certain Western countries that the Republic of South Africa has been able since 1948 to perpetuate its abominable régime of apartheid.

The methods and realities of apartheid are well known, and I need not dwell on them. That comprehensive, impenetrable social and economic system, with its own internal logic, is fed by a totalitarian ideology. It is the sum of its parts. It is like a block of granite, which cannot be re-shaped. It must be dynamited from within.

(President Diouf)

The blacks of South Africa understand this, and have now launched a broad offensive. Disgusted and revolted by such blindness and arrogance, the international community is conscience stricken and has begun to mobilize to eradicate the anachronism represented by apartheid at the end of the twentieth century.

It is proper that at this session commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, our Organization - and in particular the permanent members of the Security Council - should fully grasp their historic responsibilities under the Charter. As long ago as 4 November 1977, by its resolution 418 (1977), the Security Council, having condemned the South African Government for its continuance of the arrogant apartheid system, imposed mandatory sanctions against it under Chapter VII, confined, unfortunately to the military sphere. On 13 December 1984, the Security Council unanimously adopted its resolution 558 (1984), which reaffirmed its resolution 418 (1977).

Africa considers that this is not enough, that it is too little, even, for the current situation. That is why on this solemn occasion, as current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), I am appealing to the intelligence, the humanity and even the realism of the members of the Security Council to go beyond Security Council resolution 418 (1977) and adopt comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa. In that context, Africa formally proposes to the international community that in June 1986 an international conference be held under United Nations auspices on the question of sanctions against South Africa.

I wish at this stage to clear up some confusion on this problem of sanctions. Virtually all Heads of State with whom I have met in southern Africa, along with the leaders of the liberation movements, are resolved and ready to bear the consequences of economic sanctions in order to make southern Africa into a zone of peace, and South Africa into a democratic, multi-racial society.

(President Diouf)

We must heed the message of history before it is too late, for the defeat of the adherents of apartheid is now a certainty. Only the timing remains to be determined. The real question is how to hasten the moment. Every day that passes, every additional act of repression, increases the suffering of the oppressed, and makes a wise solution more difficult to achieve.

I have returned from a journey through southern Africa. I testify that I met men and women who are aware that they are living at a crucial point in the history of their countries. I spoke with the leaders of liberation movements, who were lucid and moderate, but unswerving on the rights guaranteed to their peoples by the United Nations Charter itself. For them, the violence of which they are accused by certain of South Africa's protectors is a by-product of the abominable system of apartheid. History will record that apartheid alone is responsible for the deaths in Sharpeville and Soweto and for the fate of Nelson Mandela and his comrades in arms, languishing in Botha's gaols. Over and above the combat imposed on them by the apartheid régime, those leaders have a clear vision of post-apartheid South African society, a multi-racial, egalitarian and democratic society guaranteeing freedom and justice for all.

Their point of view - which is also our point of view - is that it is possible to save South Africa and the rest of Africa from a racial and political explosion with unpredictable consequences. But that necessarily involves the establishment of a true climate of dialogue, which requires among other preconditions: the release of Nelson Mandela and the other political prisoners; the lifting of the state of emergency; and the repeal of repressive laws against anti-apartheid political and social groups. It also requires a commitment to frank, fair negotiations between the Pretoria authorities and the legitimate representatives of liberation movements and the South African patriotic forces.

(President Diouf)

I wish now to turn to economic matters and the main conclusions in this area of the twenty-first conference of Heads of State or Government of the OAU. I have made a lengthy analysis of all these problems. That analysis is well known, but it is as well to recall it, in order to underline the facts.

In determining to make peace prevail by law, the founding fathers of the United Nations also undertook "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom". The multilateral institutions established 40 years ago were the expression of a bold vision of what kind of international co-operation was needed in order to ensure the future, peace and harmonious development of the world economy.

However, while United Nations action has enabled mankind to survive, it has not succeeded in enhancing the quality of life for the majority of men. In other words, our Organization has been able to accept the challenge of bringing the countries of the third world into being, but it has failed to meet that of their increased well-being. In fact, obliged to cut back on their development efforts because of the combined effects of the collapse in the prices of the commodities that they export and the increasing cost of the industrial products they import, most of the developing countries have experienced an appreciable reduction in per capita income and some are on the brink of economic collapse, with disastrous consequences for the economic and social progress of their peoples.

The factors that have helped aggravate their situation and bring on stagnation, and even a perceptible drop in production, are now well known. They are, principally, the drop in the real value of official development assistance, monetary instability with fluctuations in rates of exchange and the high level of interest rates, the unremitting deterioration in the terms of trade, the almost complete disintegration of the multilateral trade system and the inflexibility of the lending policies of the financial institutions.

(President Diouf)

But the present crisis is essentially rooted in the fundamental structural imbalances of the world economic system. It was imbued with that conviction that the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in September 1979, took the important decision to invite the international community to launch a new round of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development, a decision that was to be endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 34/138.

Unfortunately, the North-South dialogue has become bogged down and is in a state of total deadlock in all the forums of the United Nations system. Some countries have even done their utmost to set the organisations of the system against each other, as if deliberations on international trade, industrialization or finance, for example within UNCTAD or UNIDO, encroached on the sphere of competence of GATT or the International Monetary Fund. In reality, however, the activities of all these organisations are complementary and closely interrelated. Such attitudes merely give expression to these countries' increasingly flaunted distrust of multilateralism and their undeniable relegation of the basic problems of underdevelopment to a status of secondary importance among their concerns.

We, for our part, are firmly convinced that the global negotiations continue to be the most important and most comprehensive initiative ever taken by the international community for the regulation of international economic relations, the resumption of the process of developing the economies of the developing countries, particularly those in Africa, and the strengthening of multilateral economic co-operation on the basis of mutual respect.

Despite its enormous potential, Africa has certainly been the region most severely affected by the economic recession.

For reasons of geography and history, our continent has the sad privilege of holding, according to all economic indicators, a whole array of negative records. It has the greatest concentrations of refugees and displaced persons: one half of

(President Diouf)

the land-locked countries; three quarters of the least advanced and most affected countries; the lowest literacy rate; the lowest level of development, with 70 per cent of the population near or below the threshold of absolute poverty; and endemic and unrelenting drought and desertification.

The alarming growth in the number of African LDCs in the course of the last few years and the negligible share of Africa as a whole in the world economy, particularly in agricultural and industrial production and in international trade in manufactured goods, are bringing about a process of the gradual marginalisation of our continent.

The heads of State and Government of the Organisation of African Unity, aware of the gravity of the situation, dedicated the greater part of their twenty-first Assembly, held at Addis Ababa from 18 to 20 July 1985, to an in-depth study of the economic crisis in Africa. In doing so, they focused their discussions primarily on a priority programme, to be implemented within the next five years, which should make it possible to lay the foundations for steady growth and domestically-based, self-sustaining development at the national, regional and continental levels.

The programme lists the most urgent problems created by ambiguous and sometimes brutal realities. Without claiming to provide miracle cures, it highlights vital points and indicates the extent and difficulty of our tasks. It also shows a great sense of responsibility.

The programme comprises five measures: accelerated implementation of the updated Lagos Plan of Action and Lagos Final Act; improvement of the food situation and the rehabilitation of African agriculture; mitigation of the burden of Africa's external debt; elaboration of a platform for common action at the subregional, regional, continental and international levels; and, last but not least, action to counter the effects of South Africa's policy of destabilization on the economies of the States of southern Africa.



(President Diouf)

Africa is fully aware that its economic recovery is primarily its own responsibility, and that this task is largely dependent on the efforts and sacrifices of the African countries, but the scale of the crisis and the magnitude of the resources needed to rehabilitate our economies demand that the international community support our efforts. The response of the international community, which I thank on behalf of Africa, has been positive in many aspects, particularly as regards meeting immediate needs for survival. However, the task is enormous and the situation is such that much still remains to be done. The fact is that the problem must be attacked at its roots.

That is why, given what we may now regard as the awakening of the international community to the serious problems of Africa, but also given the scattered approach to the problem, I appeal on behalf of the Heads of State and Government of the OAU that a special session of the General Assembly on the critical economic situation in Africa should be convened in the first quarter of 1986. That meeting could offer an opportunity to consider the problems as a whole, as well as their interrelationship, to evaluate what has been achieved and to mobilize all the industrialized countries, the multilateral financial institutions and the entire international community through an integrated approach and co-ordinated action, to make a proper effort to contribute to the continent's economic recovery.

The spectacular growth in the volume of Africa's external debt and the increasing burden of servicing that debt were another source of great concern at the twenty-first Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU.

According to information provided by the relevant monetary institutions, Africa's total debt will reach \$172 billion in 1985. The World Bank considers that, for the 1982 official guaranteed debt alone, without taking account of new loans contracted since or of private debts, together with payments made to the

(President Diouf)

International Monetary Fund, the countries of sub-Saharan Africa will have to pay \$11.6 billion a year from 1985 to 1987 for debt servicing alone.

The continually growing burden of interest rates, which have increased from 4.2 per cent in 1971 to 10.1 per cent in 1981, is today reaching its peak and forces us to borrow in order to pay for debt servicing, thereby compromising any prospect for the development of countries immersed in stagnation or even recession.

Despite the present situation, the Heads of State and Government of the OAU recognized that the external debt is an obligation assumed by our countries and that they must honour it. But the negative development of the international economic situation has put Africa in the paradoxical position of being the least advanced continent, faced with the most basic development needs, and at the same time a net contributor of financial resources to the developed countries. That state of affairs cannot continue without irreversibly compromising the recovery of an entire continent, and this is why we are trying to propose that the root of the problem should be attacked.

So far the only action taken has been to negotiate the rescheduling of the debt, according to its terms, within the framework of the Paris Club or the London Club. However, while it is true that rescheduling gives temporary relief, it is only a palliative, which increases the medium-term burdens on our budgets. Moreover, the rescheduling covers a period that is too short for our liking.

You will agree with me, then, that it is time to find a more effective remedy by mobilizing all of our forces for concerted action, which might centre on the following objectives:

Implementation of the provisions of paragraph 17 of the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa, annexed to resolution 39/29 adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session. That paragraph

(President Diouf)

recommends total or partial conversion of official development assistance debts into grants;

Replacement of successive adjustments of the debt by a long-term overall adjustment, including appreciably longer maturities and grace periods;

Restriction of amounts allocated to debt-servicing to levels compatible with our development needs;

Obtaining from the developed countries additional capital flows, in which regard, the efforts of the World Bank to establish a special assistance fund for the African countries deserve our firm support.

And here I should like to make the following specific proposal. Africa, through me, is proposing concerted, in-depth, serious action to make detailed preparations to hold an international conference on the external debt of the African countries. This conference would enable international creditors and African borrowers to discuss the African external debt in order to agree, as a matter of urgency, on short-term, medium-term and long-term measures. The proposal is part of a comprehensive initiative and is a step towards finding an overall solution to the burning question of third world debt.

I shall say no more about economic matters, but hope that at special session of the General Assembly on the critical economic situation in Africa and the international conference on the external debts of the African countries I shall have an opportunity to revert in more detail to our priority programme.

I shall now sum up and conclude.

Our world, shaken by terrible convulsions, gives rise to events that cause clashes and developments that our consciences find unbearable. The future coexists with archaic attitudes and the most atrocious barbarism. In fact, at a time when men are flying in space, repairing and retrieving satellites, in South Africa policemen armed with whips are setting dogs on innocent children and shooting defenceless people on sight.

(President Diouf)

How much uncertainty there is! Yet that uncertainty, which boggles the minds of most people in this troubled twilight of the twentieth century, may be fruitful if it increases the feeling of responsibility that everyone now has for the future of the world.

At this, the end of the millennium, uncertainty about mankind's future has assumed a completely new aspect, in that it is felt throughout the world. Indeed, everyone is starting to feel that he is not alone in facing the challenges before us, that other people are facing them, too - people of other cultures, driven by other convictions, but people who, like him, aspire to greater justice and fraternity.

In other words, mankind possesses in its very diversity the key to meet the challenges of our times. The will exists, but it is scattered, uneven and hesitant. We must unit our will into a single blueprint for the future, where the common future of man will prevail over the individual interests that tear our world asunder today.

To speak of the blueprint for the future means speaking of youth, the fountain of our hopes, youth whose thirst for ideals is reflected throughout the world by greater confusion.

It is appropriate to stress that International Youth Year has a special importance for us Africans. In our view, it has a dual significance.

Celebrating International Youth Year is, in a way, tantamount to getting loose the extraordinary energy of young people so as to enable them to participate fully in and contribute positively to the shaping of mankind's future, which is that of the rising generations.

It also provides an opportunity to channel and direct the enthusiasm and creative spirit of young people into the noble task of nation building.

(President Diouf)

Participation, development, peace; it is a theme that clearly indicates the manner in which activities and projects aimed at young people should be formulated and directed.

Is not this judicious choice of theme a call on the conscience of all nations, great and small, in order to turn their attention to youth and mobilize their efforts for it? Youth represents, as well as a hope, an objective reality of our time, finding particular expression in its growing demographic and socio-economic weight in contemporary society.

For its part, in any event, Africa, true to the choices it has made, will continue, as in the past, to make its contribution to the establishment of a propitious climate for the strengthening of international co-operation and to support all United Nations initiatives to promote mutual understanding among young people for the achievement of the ideals of human solidarity and dedication to the goals of development, progress and peace in the world.

On this fortieth anniversary of our universal Organization, we have a solemn obligation to seek and to find together, through common, bold, thorough consideration, ways and means to enhance the role of the United Nations. We must combine our efforts to enable the United Nations to carry out properly its special role in promoting peace, justice, freedom and progress for all mankind. For the international community, because of the many challenges it faces, is more than ever condemned to solidarity and unity, like the characters in Sartre's play Huis clos.

The United Nations is for us all an irreplaceable tool for achieving the higher goals of mankind, which are a world of peace, in which man will develop in freedom and equality. We must believe in this Utopia of higher goals so that we are inspired and, as in Georges Sorel's myth, the mere mention of it arouses constantly renewed fervour and faith.

(President Diouf)

I appeal for this fervour, for this almost mythical faith in this Organisation and I reaffirm the confidence that eternal Africa, more committed than ever, places in this Assembly.

Mr. Abdou Diouf, President of the Republic of Senegal, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now hear a statement by the President of the Hungarian People's Republic, His Excellency, Mr. Pal Losonczi.

Mr. Pal Losonczi (President of the Hungarian People's Republic) was escorted to the rostrum.

President LOSONCZI (Hungarian People's Republic) (spoke in Hungarian; English text furnished by the delegation): When, on 24 October 1945, the Charter of the United Nations came into force, all peoples, including the Hungarian nation, which went through the ordeal of the terrible Second World War, unleashed by fascism, deeply believed that at last a responsible world body of the community of nations, with its fundamental law, had come into being, a world body which was willing and able to fulfil the legitimate aspirations to lasting peace of suffering mankind. In the light of the cruel experiences of the Second World War, we Hungarians also attached and continue to attach historic significance to the decision to establish the United Nations and to take collective measures for the maintenance of international peace and security and the prevention of a new world war pregnant with catastrophic consequences. At the moment of its liberation Hungary officially expressed its agreement with those purposes, and it continues to look on the world Organization as an irreplaceable institution of international peace, security and co-operation.

Four decades is not a long time on the scale of history, but today a different yardstick is used for the measurement of historical epochs also. During its 40 years of existence the United Nations has grown into a really universal

(President Losonczi)

Organization in our rapidly changing world and has seen the number of its Member States trebled. As a sign of fundamental changes that have taken place on our globe, it has been joined by newly independent States which had once lived in colonial bondage and had gained national independence by making use of the possibilities created by the emergent pattern of international conditions. It is gratifying to note on this anniversary that the struggle of these peoples for liberation was greatly assisted by numerous Member States of the United Nations and by the political and moral support of the world Organization itself.

We can all gauge what we have gained from the activities of the United Nations and its specialized agencies by the fact that they have come to cover nearly all fields of relations - political, economic, scientific, cultural, social and human rights - between Member States. The world Organization is a forum at which the different States cannot only set out their views and positions but also try to find a common denominator for action to solve the problems and crises of our planet. It is a fact that during the past four decades the United Nations has provided a framework and a possibility for achieving quite a few results and has given encouragement to efforts to solve international problems or at least to find ways and means of tackling them.

I am convinced that over the past 40 years the United Nations, has, despite its problems, which we all know about, has, given proof of its vitality. It is a mature Organization, full of vigour, which has demonstrated its ability to make a useful contribution to dealing with the disquieting problems of our age and bringing about a creative international atmosphere in our complex world, fraught with tensions.

The General Assembly continues to be seized of problems of vital importance to mankind as a whole. There are no greater tasks for us as responsible statesmen of the world, here in the United Nations, as elsewhere, than curb the arms race, develop co-operation among States, elaborate a new international economic order on

(President Losonczi)

a just basis, co-ordinate the struggle against apartheid and ensure observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, to mention but a few of the pressing concerns of mankind.

Now that we are celebrating and commemorating, we must not forget for a single moment the common obligation we undertook in these matters when we joined the ranks of signatories of the Charter. I think that the very fact that such a great number of Heads of State or Government and politicians of great authority have assembled in this Hall to reaffirm their faith in the United Nations and the provisions of its Charter provides added evidence of the *raison d'être* of the world Organisation and the necessity of securing its future. Let us have confidence that all countries will translate those words of commitment into deeds for the benefit of mankind.

For known and regrettable reasons, my country, the Hungarian People's Republic, was admitted to the family of the United Nations just 30 years ago, as many as 10 years after the founding of the world Organisation. On this double anniversary, we feel we are a respected, equal and - perhaps it is not immodest to say this - useful Member of the Organisation.

The United Nations makes it possible for Hungary to take an active part in the consideration of all the items and questions on the agenda and in the elaboration and adoption of decisions, and we do make use of this possibility. It follows from our principled policy that we are not a passive spectator of the world's political, social and economic developments but that we state our position and try as best we can to strengthen the spirit of negotiations.

The Hungarian People's Republic considers that the multilateral exchange of views in the United Nations and the domain of bilateral relations are equally important and indispensable elements of international dialogue, and it is determined to try, in the United Nations too, to promote, by the means at its disposal, the establishment of a healthier international atmosphere and a safer



(President Losonczi)

world. I believe that to do so is the honour and duty of all States small and large, whatever their social systems, internal orders and forms of government.

Naturally, we entertain no illusions, for knowledge of realities is the key to realistic politics. Even the United Nations is unable to solve, from one moment to another, the painful and pressing problems besetting the peoples of the world - not even the most outstanding ones. But we are convinced that by the will of Governments our Organization can reserve for itself a greater role than it is playing at present in steering a positive course of international processes and relations. It is our endeavour to see the world Organization have wider scope for action in this field and be able to fulfil its lofty mission as effectively as possible.

With its broad and balanced foreign-policy activity fully endorsed by its people, the Hungarian People's Republic is seeking, in conformity with the interests of the country and its people, to ensure its national independence and social development and to contribute to responsible efforts for the survival and Progress of mankind. We have reaffirmed this endeavour time and again, and I wish to emphasize it in this forum too.

In accordance with the still valid principles and purposes enshrined in the Charter, and acting in co-operation with our allies, we shall continue to make efforts to maintain dialogue between countries with different social systems, to extend international co-operation, to seek ways and means of achieving a political solution to hotbeds of crisis and to strengthen the spirit and practice of peaceful coexistence.

Experience cannot but show every sober-minded politician that, on a long-term basis, restrictions and discrimination, and especially force, are a mistaken path unlikely to be conducive to the settlement of problems faced by individual countries, regions or even the world at large. It is our conviction that mankind has no acceptable alternative to the cultivation and expansion of international

(President Losonczi)

relations, unconditional respect for national sovereignty, co-operation based on mutual benefit and the negotiated settlement of problems and disputes. Recognition and acceptance of that reality and appropriate action on that basis are, in the last analysis, the fundamental conditions of existence. This awareness is reflected in our relations with the countries of Europe and other continents and is apparent in every foreign-policy action we take. In good conscience we accept the corresponding judgement of the world.

The past decades have abounded in crises and armed conflicts, but luckily the generations that have been born and have grown up in the last 40 years have not had to live through the devastation of a world war. I can say on behalf of the Hungarian people, whose centuries-old sufferings and faith in the future are expressed in passionate words in its national anthem, that we should like to see not only the peoples of Europe but those of the entire world living in lasting peace. It is therefore necessary to reach a decisive breakthrough in disarmament, which is the question of questions.

The arms race, which now threatens even outer space, has gone beyond every limit the human mind can soberly conceive of. The appearance of every new weapons system adds to insecurity and to the danger of mankind's complete annihilation, which need not be proved, given the welter of relevant facts and figures and scientific arguments known to the world.

Recent years have also seen a series of comprehensive and partial initiatives by the socialist part of the world to promote the limitation of nuclear and conventional weapons and to reduce military confrontation to the lowest possible level in consistent observance of the principle of equal security. The latest initiatives of the Soviet Union, including those presented here in this Assembly Hall, are of utmost importance in this respect and have our fullest support. We hope that those proposals, imbued with a sober approach, will meet with a reasonable response from, and similar action by, the other side.

(President Losonczi)

We are concerned to see that the significant influence and impact exercised on the course of world politics by extremist circles striving for confrontation and the aggravation of crisis situations signals a strengthening of unfavourable tendencies in our time. In this connection, too, the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States of America is of decisive importance in the system of international relations. It is therefore only natural that, in common with others, the Hungarian Government is hopefully looking forward to the Soviet-American summit in November, the participants in which the international community expects to display no small measure of responsibility.

We are firmly convinced that the only viable way for the world is that of reinforcing every possible element of the course of détente, eliminating the existing hotbeds of crisis, preventing the emergence of new conflicts, clearing the international atmosphere and establishing creative co-operation based on confidence. The organs of the United Nations, all possible international forums and all forms of bilateral and multilateral contacts should be used to advance these ends.

Allow me from this rostrum to assure the United Nations and its Secretary-General, who enjoys high esteem in my country, of Hungary's support in this endeavour. I am confident that the fortieth commemorative session of the General Assembly will carry on its work in a constructive and forward-oriented spirit and that it will take effective steps towards halting the arms race, strengthening co-operation and enhancing international peace and security. The Hungarian People's Republic wishes to contribute its share to this pursuit and will also act accordingly in the future.

Mr. Pal Losonczi, President of the Hungarian People's Republic, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will next hear a statement by the President of the Lebanese Republic, His Excellency Shiekh Amine Gemayel.

Shiekh Amine Gemayel, President of the Lebanese Republic, was escorted to the rostrum.

President GEMAYEL (Lebanon) (interpretation from Arabic): It is an auspicious occasion for me to participate today in this celebration marking the fortieth anniversary of the foundation of the United Nations. I am pleased to address you on behalf of Lebanon, a country whose privilege it was to contribute to the creation of this Organization devoted both to the establishment of world peace and to the self-determination of all peoples of the world.

As a founding Member of this Organization, my country was committed to promote and uphold faithfully its principles and to participate actively in its worthwhile endeavours. After gaining its independence in 1943, Lebanon signed the United Nations Charter and, for reasons both national and political, has never ceased to serve its cause. It is a source of great pride for us that Lebanon also made a profound contribution to the creation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, a Declaration that has become a guiding light for the peoples of the world in their struggle for freedom, justice and peace.

I would like to seize this opportune moment to express appreciation for the assiduous efforts exerted by the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, together with his assistants, in developing the activities of the world Organization in a manner which has strengthened its ability to fulfil its role in a variety of different fields.

It is also an occasion on which I express my heartiest congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your election to the highest office of the General Assembly, hoping that your election will be a propitious omen for the whole world to recover

(President Gemayel)

every lost peace, to vindicate every violated right and to reassure all who thirst for justice, freedom and dignity.

Although we are at present suffering the ravages of war, we must not forget those nations that have willingly enlisted to serve the cause of peace in my country and which have endured severe hardships in this service. I particularly wish to cite the countries now participating in the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). In the name of every Lebanese citizen I wish to convey our sincerest gratitude to every member in that force, for they have indeed been a living example of solidarity among the nations of the world.

Regrettably, their contribution has even reached the point of supreme sacrifice: some of these young men lie buried in the soil of my country, a country they have loved and which, until that fateful event that claimed their lives, reciprocated that love. May we never forget them and the enduring wound left in the hearts of their dear families.

Should I choose to document the warm appreciation which the Lebanese people felt for the men of UNIFIL, I would need only refer to that remarkable and moving public expression on the part of our villagers in the south of Lebanon when they appealed to one of the UNIFIL contingents not to withdraw or curtail its valuable services, of which Lebanon stands in dire need.

In the course of the life of the United Nations Lebanon has never hesitated to champion the just causes of freedom and peace. Lebanon considers itself concerned with all just causes wherever they may be and, in particular, within neighbouring countries where the rights of the Palestinian people have been suspended for decades. Although Lebanon has been suffering on account of the violation of its own rights, it cannot overlook the sanctity that attaches to all such rights. When one suffers protracted injustice one naturally becomes more sensitive to the injustice that touches others. For that reason my country anxiously reaches out to this international Organization to urge it to seek the implementation of its own

(President Gemayel)

resolutions and to discover a formula that can ensure the full participation of all the parties concerned in the creation of a just and enduring peace.

Lebanon also looks with great concern upon the events of the Iraq-Iran war for reasons that go beyond the attrition that war is causing those two combatants. That war not only threatens the security of the entire Gulf region, but also undeniably poses a threat to world peace.

We hope that the prospective summit meeting between the leaders of the two super-Powers will usher in a relaxation of tension in the Middle East and everywhere else. The upsurge of violence in which, unfortunately, my country has become involved is so virulent and powerful that it cannot easily be contained. Now it is beginning to envelop the entire world.

In the modern age these fires of tension, disorder and terrorism cannot be prevented from spreading, and therefore the security of the Middle East region is integral to the security of the world as a whole.

I do not think that there is anyone who is either unaware or ignorant of the causes of the war in Lebanon and against Lebanon. After 10 years of strife exacerbated by the use of sophisticated destructive weaponry, who could believe that this war is the work of the Lebanese alone?

Lebanon was initially forced into the war as a result of being forcibly linked to the Middle East crisis, and of reckless adventurism on its soil and intervention by foreign Powers. Those Powers profited from the climate of democracy and freedom which prevailed in Lebanon. The country was thus sought as a refuge by all those who harboured ulterior motives or desired to promote regional or international interests. And the misdeeds of others were to be paid for by the lives of our country's sons and daughters.

Concomitant with the manipulation of that climate of freedom came another manipulation aimed at destroying Lebanon's unique social and economic structure, which had been an impressive model of coexistence. With the intensification of

(President Gemayel)

foreign strife within its boundaries, the country was transformed into a quagmire of international, regional and Arab contradictions. Thus, heavy and sophisticated armaments poured into the country from every direction to such an extent that the value of those arms exceeded many times over the amount the State could spend in support of its own legitimate forces. I need not mention the other means of terror employed to commit murder and to engender destruction.

It is therefore understandable that those who would lose the most if peace were to prevail and if Lebanon were to be restored to its former well-being and stability are the very ones who are benefiting from the current situation, at once strange and horrible. It also follows that the perpetuation of this condition will inexorably lead to greater confusion and upheaval, severely affecting a widening circle of human lives.

However, I can assure the Assembly that despite this extreme ordeal, the pulse of Lebanon is still beating with vibrant life. Those who imagined that Lebanon was finished as a State, as a homeland and as a people are, I believe, now beginning to realize that the dynamic force of life in my country is more powerful than the mighty agents of death and extinction. How can I make tangible the manner in which the Lebanese have relentlessly risen from underneath the charred rubble, out of the dark smoke and the din of battle, with greater resolve and more intense determination? Despite the magnitude of Lebanon's military, political and economic tragedy, which places enormous pressure on its people, Lebanon has not given up. Its faith remains unshaken and it continues to find in its ordeal a source of renewed perseverance and fortitude, in complete defiance of the awesome forces of disintegration.

The Lebanese have persevered in their strong faith in Lebanon and in the principles of unity and independence. Not one voice has been raised on behalf of partition, secession or the abandonment of our homeland. Rather, whenever the opportunity arose to cross from one part of the capital to the other, the Lebanese

(President Gemayel)

on both sides took the risk of crossing over despite the dangers of shelling and sniping.

Suffice it to say that statistics put the number of those who pass between the two areas daily at around 80,000 Lebanese, out of 500,000 residents in the capital, Beirut. The Lebanese have proved their will to life and their determination to survive in freedom and in an independent sovereign country, a country which has shown its prodigious capacity to defy danger, to defy fate. Lebanon has fought destruction with construction, and material power with the power of faith, clinging steadfastly to its rights in the face of tragedy and catastrophe in order to secure its future and its peace.

A people demonstrating such qualities deserves every possible support from friendly and peace-loving people in view of the human values and accumulated cultural heritage it represents. Now that opportunities on a national scale seem more promising than ever before, this country deserves every effective effort to save it. All parties, particularly the combatants, are taking positive steps forward on the path of dialogue, mutual understanding and reconciliation. Those steps began at the conferences held in Geneva and Lausanne and they will continue until our mission is achieved.

Our neighbour Syria has devoted its closest attention to the Lebanese situation. Our two countries possess many historical and cultural links and are bound together by the strongest of ties. We earnestly hope to receive the assistance of the international Organization and of all our friendly neighbouring nations in order to restore our country to complete unity, independence and sovereignty over all its territory.

Indeed, Lebanon is not a temporary and transient entity. It has a venerable past, especially in the practice of constitutional law. Its modern constitution, framed in 1926, is in fact one of the oldest modern constitutions in the area, moreover it represents the maintenance of a constitutional legacy stretching back



(President Gemayel)

many centuries. That fact has permitted Lebanon to endure until very recently as an international cultural and economic centre.

The Lebanese State is a State of law. This is what it has always been and this is what the Lebanese want it to remain. It is for that reason that the Lebanese are preparing to formulate a new constitution, more appropriate to the changes in their situation and more responsive to the principles of freedom, justice and equality of opportunity. I am confident that they will reach their goal in the near future, away from the din of battle and the clash of arms.

I can confirm that the Lebanese have now reached agreement on those matters over which they disagreed in the past. The experience of the last 10 years has served to strengthen their mettle, their feelings of belonging and being committed to a united Lebanon, an Arab Lebanon, a Lebanon open to the world and concerned with the issues that affect it.

It may be correct to say that the domestic aspect of the Lebanese question is almost resolved. What remains, of course, is the foreign aspect. We shall need your help in this endeavour. Of primary concern is the implementation of those resolutions already adopted by the United Nations, especially the ones calling for the total withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory. I fervently urge you from this rostrum to ensure the implementation of resolutions 425 (1978), 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). This is long overdue; their non-implementation has prevented the Lebanese State from reimposing its authority over all its territory.

Owing to the procrastination in the implementation of those resolutions, our people in the south have been forced to adopt armed resistance as a means to ensure their freedom. They have sacrificed many lives and much property at the altar of martyrdom, and on this occasion I express to them my respect, admiration and appreciation.

(President Gemayel)

Those sacrifices deserve a response by the international conscience to the rightful demands of Lebanon, which have been repeatedly recognized by the international Organization. Help us to overcome the problems resulting from the war. It was not our war, but Lebanon has paid dearly for it - in terms of its prosperity, its economic and social conditions, and the fruits of its labours over scores of years. I appeal to the United Nations and its specialized agencies to extend assistance to my people by looking after refugees, comforting those afflicted by disaster and healing the wounds of the injured. We have suffered such a catastrophe that Lebanon cannot overcome it on its own.

Although Lebanon is a small country, it possesses a great heritage justifying its permanence. My country has been in the forefront of those who respect human rights and of those who defend them in international organizations, including this one; we have been at the forefront of those who defend the rights of oppressed peoples still under the yoke of occupation. My country has defended the rights of those who have been the victims of cruelty, and injustice and narrow self-interests. It behoves Lebanon, therefore, to defend its own cause from this rostrum and to emphasize its right to exist, its rights over its land, its sovereignty, its freedom and its legality and, finally, the rights of all its children who have been forced out of their homes and have become refugees in their own land.

We are not begging for these rights; we are not begging for peace. Rather, we seek a peace which we hope will be established on firm and enduring foundations, a peace that will make possible continued stability and prevent any attempts at explosions..

The Assembly will note with me that the aim of the wars that buffeted Lebanon was to destroy it. But Lebanon persevered. The wars were aimed at forcing defeat and capitulation on the Lebanese people. But our people did not capitulate; they

(President Gemayel)

were not defeated. Lebanon is still there. It has achieved the miracle of survival and it deserves the dignity of life.

On behalf of Lebanon I salute you. On behalf of Lebanon I declare that Lebanon will survive at the crossroads of land and history. It will be living testimony to right, justice, liberty and the dignity of man.

Sheikh Amine Gemayel, President of the Lebanese Republic, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Head of State of the Kingdom of Lesotho, His Majesty Motlotlehi King Moshoeshoe II.

His Majesty Motlotlehi King Moshoeshoe II, Head of State of the Kingdom of Lesotho, was escorted to the rostrum.

King MOSHOESHOE II: Mr. President, we extend to you and to the members of this Assembly fraternal greetings from the Kingdom of Lesotho. In doing so, we take the opportunity to offer you our warm congratulations upon your assumption of the presidency of this fortieth session of the United Nations General Assembly. We wish to pay a special tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Paul Lusaka, who discharged his duties as President of the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly with distinction.

As we meet here, during this special session marking the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, we should all feel duty bound to express deep gratitude to the founding fathers of this body for their vision in having left for humanity a legacy which, over these many years, has been its best guarantee for continued survival. Despite its imperfections, the United Nations Charter remains, after 40 years, the primary document of international relations.

It is a manifest result of the Charter's objectives in favour of international peace, freedom and social progress that there has been no world war since this historic document was signed in San Francisco in June 1945. The absence of war not

(King Moshoeshoe II)

only is a favourable condition for the progress of all peoples but to us, the smaller and weaker nations, is also a guarantee against the hegemonistic tendencies of the bigger and stronger ones that have used conditions of war to advance their designs for domination.

By the same token, it is through the instrumentality of the United Nations that the process of decolonization was speeded up and the majority of the nations of the world granted political independence. It remains our hope that through the same instrument the few remaining pockets of oppression, such as in Namibia and in South Africa, can be destroyed.

Similarly, the world community, particularly the underprivileged peoples, have benefitted tremendously under various assistance programmes channelled through the specialized agencies of the United Nations. My own country is a beneficiary of such assistance through those agencies, and I wish to pay a tribute to the role the agencies have played in support of our national development efforts.

While taking pride in the various achievements of the United Nations, we should also remain conscious of the lack of success with which it has met in many other areas of its activity. In doing so we have to ask ourselves whether the United Nations is inherently incapable of solving these problems or whether obstacles are being placed in its way to prevent its functioning correctly. There may be some inherent problems with regard to which, I trust, the Secretary-General and his staff will be helped to do their utmost to evolve solutions to avoid the ineffectiveness of the past, but the broader problem lies in the obstacles which are deliberately placed in the way of this Organization to prevent it fulfilling all its tasks and living up to all its obligations.

Paramount among those obstacles is, in our view, the use of the veto power. It seems to us that all too frequently the veto is used by some Powers to promote their own self-interest at the expense of the interests of the majority of Member States. Contrary to the basic founding principles of this Organization - an

(King Moshoeshoe II)

Organisation of independent and equal States - the veto power is being used to manipulate the Organisation and turn it into an organization of satellite States which must comply with the whims of their super-State principals.

It is largely because of the threat of the use of the veto that the United Nations has not yet been able to resolve the question of Namibia's independence. While the people of that country are toiling and languishing under the yoke of foreign domination and interference, some Members of this world body are clinging rigidly to positions of self-interest, be they political or economic. Yet some of those Members are the most vocal on the issues of democratic philosophy and human rights. Thus, it seems, the concepts of democracy and human rights are selective and cease to be applicable when the selfish interests of some Powers are at stake.

That selective application of the concepts of democracy and human rights also vitiates the situation in South Africa. For too long a time now humanity has been vexed with the problem of the racial exploitation and oppression in that country. But due to the economic and political self-interest of some of those with veto power in the United Nations this body has vacillated in indecision and has taken no meaningful action to this day, when that troubled country has been plunged into an unprecedented racial conflagration.

The same approach characterizes the conduct of those countries with regard to the specialized agencies. It is regrettable that the United Nations agencies should be accused of politicization, when all they are doing is going by the wishes of the majority, something which should be acceptable to all Member States claiming democratic virtues. Otherwise we are left with no conclusion other than the regrettable one that some Member States simply wish to use their economic power in the specialized agencies to convert those agencies into mere instruments of their policy objectives and to subject the whole United Nations system to their political whims.

(King Moshoeshoe II)

The scenario I have outlined ties in very well with the unfortunate notion of spheres of influence, under which the big Powers have Balkanized the world into zones which they entrust to their regional prefects. We in southern Africa are not immune from that scourge, and the various problems confronting our States are actually orchestrated by the regional bully and hegemonist, South Africa, which is seeking to ensure that the whole region toes the line. Any attempts on our part to maintain an independent line, with the sole aim of the development of our economies and the social advancement of our peoples, are met with ruthless acts of military and economic destabilization, as well as other types of harassment.

Lesotho, as an enclave surrounded by South Africa, has found itself in an almost hopeless position in the face of acts of political blackmail, disinvestment and destabilization master-minded from South Africa. Perhaps the instance best known to this Assembly is that of 9 December 1982, when the South African army attacked our capital city, Maseru, and killed in cold blood 12 citizens of our country and 30 refugees belonging to the African National Congress of South Africa. Extensive damage to property was also caused in that attack.

It will be recalled that after that brutal act of aggression the Security Council unanimously adopted its resolution 527 (1982) of 15 December 1982, condemning South Africa for its attack and calling upon it to pay full and adequate compensation to Lesotho for the damage caused. It is sad to have to say that, truly in character with its arrogant defiance of the United Nations, South Africa has refused to abide by that resolution. Thereafter, by its resolution 535 (1983) of 29 June 1983, the Security Council appealed to the international community to extend assistance to Lesotho in consequence of the attack. We take this opportunity to appeal to those countries that have not done so to provide such assistance.

If the December 1982 attack became well known to this body it was only because it was the climax of numerous acts of destabilization against Lesotho. Armed

(King Moshoeshoe II)

incursions into Lesotho from South Africa, by elements trained, armed and deployed by that country, are now a common phenomenon in which many innocent civilians have been maimed or murdered. The physical and psychological harassment of our people by South African officials at entry points along our common borders is an ordeal which our people have to suffer in view of the inescapable economic exchanges between us and South Africa. The deliberate embargo of our goods, which have to pass through South Africa, is a naked manifestation of South Africa's contempt for orderly relations between States, which is particularly deplorable because Pretoria is illegally exploiting our geographical position as a completely land-locked State and unjustly misinterpreting our customs union agreements to suit its own designs. The constant threat of the repatriation of Lesotho migrant workers, who are in South Africa because of a past colonial policy which conceived of Lesotho only as a source of cheap labour for industry in South Africa, is crude blackmail aimed at causing unrest as a result of unemployment in Lesotho. As is well known, such acts of destabilization have been extended to all independent countries of southern Africa, such as Angola, Botswana and Mozambique.

While South Africa, with the tacit support of its friends, has unleashed these programmes of political blackmail, disinvestment and destabilization against its neighbours, in South Africa itself the situation is moving from bad to worse as the black majority surges forward in demanding its God-given right to determine its own destiny. At the centre of this upheaval is the odious system of apartheid, which remains the most cruel and intense form of racism, despite all the sugar-coating it has been given.

It is under that inhuman system that we have witnessed the Balkanization of South Africa, which has resulted in the alienation of the majority of the indigenous people from the land of their birth while a handful of settlers have arrogated to themselves the abundant riches of the country, which they are continuing to plunder in conspiracy with foreign monopoly countries, which have

(King Moshoeshoe II)

only a casual interest in the well-being of the majority, whom they see at best merely as servile creatures of labour.

The immoral system of apartheid has continued to incarcerate black people and their leaders, some of whom, like Nelson Mandela, have now spent more than 20 years in gaol for nothing other than asserting the universally acclaimed concept of equality among men. Today in the twentieth century it is only in South Africa that the artificial and unscientific notion that a man can be inferior by virtue of the colour of his skin is upheld and employed as a basis of Government policy.

The current state of emergency in South Africa, which has heightened the rate of killing, maiming and gaoling people to an unprecedented extent, is a response which a system based on violence could be expected to unleash in the face of the diminished patience of black people, who for years have followed a peaceful path in demanding democratic change. The apartheid system, which over the years has victimised all black people in South Africa, is squarely to blame for the unrest that is sweeping across that country today. It is futile to blame the current upheavals in that country on so-called agitators, or so-called communist penetration, because neither has created the conditions of slavery under which black people have lived for so many years and against which they are now in open rebellion.

The white rulers of South Africa have ignored many opportunities in the past to hold meaningful dialogue with the authentic leaders of the black majority to evolve a just dispensation, so that black and white can, together, shape a common destiny and, equally, enjoy the vast resources of their country. The continuing delaying tactics of the South African Government only serve, in our view, to diminish even further the chances of a peaceful solution to the southern African problem.

As people who are right inside the situation and who observe the South African scenario from a vantage position, we in Lesotho are always dumbfounded to hear some



(King Moshoeshoe II)

people outside express satisfaction with what they see as peaceful change taking place in South Africa. What type of peaceful change is it that increases gaol populations to the extent that they now include children in school uniform? How can we speak of peaceful change when the oppressor kills and tortures with impunity, and when South African citizens continue to take refuge in Lesotho, Botswana, Mozambique, Swaziland, Angola, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Tanzania and other countries in Africa? What type of peaceful change is it that continues to perpetuate inequalities and disparities between the living standards of black and white peoples? Are the non-white majorities of South Africa expected to reconcile to injustice and become accomplices in their own oppression and murder?

Today, when the South African military complex has, either directly or by proxy, intensified aggression against neighbouring countries, it is unrealistic to contemplate peaceful change within the framework of apartheid, which is intrinsically a system of institutionalized domination, oppression and violence. Perhaps those who speak about peace have been hoodwinked by the propagandists of apartheid, who speak about peace while their Government is intensifying the practice of war.

In this context, I sincerely hope that the United States Administration will finally come to recognize that the policy of constructive engagement will not succeed in bringing about change in South Africa. Instead, it will succeed, as it is doing, in buying time for the minority régime, which will continue to derive comfort from the fact that a super-Power like the United States is making no firm and consistent demand for the ending of apartheid. In our view, nothing short of the immediate and unconditional dismantling of apartheid can guarantee peace and harmony in South Africa itself and in the region as a whole. There can be no real peace without justice.

(King Moshoeshoe II)

This appeal is addressed not only to the United States, but to all the other permanent members of the Security Council. We are asking them to address issues of peace, security and justice with the seriousness and urgency they deserve. The oppressed and suffering majorities of South Africa are today watching to see whether this Organisation will now unanimously take the urgent, necessary and appropriate measures to deter and disarm the oppressive régime in Pretoria, to dismantle completely the system of apartheid, and to help them build a truly democratic, caring, sharing and just society for all the citizens of South Africa.

The United Nations has been seized of the vexing problem of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa since the formation of the Organisation. Numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council and the decisions and opinions of the International Court of Justice on South Africa's occupation of Namibia and its illegality have had no persuasive effect on that country. Hopes were raised when Security Council resolution 435 (1978) commanded the support of the international community, including South Africa. That resolution is therefore the only acceptable basis for the settlement of the Namibia question, and we call for the implementation of the plan under that resolution without further delay.

We have been given to understand, by one of the Secretary-General's reports, that virtually all outstanding issues have been resolved, except that South Africa still maintains that the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is a pre-condition of the implementation of the resolution. That clearly extraneous and irrelevant pre-condition is advanced only to prolong South Africa's presence in Namibia, where it has extended its oppressive policy and is engaged, in collaboration with some influential Western countries, in the exploitation of the Territory's human and natural resources. Namibian territory is also used for destabilization expeditions into neighbouring countries.

(King Moshoeshoe II)

In order to entrench itself, and as a manifestation of bad faith concerning the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the South Africa Government has established the so-called interim administration in the Territory, which the international community has denounced as illegal and incompatible with resolution 435 (1978). We reiterate that in our view no viable solution can be found without the participation of the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), which is the sole and legitimate representative of the people of Namibia.

The United Nations Charter recognizes the intimate links between peace and security on the one hand and economic development on the other. The Charter should be a shield of peace and security for all nations, large and small. We believe that small and economically less developed countries have special claims to the United Nations. Lesotho's claims on the protection of the United Nations have been recognized in the past. It is an open secret that Lesotho has always been subject to political blackmail, destabilization and economic disinvestment, and now it is being threatened with even harsher sanctions by South Africa - for no reason other than its geographical position and refusal to yield to intimidation designed to make it a sacrificial lamb in the present campaigns for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

Lesotho has no power to stop sanctions against South Africa if the international community decides that that is the last peaceful means left to break the power of apartheid. As far as Lesotho is concerned, problems should be tackled at their source. We must cure the cause of the disease, and not just its symptoms. The main source of both political and economic instability in South Africa today is the policy of apartheid. It will benefit no one to make Lesotho a sacrificial lamb on the altar of the sanctions issue. The complications arising from apartheid make it infinitely more difficult for Lesotho to fulfil its primary responsibility of improving the standard of living of its people. In the event that the international community decides to impose comprehensive mandatory

(King Moshoeshoe II)

sanctions against South Africa, we hope that it will apply its wisdom and deploy its systems and agencies to ensure the economic survival of States neighbouring South Africa.

The crisis that engulfed the world economy in the early 1980s is still continuing. With regard to that matter, I refer representatives to the text of my statement, which has been distributed.

I want to end this statement on a note of hope for ourselves, the world in which we live and the United Nations. We in Lesotho shall continue to abide by the Charter of the United Nations and respect its principles and objectives. We shall adhere to our obligations to the United Nations and at the same time continue to rely on the United Nations system to provide the last lines of defence for our security as an independent State. Our Government will continue to play its role, both regionally and internationally, so that after 40 years as a viable international Organization the United Nations may be strengthened so as to remain an instrument for the betterment of mankind and a voice for the conscience of humanity.

His Majesty Motlotlehi King Moshoeshoe II, Head of State of the Kingdom of Lesotho, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the Prime Minister of the Republic of Iceland, His Excellency Mr. Steingrímur Hermannsson.

Mr. Steingrímur Hermannsson, Prime Minister of the Republic of Iceland, was escorted to the rostrum.

Mr. HERMANNSSON (Iceland): When the United Nations was founded 40 years ago, destruction, misery and horror brought on by war were much alive in the minds of men. As clearly spelled out in the Charter of the United Nations, the founders were determined not to let this happen again. The United Nations was to secure peace and justice and improved equality among nations.

(Mr. Hermannsson, Iceland)

There is no denying that we have failed; wars are still being fought and a large part of the world's population lives and dies in misery and hunger. The gap between the rich and the poor has increased. And possibly worst of all are the continued violations of human rights, in spite of repeated declarations to the contrary.

In the General Assembly, nations have a growing tendency to align themselves in opposing groups, based on political beliefs and forms of government; and the Security Council has become the political playground of the big Powers. A wholly objective approach to the many problems facing the world may be too much to ask for. The fact is, of course, that solutions differ according to political ideologies. But certainly the right of any nation to determine its own form of government and to determine its course and its future should be the guideline for all who really want peace, law and order. No nation or group of nations has the right to impose upon another nation a solution or a form of government it may have chosen for itself.

There is no doubt that progress has been made in the production of food and medicine. Yet, it is alarming that millions of people suffer every year from starvation and disease in large areas of the world. In spite of the "green revolution" and tremendous technological progress in agriculture, land is being eroded and ruined and thus the very basis for survival destroyed. There certainly seems to be a lack of foresight.

Progress in the field of education has also been disappointing. Such efforts are often torn apart by internal conflicts while a large part of the world population remains illiterate and therefore unable to participate in modern society and development. But the failures must not serve as an excuse for giving up. There are certainly several achievements.

(Mr. Bernannsson, Iceland)

Although armed conflicts continue to break out, they have not led to the world holocaust that modern weaponry has made possible. In part this is due to the open discussions encouraged by the United Nations and the common awareness that the maintenance of peace in each and every part of the world is of concern to all. The expectations of the founders that this Organisation would play a more active military role have, however, not been realized, and this has of course been reduced the effectiveness of the United Nations peace-keeping effort.

I am especially pleased to mention the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, which after many years of extended meetings and debates was accepted by a large majority of the countries of the world. That document is an important contribution of the United Nations to the settlement of the growing conflicts over rights to the resources of the seas and the sea-bed.

Now is the time to review the successes and failures of the past 40 years, improve the Organization and working of the United Nations - and to do better. I shall mention here only a few of the areas which we consider of greatest importance.

The General Assembly must be acknowledged as a forum of free speech and debate, unhindered by power blocs or preconceived judgements. In the Security Council, the right of veto must be exercised with great care; if not, I fear there may not be much future for the United Nations.

We should also like to stress reduced bureaucracy and paper work and more action. The limited funds available for the tremendous task of food production and improved education must get to the nations in need and not be spent on administration.

The United Nations should strive for economic improvements in the developing countries. This should be done by assisting the countries themselves in the utilization of their resources, by increasing their production of food, so that freedom from hunger and starvation can be secured, by improving general education, by making know-how available and assisting such countries in adapting new

(Mr. Hermannsson, Iceland)

technology to their needs. Importation of technology must take into account and be adapted to life-styles developed in different countries in different ways through centuries. We do not believe in imposing our Western way of life on others.

The goal must be freedom for all nations to choose their way of life and the freedom of all men to effect their own happiness. Last, but not least, I want to stress the need for a renewed effort in health care and welfare, especially for children.

Having said that, I must, however, stress the interdependence of all nations in a world made increasingly smaller by improvements in communication and transportation, as well as growing international trade. The world's resources are limited and used at a steadily growing pace. Depletion of the resources or destruction of the environment will affect everyone. We have, I believe, come to the point where foresight is not only desirable but necessary if a catastrophe is to be avoided. Future study and planning should, therefore, be high on the United Nations priority list.

Certainly, efforts to prevent wars must be continued. The nuclear-arms race must stop and be reversed. In its opposition to the build-up of nuclear weapons, the Icelandic nation is united. Thus the Althing, the Icelandic Parliament, earlier this year unanimously passed a resolution on disarmament.

The Althing called on the nuclear Powers to conclude agreements on reciprocal and comprehensive disarmament under international control and surveillance. The Government was encouraged to support and enhance efforts towards a total ban on testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons under reliable control, as well as the complete cessation of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes, while encouraging the conclusion of international treaties on annual systematic reductions of nuclear arsenals.

(Mr. Hermannsson, Iceland)

The Althing furthermore emphasized that a substantial portion of the huge amounts of money now being spent on weapons should be channelled towards relieving distress in the poor nations of the world.

The Althing also reiterated the policy of Icelandic Governments that no nuclear weapons are allowed in Iceland, neither on land nor sea.

We believe distrust between nations to be one of the chief causes of conflict. Thus we feel that safeguarding human rights and dignity, freedom of speech and freedom of travel to be fundamental for lowering tension and for success in most of the areas worked on by the United Nations. It has been repeatedly shown that common people of different nationalities and races get along well if allowed to get acquainted. The United Nations must relentlessly fight against all forms of violation of human rights and against apartheid, and for freedom of speech and travel.

The General Assembly may have found my assessment of the past gloomy and my demands of the United Nations in the future unreasonable. I wish to emphasize that I am certain that the situation would have been much worse if the United Nations had not existed. I am fully aware of the tremendous efforts of many individuals in the struggle for a better world. But this is the time and the place to speak out. Countries both large and small have not only the right but the duty to do so.

It is our conviction that the world can be made a wonderful place for all to live in. If we have the will, we have the means and the know-how to create a better world. The United Nations is an instrument which we can in our wisdom apply to that purpose.

Mr. Steingrímur Hermannsson, Prime Minister of the Republic of Iceland, was escorted from the rostrum.



The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the Prime Minister of the State of Israel, His Excellency Mr. Shimon Peres.

Mr. Shimon Peres, Prime Minister of the State of Israel, was escorted to the rostrum.

Mr. PERES (Israel): The world in which the United Nations was born was torn between two conflicting feelings. There was shock and grief in the wake of death and holocaust. But there was also a gleam of hope: hope for a new era of freedom, for a world free of oppression, of discrimination, of racism, of apartheid; above all, for a world free of war - for the reign of peace.

Nothing reflects the universal idea of Judaism more than the noble idea of nations united, a United Nations. This ideal rests, as our forefathers taught us, on the three pillars that support the world: justice, truth and peace. Yet this great vision is shadowed by inescapable concerns. As Jews, we bear heavy memories. As Israelis, we confront national dilemmas.

Search the map of Western civilization across the ages; not a place will be found where Jews were not persecuted. Save for the new world, you will find yourselves marching along the trail of Jewish blood and tears, tracing the chronology of Jewish martyrdom. This was the history of my people for 2,000 years, until there came a point when the Jews tired of dependence on the hatred or the tolerance of others to settle their fate.

This is the very essence of Zionism. Jews were no longer willing to court the favour of others and to contend with the force of their fear. Israel was created not only as a home for persecuted Jews the world over but also as the last refuge from any need to justify their Jewishness.

Here is the hope of the people of Israel: finally to be masters of their own fate, true to their own heritage, sovereign in their own land, free to practise their faith and continue their contribution to a world that rejected them.

Zionism is thus a victory over racism.

(Mr. Peres, Israel)

When the dawn finally came, an ancient language was given a new reality. From across distance and time, Jews gathered anew. A wasteland was made to bloom. The unskilled wandering Jew turned artisan, farmer, scientist and soldier, rebuilding his home with a new-found pioneering spirit.

True to our heritage, we set out to secure a safe haven not only for those who fulfilled their dream by making Israel their home but also for those as yet deprived of that right. In that tradition, still today we pray that all Jews who yearn for Zion - be they in the Soviet Union, Ethiopia, Syria or elsewhere - will be permitted to reunite with their destiny.

I call upon the Soviet leaders: let our people go. Empty the prisons of people whose sole crime is loyalty to Jewish tradition - individuals like Sharansky and Begun. This call exceeds ordinary political considerations. It reaches the depth of human dignity and the source of human rights.

A people reborn, we faced poverty, desert, isolation and the challenge of moulding the ingathering into one nation. We never expected to be surrounded by hostility. Seeking coexistence with our neighbours, we found that the revival of two national movements - the Jewish and the Arab - produced conflict rather than co-operation.

Recently it has manifested itself in the form of international terrorism. Indeed, in our region terrorism is at war with peace. Terrorism is bent on injuring the peace process, but we have equal determination: it will not stop progress towards peace.

We reject the absurd claim that resisting terrorism, rather than terrorism itself, undermines efforts for peace.

I should like to express from this rostrum my deep sorrow and extend my sincere condolences to Mrs. Klinghoffer and her bereaved family, who are at this very moment mourning the death of their father, an innocent victim of senseless cruelty.

(Mr. Feres, Israel)

Nobody has brought more tragedy on the Palestinians than PLO terrorism. Our enemy is not a people or a race or a religion or a community. Our enemy is belligerency, hatred and death. We know that there is a Palestinian problem. We recognize the need to solve it honourably. We are convinced that there is no solution but through diplomatic means. From this rostrum I call upon the Palestinian people to put an end to rejectionism, to belligerency. Let us talk. Come forth and recognize the reality of the State of Israel, our wish to live in peace and our need for security. Let us face each other as free men and women across the negotiating table.

Let us argue, not fight. Let us arm ourselves with reason; let us not reason with arms.

Ever since the beginning of the dispute we have urged our Palestinian neighbours to reach an accommodation. For all those years our hand remained outstretched in vain, and the reply we heard was the echo of our own voices.

When President Sadat came to Jerusalem, the course of history for all of us was changed. He found Israel willing, open and as courageous as he was in the pursuit of peace. The world looked on in wonder as a conflict which had seemed insoluble for more than 30 years turned soluble in less than one.

Today, between the 48 million Egyptians and 4 million Israelis there is peace. Peace with Egypt was to accomplish several objectives: The Sinai was returned to Egypt. A solution to the Palestinian problem in all its aspects was to be reached. It was agreed that full autonomy to the residents of the territories could be a promising step in that direction. Peace between Egypt and Israel - which was never intended to be an isolated episode - was to become the corner-stone of a comprehensive peace strategy in our region. Peace between us was to be filled with constructive content.

(Mr. Peres, Israel)

That treaty survived tests none of us foresaw. Its full implementation is a challenge and a hope to this very day. We turn to our Egyptian friends with an invitation to breathe life into our relations and to raise our peoples' spirits. Let us not allow gloom and doom to overshadow our worthiest accomplishment. Let us make our peace a success - a source of encouragement to others.

The most complex issue - yet the most promising - involves our neighbour to the east, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. An issue not confined to borders alone, it reaches across peoples and States. Its settlement should also comprise the resolution of the Palestinian issue.

Middle East archives are filled with negotiating plans, but its diplomacy is short of negotiating partners. Thus, this is the hour for decisions and statesmanship. I invite this Organization to depart from the tired and timid norm and to fulfil its destiny as enshrined on its walls by ushering the parties to the conflict into a new diplomatic initiative. Let all parties to the dispute facilitate a new phase in the Arab-Israeli peace by renouncing and putting an end to the use of violence.

The new initiative should be based on the following principles:

First, the objective of these negotiations is to reach peace treaties between Israel and the Arab States, as well as to resolve the Palestinian issue.

Secondly, neither party may impose pre-conditions.

Thirdly, negotiations are to be based on United Nations Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and on willingness to entertain suggestions proposed by other participants.

Fourthly, negotiations are to be conducted directly, between States.

Fifthly, if deemed necessary those negotiations may be initiated with the support of an international forum, as agreed upon by the negotiating States.

(Mr. Peres, Israel)

Sixthly, this gathering can take place before the end of this year, in Jordan, Israel or any location, as mutually agreed upon. We will be pleased to attend an opening meeting in Amman.

Seventhly, negotiations between Israel and Jordan are to be conducted between an Israeli delegation, on the one hand, and a Jordanian - or a Jordanian-Palestinian - delegation, on the other, both comprising delegates that represent peace, not terror.

Aware of the nature of this undertaking, I propose the following as a possible blueprint for implementation: negotiations may produce immediate as well as permanent arrangements. They may deal with the demarcation of boundaries as well as with the resolution of the Palestinian problem. The Camp David Accords provide a possible basis for the attainment of these objectives.

The permanent members of the Security Council may be invited to support the initiation of these negotiations. It is our position that those who confine their diplomatic relations to one side of the conflict exclude themselves from such a role. This forum, while not being a substitute for direct negotiations, can offer support for them. Indeed, nothing should undermine the direct nature of these negotiations.

In order to expedite this process, the agenda, procedure and international support for negotiations can be discussed and agreed upon at a meeting of a small working team to be convened within 30 days.

Let us put this process into motion. Let us shield this flickering hope from threatening winds. Let us not consign this moment of hope to the fate of missed opportunities.

Let us look our younger generation in the eye and vow to do all that is humanly possible so that never again will a young boy die in a war we failed to prevent.

(Mr. Peres, Israel)

The sons of Abraham have become quarrelsome but remain family, now the less. Destined to live side by side from time immemorial till the end of time, sharing a past of mutual enrichment, struggling through a present of suspicion and conflict, holding to a separate - yet common - desire for a better future, they have reached yet another moment of truth.

We are ready to enter it with no hesitation. I hereby proclaim: The state of war between Israel and Jordan should be terminated immediately. Israel declares this readily, in the hope that King Hussein is willing to reciprocate this step.

Let us not confine the horizons of our vision to the limits set by what is proved by history. For the future holds yet untold possibilities for peace and prosperity for our war-torn lands.

In the words of the Prophet:

"...and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory ... and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts."

(Naggal, II:7,9)

Mr. Shimon Peres, Prime Minister of the State of Israel, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call upon the Vice-Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, His Excellency Mr. Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

Mr. GENSCHER (Federal Republic of Germany) (spoke in German; English text furnished by the delegation): On 26 September of this year I expounded my country's policy before the General Assembly of the United Nations. Today I have the honour of addressing the Assembly on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

The United Nations was the international community's reply to the disaster of World War II. This reply not only had to cope with the horror of 50 million dead but also had to take into account the collapse of a global order that had been shaped by Europe over the course of centuries.

The founders of the United Nations had to develop the concept for a new international order. Unlike the League of Nations, the new international organisation had to be truly universal. That goal has almost been attained. By bringing about decolonisation, the United Nations has itself contributed considerably towards universality.

The proscription of war and the prohibition of recourse to force for political ends had to be affirmed as binding international law. The United Nations has ensured that war and force are no longer legitimate instruments of national policy. Even though numerous wars have been waged since 1945 or are still being waged, one thing is clear: Whoever takes up arms must justify his action to world public opinion here in the United Nations. Only the need for self-defence may be cited as cause for such action.

The founders of the United Nations added new dimensions to the concept of peace. The non-use of force is now but one of these. Potential sources of conflict must be eliminated. It is for that reason that the promotion of economic and social welfare has one of the highest priorities among the goals of the United Nations. Without efforts in this direction, people in the third world would be poorer, hunger would prevail to an even greater extent, far fewer people could read and write and diseases and epidemics would be even more widespread.

The United Nations is also concerned with individual rights. Our Organisation acknowledges the great importance attaching to justice and the protection of human rights for the preservation of peace. The international codification of human rights is one of the greatest and most important accomplishments of the United

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

Nations. Respect for human rights must be the yardstick by which all nations are measured. We know how much still remains to be done.

International politics should be subjected to binding rules. The United Nations Charter is an attempt to create rules for the worldwide reconciliation of interests.

The ideals of the United Nations have been attained only in part. We still must live with war, violence and terror. Hunger and need are still growing. Arbitrary actions and suppression by Governments still must be condemned and opposed time and again. But can we reproach the United Nations for the fact that its Members have not achieved in 40 years what mankind had previously failed to accomplish in thousands of years? In a historical context, 40 years are but a brief moment.

Great challenges must be met. We must avert the danger of a new world war, and that is true for both conventional and nuclear war. We must jointly alleviate hardship and pursue international economic and development policies. Damage to the environment does not stop at national frontiers. Modern technology and worldwide communications bring us closer together. The misery of refugees transcends national borders. Human dignity must be defended everywhere.\*

This worldwide interdependence inevitably requires a forum for discussion, negotiation and reconciliation of interests. The United Nations is such a forum. If the United Nations did not exist, we would have to found it now.

We counter hasty and superficial criticism as follows. The United Nations mirrors the state of international relations. It reflects the conditions in which our world lives. It suffers from unduly high expectations and from the unrealistic hope that historical change can come about overnight.

---

\* Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.



(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

Of course, the United Nations also suffers from problems it inflicts on itself. We are all well aware of our Organization's deficiencies. The United Nations is in need of reform.

The notion cherished in 1945 of the joint protection of peace by the permanent members of the Security Council has been superseded by the reality of West-East antagonism. Consequently, the small and medium-sized nations bear a special responsibility within and for the United Nations. Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar has called upon us to intensify our consultations prior to sessions of the United Nations. He was right to do so.

Whenever we have political differences with other countries, it is important that these first be discussed bilaterally before we heap reproaches on one another in front of world public opinion. This applies to everyone, including the major Powers.

We hope that the forthcoming meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev will also have a positive impact on the work of the United Nations. We expect a process to be initiated that will place relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as West-East relations in general, on a more stable basis.

On 8 January 1985, the United States and the Soviet Union declared the following as the objectives of their arms control negotiations: to prevent an arms race in space and terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and strengthen strategic stability.

These are far-reaching objectives and we fully support them. We must seek to ensure that security and military stability can be achieved at a drastically reduced level of all armaments. We realize that the dialogue between the super-Powers cannot solve all the world's problems. All Members of the United Nations must make a contribution of their own. Small and medium-sized countries can

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

achieve a great deal if they become aware of their capabilities, join forces and adapt their contribution to actual conditions and problems. That has been demonstrated at a time of severely strained international relations by the countries participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

The union of European democracies in the European Community is also an expression of European self-discovery and self-assertion. Our readiness to co-operate with our Eastern neighbours in Europe is an expression of European responsibility for peace, just as the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic act in a community of shared responsibility by Germans, irrespective of fundamental differences in their political and social systems and of their membership in different alliances.

We are all responsible for the smooth functioning of our Organization and we must all seek solutions to its problems. Despite all its successes, the reputation of the United Nations is impaired by resolutions which, while adopted by a majority, are not translated into practice. Of what use are the most impressive voting results if they are not followed by deeds?

The United Nations Charter rightly introduced the principle of one country, one vote. In this way, the sovereignty of States is respected. The United Nations is the necessary, indeed indispensable, forum where small, weak and poor countries too can and should have an equal say. This equal voting power imposes great responsibility on small countries. Anyone who fails to live up to this responsibility strengthens the trend towards a return to bilateral negotiating processes, weakens the United Nations and hence enfeebles the forum where one's own ideas should be effectively expressed. The work of the United Nations and its specialized agencies must not be encumbered with ideology.

Efforts to achieve disarmament and arms control in the global context are of decisive importance for the preservation of world peace and the strengthening of

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

international security. With the participation of the United Nations, the first agreement was concluded that outlawed an entire category of weapons: the bacteriological weapons Convention. The United Nations played a major part in the conclusion of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The key subject of the United Nations is the prevention of war - and, let me stress once again, the prevention of any war, not only nuclear but also conventional. This is the purpose of the prohibition of the threat or use of force enshrined in the Charter. If we want to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in international security policy, we must devote increased attention to those problems caused by the massive build-up and imbalance of conventional weapons. All our disarmament and arms control efforts must be directed towards the goal of preventing war. Peace can no longer be safeguarded by autonomous measures alone; co-operative solutions are required. For this we need confidence-building, transparency, openness, balance and verifiability. This is a great task for the United Nations too.

Its role in the North-South dialogue is of great importance as well. The United Nations system is the most important body for multilateral development policy. Here we seek solutions to the central problems of the world economy, and of the developing countries in particular.

Our positive overall assessment does not blind us to the system's deficiencies. Duplication of work and constant repetition are serious shortcomings. It does not make sense to keep speaking about the same things in an unco-ordinated fashion in various bodies.

One of the outstanding tasks of the United Nations is to strengthen the independence and identity of all countries in the world, big and small alike. Respect for the right of all nations to self-determination, including that of the German people, is indispensable.

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

The United Nations must actively promote a world-wide cultural dialogue which encourages respect for the cultural achievements of others and for the cultural identity of nations and States. We need a North-South dialogue on culture.

We regard international economic, developmental and cultural co-operation in the United Nations as part of our policy for peace. The credibility of the United Nations is determined by its uncompromising support for human rights - namely, civil, economic, cultural and social rights. We must not be one-sided in this respect. The United Nations needs effective and objective instruments to ensure the observance of human rights. We need a commissioner for human rights and a United Nations court of human rights.

Forty years constitute an individual's active working life. The first generation of the United Nations now lies behind us. What will we hand on to the next generation? At this juncture we are reaffirming the ideals and principles of the founding fathers of the United Nations. We must concentrate on the essentials. Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe once wrote: "Anyone who aspires to great achievements must be concise. Conciseness reveals the true master". We must not nurture any illusions by setting unrealistic goals for the United Nations. Otherwise, we shall foster disappointment at the United Nations and dissatisfaction with it. This anniversary, too, should be celebrated soberly and without false pathos.

This building is often referred to as the "glass house on the East River". It is a glass house in a figurative sense also. Here international affairs covering the whole globe become transparent. This constitutes the contribution by the United Nations to the predictability and calculability of international developments and to the stabilization of peace. If we learn to work together peacefully in this forum, then we shall take small steps towards the attainment of the great goals of the United Nations: a world in which people can live free from

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

fear and hardship, a world in which international law prevails, a world directed towards freedom and justice, respect for human rights and the right of nations to self-determination.

The PRESIDENT: I now call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Special Envoy of the President of the Republic of Indonesia, His Excellency Mr. Mochtar Kusumaatmadja.

Mr. KUSUMATHADJA (Indonesia): On the auspicious occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, it is a distinct honour and privilege for me to convey to this Assembly the following message from His Excellency Mr. Soeharto, President of the Republic of Indonesia:

"As we commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, the Government and people of Indonesia join with the Governments and peoples of the world in paying tribute to the wisdom and foresight with which the founders of the Organization launched this noble venture to attain universal peace and security in a world where freedom, justice and equality would prevail. Their visionary impulse, as reflected in the United Nations Charter, was the determination 'to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war' by eliminating the seeds of war and by ensuring the conditions on which to build harmony, mutual tolerance and co-operation among nations.

"To the people of Indonesia this milestone in the life of the United Nations is an occasion of particular historic significance. For at the same time as we commemorate the fortieth year of the existence of our Organization, the people of Indonesia this year are also celebrating the fortieth year of their rebirth as an independent nation, which they proclaimed on 17 August 1945.

"We in Indonesia perceive this coincidence between the founding of the United Nations and the proclamation of our national independence not simply as

Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

a parallel in time but, above all, as a coalescence of ideals and values. Both the United Nations and the Republic of Indonesia came into being in the aftermath of a devastating world war. It is not a coincidence, therefore, that both the Charter of the United Nations and the Constitution of Indonesia embrace principles and objectives that are fundamentally in accord with one another, such as independence, social justice, equality, peace and peaceful development.

"Thus, the United Nations has been for the Indonesian nation a most important forum in which we can pursue our constitutional obligation to eradicate colonialism, domination and injustice everywhere and to contribute to a new world order based on independence, abiding peace and social justice. For its part, Indonesia has consistently endeavoured to strengthen the role of the Organization in all facets of international relations.

"A major contribution to the promotion of the objectives of the United Nations was made by the historic Asian-African Conference held in Bandung in 1955. That Conference signalled the determination of the newly emerging nations to consolidate their unity and solidarity in order to address together the multitude of problems before the international community. The primacy that the leaders of Asia and Africa attached to the central role of the United Nations is reflected in the very first of the 10 principles adopted by the Conference, which proclaimed respect for the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. Their united call for action encompassed the same aims as are set forth in the Charter, namely, eradicating colonialism, ensuring respect for fundamental human rights, eliminating racial discrimination, encouraging the peaceful settlement of disputes, halting the arms race and promoting economic development through international

Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

co-operation. At the commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the Asian-African Conference, held in Bandung last April, the participating countries reaffirmed the enduring relevance of the 10 Bandung principles to the establishment of a just and equitable world order.

"This anniversary session provides us with the opportunity to review the performance of our Organization over the past four decades, to examine the factors that have contributed to its successes as well as to its failures and shortcomings, and to reflect on ways further to enhance its efficacy in realising the ideals enshrined in the Charter.

"Foremost in the eyes of the founders was the need to strive for an international order based on justice and the supremacy of law. In this respect, the achievements of the United Nations have been commendable. More international legal instruments, covering a myriad of human endeavours, have been promulgated in the past 40 years than in any comparable period of recorded history.

"The transformation of the world from one of colonial bondage to an international community of sovereign independent States has been rightly acclaimed as one of the most significant achievements of the United Nations. The Organization has contributed decisively to the world-wide decolonization process, inter alia by adopting and implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the twenty-fifth anniversary of which we are also commemorating this year. The application of the provisions of that historic document through a broad framework and programme of action has changed in a fundamental way the entire complexion and quality of the United Nations itself, making the Organization today a far more representative forum and one ever closer to its goal of true universality.

Mr. Purnomastomo, Indonesia)

"The fact that none of the conflicts since 1945 has escalated to global proportions is attributable to the United Nations, where the collective moral and political influence of its Members and the deliberative mechanisms that have been developed have proved effective in containing or mitigating crisis situations.

"While the Security Council has not functioned in the manner envisaged in the Charter, it has proved itself as a forum in which the conflicting parties can seek redress and thereby gain time, by substituting negotiation, conciliation or mediation for the use of armed force. Peace-keeping operations, to which Indonesia has made significant contributions, have also strengthened the overall capacity of the United Nations to contain conflict situations. The conflicts of the past four decades would have been infinitely more devastating and far less susceptible of peaceful resolution had it not been for the framework for preventive diplomacy provided by the United Nations.

"The concern of the Organization to ensure disarmament was evident from its very inception, when the first resolution adopted by the General Assembly dealt with the question of nuclear weapons. From that time on, the United Nations has provided the only fully representative multilateral forum for disarmament negotiations, within which some agreements have been reached.

"In the broad and complex spheres of international economic and social development the United Nations has played a central, indeed a crucial, role. Mandated by its Charter to promote higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development, the United Nations has progressively intensified its support for the developing countries in their struggle to break the cycle of poverty, hunger and ignorance. The work of its specialized agencies has brought comfort to many thousands of



Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

refugees, to those afflicted by disease, illiteracy and the calamity of natural disasters, and to millions of undernourished children. In this context, my Government strongly affirms its commitment to achieving the commendable goal of universal child immunization by the year 1990, as set by the World Health Assembly and to be implemented by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Health Organization (WHO) and many others, to save succeeding generations from life-threatening diseases. In the fields of economic and technical co-operation the United Nations has been the channel through which development assistance and technology transfer have been made available to many developing countries. Likewise, the record of the United Nations in the field of human rights is equally noteworthy.

"Unfortunately, many of these activities and programmes are less conspicuous to the public eye. Yet in tangible terms they translate into \$2 billion annually and constitute by far the greater share of the human and financial resources expended by the Organization.

"It is beyond question, therefore, that the Organization's activities have raised the global consciousness on key issues and concepts concerning a more equitable and just world for all. In sum, the scope and essential thrust of these activities attest to the indispensability of the United Nations as an agent of development and peaceful change and as a forum where nations can harmonize their actions and negotiate solutions to the global issues of our time.

"While reflecting on the achievements and the positive contributions of our Organization, my Government is also acutely aware of its limitations and shortcomings. The perceived incapacity of the United Nations to cope adequately with unprecedented problems and challenges has caused increased

Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

frustration and disillusionment among the peoples of the world and has led some to call even the relevance of the United Nations into question.

"It is more necessary than ever before that the Security Council fulfil its primary responsibility to the international community for the maintenance of peace and security, for which unanimous resolve is imperative. Our primary task must be to ensure a strengthened role for the Council and for the Secretary-General in conflict resolution, and the establishment of workable machinery for the defusing of crises before they become full-blown wars. However, to be successful, the procedural and other improvements must be reinforced by a conscious commitment, especially by the permanent members of the Council, to the wider global responsibilities inherent in their acceptance of the Charter.

"United Nations peace-keeping operations should also be reassessed, for they are still of an expedient and improvised nature and have not led to the larger requisites of peace-making and peace-building. In order to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations for conflict control, the system of peace-keeping must be further developed, based on a firm consensus as to its functioning, financing and jurisdiction so as to assure global support.

"In the quest for common security, the necessity to arrive at a global compact in order to prevent nuclear war should remain the pre-eminent concern of the international community. The arms race in both its nuclear and conventional aspects must be halted and reversed. In conformity with the overwhelming desire of all peoples of the world, the nuclear Powers should cease all testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons, commit themselves against their use and proceed in earnest with negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

"The remaining vestiges of colonialism continue to challenge our collective sense of justice and morality. The United Nations bears a particular obligation to realize the inalienable rights of millions of black Africans in Namibia and South Africa who are still suffering under the most demeaning forms of colonial exploitation and apartheid, universally condemned as a particularly virulent form of racism. Nor can the question of Palestine be dissociated from the colonial context, as Palestinians are still deprived of the right to return to their homeland, to self-determination and to independence in a State of their own.

"Despite the significant advances in economic and social development, major obstacles and challenges still confront the concerted efforts of the United Nations and the international community. International economic relations continue to be characterized by inequity, imbalance and exploitation. Such constraints graphically demonstrate the inability of the international economic system to assist in the advancement of the majority of mankind. They are also symptomatic of the underlying structural weaknesses of the present economic order. Interdependence must mean, and indeed is increasingly shown to be, a two-way street. The developed countries, no less than the developing, will benefit from greater stability and equity in commodity markets, from a freer flow of global trade and from more soundly structured monetary and financial systems. Hence, the proposition to restructure the international economic framework, to establish a new international economic order, far from being a call for ever greater charity from the rich or for a massive transfer of wealth, should be seen as a requisite in which both have a vital stake.

"What is therefore urgently needed is a new vision in international economic co-operation based on the recognition that in a world of

Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

interdependence there must be a fair sharing of the burdens as well as the fruits of global development. This can be effected only through the equitable functioning of international institutions and the democratisation of inter-State relations.

"It is only fitting that on this fortieth anniversary of the United Nations we should return to the spirit of 1945 and recommit ourselves to multilateral co-operation. Only then can we build a more peaceful, just and equitable world for all its inhabitants. Only then can the promise of freedom from war and deprivation be fulfilled to all the peoples of the world. In the context of these overriding concerns, the International Year of Peace that is being simultaneously proclaimed at this observance of the birth of the Organization is a fitting expression of mankind's yearning for universal and permanent peace.

"We must never lose sight of the fact that it is, indeed, the peoples of the world, and not only the Governments of its Member States, that are the real constituency of the United Nations. And it is from them, the citizens of each country, that a strengthened commitment to the United Nations is also necessary to ensure the continued, positive involvement of their Governments in the work of the United Nations. Particularly young people must be made more aware of the purposes and potentials of the Organization in building a better world for them and the generations to come. In this, the coincidence of the International Youth Year with the United Nations anniversary is a most worthy starting-point to begin this process.

"The fortieth anniversary offers a unique opportunity to all of us to rededicate ourselves solemnly and sincerely to the purposes and principles of the Charter and to reaffirm our faith in the capacity of the United Nations as

Mr. Kusumastmadja, Indonesia)

the principal instrument for securing the minimum conditions for peace, justice and development in the world. On this auspicious occasion, the Government and people of Indonesia renew their commitment to the United Nations as the centre and citadel for a new and revitalized world order."

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.