

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
FORTIETH SESSION
*Official Records**



MAY 19 1987

FIRST COMMITTEE
58th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 4 December 1985
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 58th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC.2-730, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/40/PV.58
10 December 1985

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 71, 72 AND 73 (continued)

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

Mr. GRANDERSON (Trinidad and Tobago): My delegation wishes to address agenda item 73, "Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security".

It was not by chance or by any mere whim that the theme of the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations was "the United Nations for a better world". The United Nations is a beacon of hope, comfort and inspiration for many States of this world, especially the small and vulnerable States. It is the single most important instrument for the promotion of understanding, co-operation and security in a world torn by strife and conflict. In a word, it is the most important institution in man's ceaseless search for a better world, for a world characterized by well-being, peace and security.

In that context, the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations lie at the very heart of the efforts of the global community to improve the international political environment by promoting international peace and security. It is therefore a source of great regret and concern for my delegation that, 40 years after the founding of the United Nations, the collective security provisions of the Charter have not yet been fully implemented. We are even more disturbed by the reluctance or inability to devise procedures to rectify that grave shortcoming. General Assembly resolution 38/191 of 20 December 1983 provided for the establishment of an ad hoc committee to explore ways and means of implementing the collective security provisions of the Charter. Two years later, that committee has yet to be constituted.

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad
and Tobago)

During the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, a great number of Heads of State or Government or their special envoys addressed the issue of international peace and security and expressed their views on how it can be strengthened. On the occasion of the special meeting of the Security Council to commemorate that anniversary, a meeting which took place on 26 September 1985, the Foreign Ministers or representatives of the States members of the Security Council also considered the problem of international peace and security. They agreed that there was an urgent need to enhance the effectiveness of the Security Council in discharging its principal role of maintaining international peace and security.

Is it too much to hope that this widely-shared perception of the need to improve the effectiveness of our Organization might breathe the breath of life into efforts to constitute the ad hoc committee? Is it too much to expect that the insights of those statesmen and the views expressed by the Secretary-General in his reports on the work of the Organization will become a meaningful aspect of the considerations of the ad hoc committee when it is finally constituted?

I do not think it is necessary for my delegation to expand on the urgency of embarking on that exercise of revitalizing the system of collective security. As the Secretary-General has repeatedly stressed, international relations have now reached a critical stage, and two paths are opening up before us, one leading to coherence, stability and peaceful progress and the other to greater and greater disarray. The realities of contemporary international relations increasingly indicate the need for multilateral responses to political, economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems in a world which has become more and more interdependent. At a time of increasing tension and conflict, the lack of a

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad
and Tobago)

functioning collective security system too often leads to the intervention and involvement of Powers intent on pursuing, on a global scale, their own narrow security interests. That results in super-Power confrontation, in the escalation of the arms race and in the exacerbation of conflict and tension, not in the resolution of problems or the maintenance of international peace and security.

The continuing obstruction by South Africa concerning the independence of Namibia and the dramatic deterioration of the situation in apartheid South Africa are but two glaring examples of the failure of that approach. They underline the urgency with which we must tackle the problems associated with the implementation of the collective security provisions of the United Nations Charter.

We do not wish to give the impression that we see the implementation of those collective security provisions as a panacea which will make it possible to realize international peace and security. It goes without saying that it would have to be complemented by other measures such as disarmament, détente, confidence-building, the peaceful settlement of disputes, compliance with the principles of international law, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and universal economic development. The implementation of these collective security provisions would, however, establish machinery for the speedy and efficient resolution of conflicts.

During the fortieth anniversary commemorations, Member States of the United Nations rededicated themselves to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. What better way to concretize that commitment, that resolve, than to take the first important steps to implement an efficient system of collective security and thus enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. RACZ (Hungary): Fifteen years ago the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Since that time the validity of the Declaration has been proved. My delegation has explained its position on that Declaration in a very detailed manner, and I do not want to repeat myself this year.

As my delegation has said in various statements this session, both in the General Assembly and in the First Committee, we cannot help pointing out that since last year there has been little improvement regarding the resolution of regional disputes.

We are deeply worried about the situation in the Middle East. With every day that passes we become more convinced that the only way out of that perennial crisis is a comprehensive settlement ensuring the exercise by the Palestinian people of its legitimate rights, including the right to establish a State of its own. Such a settlement would also create all the conditions and guarantees necessary for all States of the region to live in peace and security within internationally recognized borders. Success can be achieved only if all States of the region, as well as those with influence in the region, make every effort to bring about negotiations on that basis.

The situation in Central America is also a source of concern. Moments of hope, brought about by initiatives made by the States of the Contadora Group, alternate with moments of desperation, as tension is artificially maintained by a State with great influence in the region. In our view, the cessation of threats, of dubious military manoeuvres and of covert and overt interference is a prime condition for the States concerned to embark on the path to a negotiated settlement of the crisis and for creating a climate of détente in the Central American and Caribbean region.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

To our great regret, Cyprus remains a hotbed of tension. We maintain that the restoration of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and respect for its sovereign and non-aligned status is a conditio sine qua non for the elimination of tension in that region, and we support every effort, including negotiations between the communities concerned, directed towards a negotiated settlement in the spirit of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

In the same spirit, we deeply appreciate efforts by the countries of Indo-China to reduce tension in South-East Asia. We are convinced that the controversial issues of the subcontinent can and should be solved peacefully by the States directly involved on the basis of respect for their mutual interests and of existing realities. We welcome the proposals set forth by the Foreign Ministers of the Indochinese countries at their meeting this year.

The realization of the proposals made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the peaceful and democratic reunification of the country would mean significant progress in improving the international climate.

My Government resolutely demands that the rights of the Namibian people, represented by the South West Africa People's Organization, be implemented without delay and that independence be granted to Namibia in accordance with relevant United Nations decisions, including Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

My country attaches great importance to the situation in Europe. This is motivated not simply by the fact that Hungary is situated in the heart of Europe but also by our awareness that the highest concentration of dreadful arms is to be found in Europe. The Hungarian Government reiterates its support for the proceedings of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and expresses the hope that the negotiations currently in progress at the Stockholm Conference will conclude successfully.

My Government is deeply interested in maintaining the vitality of the process initiated in Helsinki. It has been doing its utmost to help the process of Helsinki unfold and is continuing to deploy all efforts to promote the full and balanced implementation of the principles and recommendations contained in the Final Act. We regard the decision to have Hungary act as host country to the European Cultural Forum, which was just concluded, as recognition of our efforts in this direction. We see the Forum as an important and positive event, since it has contributed to the widening of the Helsinki process. It is our strong belief that co-operation in Europe in any sphere of social activity can be an important step towards the strengthening of confidence and security.

We are all aware of the fact that relations between the two great Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, have been and remain a decisive factor in the international situation. It is with this in mind that we have learnt with great pleasure and encouragement that the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States met and discussed the most burning problems of our age in Geneva last month. However, prior to the summit meeting we witnessed both alarming and encouraging developments. Without attempting to go into detail, I would only mention that the negative signs range from attempts to reinterpret vital arms-control treaties and, in parallel, the testing of arms destined for deployment in outer space, to the attempt made in the last day before the summit to undermine it.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

The Geneva summit meeting was significant as an event initiating a dialogue aimed at achieving a turn for the better, both in Soviet-American relations and in the whole world. Generally the results of the meeting produced more favourable possibilities for improvement in the international situation and a return to détente. It is vitally important to put those possibilities into practice on both sides in the future.

The inadmissibility of nuclear war and the commitment of both sides to refrain from attempts to achieve military superiority, as set forth in the joint United States-USSR statement, is of fundamental importance. Although the concrete problems of arms limitation and reduction were not solved in Geneva - nobody could have expected the summit meeting to solve all the accumulated problems in two days - it was of great importance that the parties reaffirmed the Soviet-American agreement of January 1985 on the need to seek ways and means of terminating the arms race on Earth and preventing it in outer space.

Since the summit meeting, although the number of weapons is unchanged, the world has become a safer place. The Soviet Union and the United States have just begun a new dialogue. They have taken the necessary steps towards a world with fewer armaments but more confidence, a world in which peace is solid. That goal is still far away, but we witnessed the first steps along this very long road two weeks ago. The responsibility of the two parties is enormous and results can be achieved only by the exercise of political will on both sides. We hope that the continuation of the dialogue resumed in Geneva will bring about the desired results, namely, the termination of the arms race on Earth and its prevention in outer space.

Mrs. TNANI (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): In this year in which we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, which coincides with the fifteenth anniversary of the General Assembly's adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, we must recognize that never before has the right of each State to security been as disregarded as it has in recent years; never before has the security of some been so completely dissociated from that of others - and never has the collective security system contemplated in the Charter of the United Nations been given specific shape. The principles of the Charter - tolerance, good-neighbourliness, the non-use of force and co-operation - are no longer respected. Régimes such as those of Israel and South Africa are vainly attempting to build their own security upon the destruction of the security of others. The same phenomena are to be found in the military relationships between East and West and in North-South economic relations.

The nuclear threat and East-West rivalry have from its earliest years so handicapped the United Nations that the general and complete disarmament that seemed so inevitable in the aftermath of the Second World War has never been achieved. The arms race has known but a brief respite in the 1970s, with the accords banning anti-missile weapons and the limiting of offence strategic weapons. That respite on the military level coincided with the proclamation of the new international economic order, the launching of negotiations on the law of the sea and the recognition of national liberation movements, in particular the Palestinian and Namibian movements.

However, in the 1980s East-West relations further deteriorated, as did North-South relations. On this first point, military measures and counter-measures have relaunched the arms race and threaten to extend to outer space. With regard to the second, we have witnessed the launching of a real offensive against the new

(Mrs. Thani, Tunisia)

international economic order, against the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and, more recently, against the national liberation movements, that of Palestine in particular. Thus, neither political, military nor economic security have emerged strengthened from this experience.

Fortunately, however, there are certain signs of hope on the horizon. Thus, at the Geneva summit meeting the parties agreed to speed up ongoing negotiations and referred to their communiqué of 8 January 1985, which stated the need for "preventing the arms race in space and terminating it on Earth [and] limiting and reducing nuclear arms."

(Mrs. Tnani, Tunisia)

At the same time, rich countries have recently given signals of flexibility in their financial policies towards poor countries, a development that is encouraging and not insignificant.

However, something that is being pursued with a suicidal fury is the aggressive policy of Israel and South Africa against the security of the countries and peoples of the Middle East and southern Africa. We are duty-bound to denounce that policy and to combat it relentlessly, lest it become trivialized and, with time, come to be regarded as legitimate.

Recently my country, Tunisia, was the victim of Israeli aggression, which was justly condemned by the Security Council. In this connection I should like to emphasize that the Israeli aggressor, with South Africa, has a sad record of condemnations by the United Nations, whereas the aggressed party, Tunisia, has always been in the forefront in upholding just peaceful solutions, including in the Middle East. In a more general way, however, I should like to point out that Israel, which has considerably extended its military operations in the Mediterranean, is threatening to upset the overall balance of the region and to disrupt the ongoing efforts to make the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and co-operation. I should like to say once again that Israeli aggression can only prompt the Mediterranean countries members of the Non-Aligned Movement to greater vigilance and firmness in defending their joint positions.

We should like here to renew our full support for the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session in 1970, as supplemented in 1984 by resolution 39/159 on the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States.

We also renew our support for the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-third session in

(Mrs. Tnani, Tunisia)

1978. However, that Declaration cannot be implemented fully and with lasting success without respect for and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Helsinki Final Act, another achievement of détente, has been able to reconcile respect for human rights and the rights of those European States within the frontiers that came into being after the Second World War.

We also support actions by the General Assembly for the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness among States. In particular, we emphasize our support for resolution 39/78, which states, inter alia, that good-neighbourliness presupposes the rejection of any acts seeking to establish zones of influence or domination.

As for international terrorism, we condemn it, whatever its source and whatever its form, whether criminal act or act of reprisal. It is an intolerable attack against the security of persons and demands concerted action by States within the context of international law.

That does not, however, prevent us from reasserting our conviction that peoples subjected to any form of foreign domination are waging a legitimate liberation struggle and that they therefore have the right to resort to any means available, including armed struggle, in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter.

We have too much respect for the system of collective security established by the Charter to accept the premise that international security may be taken outside the sphere of responsibility of the Security Council. We are convinced that there is broad consensus in this regard. The deterioration of the international situation requires an effective Security Council and the re-evaluation of its working methods and mechanisms so as to enable it further to strengthen its authority and its enforcement capability.

(Mrs. Tnani, Tunisia)

Our efforts should be aimed at helping the Security Council fully to implement, if need be, the enforcement powers entrusted to it in Chapter VII of the Charter. Détente in international relations would contribute powerfully to that end.

We are witnessing too many threats against peace and too many breaches of the peace, too many acts of aggression, not to call upon the Security Council to resort with greater conviction to the sanctions provided in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

Last July, partial measures were taken by the Security Council against South Africa. The fact that such measures were inadequate and that certain countries refuse or hesitate to apply them does not prevent us from hoping that the process thus begun will be continued and expanded against any aggressor State, notwithstanding some of the disappointing votes recently cast in the Security Council on this same question.

In conclusion, the world will not be secure so long as we cannot succeed in halting the threats of war throughout the world and in putting an end to hunger, disease and poverty in the developing countries, as well as eradicating racism, apartheid, State terrorism and foreign occupation.

Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): I should like to speak on the subject of the strengthening of the security and co-operation in the region of the Mediterranean.

The Mediterranean region is diverse in its history, ethnic background and levels of economic and social development. It has been a strategic area, a crossroads of interests.

In the end, however, there as everywhere in the world, contradictory processes boil down to issues of independence, sovereignty, self-determination and peace and security for unhindered social and political development. Against this background the General Assembly set out three years ago to find a new basis for the

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean. While some results were achieved, there has also been an increasing resistance to the growing forces of independence and equitable co-operation.

While the quest for independence and sovereignty continues, attempts are being made to regain the positions lost in the wave of liberation and decolonization. The military presence of the most powerful is increasing, with the aim of spreading their influence and, eventually, imposing their will. Conflicts and disagreements between individual countries of the region that are rooted in the inequality of the past and present tend to be used, whenever possible, to serve the purposes of non-regional factors. All this is done in disregard of the long-term interests of the peace and security of the Mediterranean itself.

The news from the Mediterranean that has come our way recently gives us cause for particular concern. State terrorism is running rampant and the use of force is escalating, threatening the stability of an ever-wider area of the Mediterranean.

The bombing of Tunis is a telling example of the force and destruction that have of late been visited upon the Mediterranean. It represents a flagrant violation of the sovereignty of the independent and non-aligned country of Tunisia and of the basic principles of the Charter and the norms of international behaviour. The long arm of the war machine has committed aggression against a peace-loving country, falsely pretending that it is thus serving so-called security interests. There are no security interests that can be protected by the bombing of a peace-loving country.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

That sort of behaviour should be cut short if the efforts of so many Mediterranean and other countries are to be successful and if peace is to be brought to the shores, airspace and sea lanes of the Mediterranean.

The latest developments in the Mediterranean have once again brought to the fore the urgent need to remove the underlying causes of the crisis and of the inequitable relations which prevail in the region. Those developments require a response to injustice; they require dialogue and negotiation on the basis of the United Nations Charter and of the principles of non-alignment, with full respect for the legitimate interests of the countries and the peoples of the region.

There will be no peace in the Mediterranean so long as there is no just, comprehensive solution to the Middle East crisis, to the question of Palestine, to the crisis in Lebanon and to the problem of Cyprus. Every one of those crises results from the violation of independence and from aggression and the use of force against peoples and their inalienable rights. The fact that non-regional factors are involved makes the situation more complex and more dangerous.

Let me state again, however, that the solution of the Middle East crisis can be achieved only on the basis of the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, the realization of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to a State of its own, and of the right of all countries and peoples of the region to peace and security within internationally-recognized borders. An international conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations, constitutes the best framework for a just, lasting and comprehensive solution, and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, should participate in such a conference on an equal footing.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

With regard to Lebanon, it is indispensable to implement fully Security Council resolutions calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Lebanese territory, to create conditions in which the Lebanese people and Government may exercise sovereignty throughout their territory and within Lebanon's internationally-recognized boundaries, and conditions of territorial integrity and independence for Lebanon.

The solution of the Cyprus crisis can be achieved only through full respect for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and non-aligned status of that country.

The piling up of weapons as a consequence of the extension to the Mediterranean of global rivalries places pressure on and poses a constant threat to security, independence and peaceful development, primarily of the non-aligned countries of the region. Demonstrations of military force in the Mediterranean constitute a means of exerting political pressure on the littoral countries, aimed at limiting their freedom and independence. Stability in the Mediterranean and the security of its countries can be built neither on a bloc basis nor on solutions imposed from outside. The stability of the Mediterranean can be achieved only through the development of equitable co-operation with full respect for mutual differences.

Despite difficulties and occasional setbacks, a process of genuine security and co-operation in the Mediterranean has taken root. From their 1972 Georgetown Ministerial Conference to their last Ministerial Conference, held at Luanda in September this year, the non-aligned countries have adopted recommendations for the elimination of causes of tension in the Mediterranean. They have initiated action aimed at creating a new basis for the strengthening of security and co-operation in the region. They have initiated a process of laying new ground for peace and

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

all-round co-operation in the fields of the economy, science, technology, the environment, culture and the arts, tourism and sports. That is an essential component for the construction of new relations in the Mediterranean and an important element of détente.

The first ministerial meeting of the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Valetta last year, was one of the stepping-stones in that direction. It was also the basis for other activities of the non-aligned countries aimed at transforming the Mediterranean into a region of peace, security and co-operation in accordance with the decisions of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the resolutions of the General Assembly. The next such meeting, scheduled for 1986, will mark another step in that direction.

There are other examples that show that it is not only necessary, but also possible, to build relations based on peaceful co-existence and mutual trust in the Mediterranean. The meeting on the protection of the environment in the Mediterranean, held at Genoa, Italy, and the meeting of economic experts of Mediterranean non-aligned countries, held at Valetta, Malta, are examples of those constructive efforts. The United Nations, too, may play an important role in encouraging regional and inter-regional co-operation and in strengthening peace and security. The process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is also playing a significant role in promoting the Mediterranean dimension of European security.

All forms of contacts that can enrich general co-operation in the Mediterranean should be used. All this would contribute to mutual trust in the region and highlight the common interest of all the Mediterranean countries. Common interest can be the only framework for general co-operation in the Mediterranean.

(Mr. Golob, Yugoslavia)

Co-operation should be strengthened not only through existing institutions, but also through new forms of co-operation. In the long run that would reduce differences and promote mutual trust and understanding.

But we are quite well aware that all that has to be done in the face of the forces of domination and territorial expansion which, by supremacy and force, by bloc divisions and strategic entanglements, threaten the basis of the stability of the region envisaged by the non-aligned and other States of the region.

Finally, co-operation among equals and respect for the rights of peoples is the soundest ground for peace and the best barrier to war.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from French): The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security occupies a noteworthy place among the documents adopted by the United Nations with a view to realizing its main purposes. Its adoption by the General Assembly in 1970 on the initiative of the socialist countries reflected the determination and wish of the States Members of the United Nations to ensure better implementation of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. In the 15 years since its adoption, that Declaration has continued to serve its purpose, and it retains its great political significance and timeliness.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

It would be no exaggeration to say that the leitmotif which ran through the statements made by the Heads of Delegation of a majority of States and by the many Heads of State or Government who took part in the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations was the urgent need that all States do all they can to ward off the threat of nuclear war and to safeguard international peace and security. At the same time they reiterated the need to enhance the role and effectiveness of the United Nations, particularly in the pursuit of its primary purpose: the maintenance of international peace and security.

This fortieth anniversary of the United Nations coincides with the fifteenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and it cannot be denied that international peace and security and the right of peoples to life and to peace are gravely threatened. The arms race continues, and the threat of nuclear war has not yet been lifted. That tense international situation is not the result of "super-Power rivalry", as some like to repeat, but is rather due to the policy of State terrorism and interference in the internal affairs of other regions and States. It is due to the policy of blackmail and pressure pursued by imperialist circles and the attempt by those circles to extend the arms race to outer space. It is those policies which are rekindling existing tensions and conflicts and giving rise to new ones.

The experience gained over the 40 years of the existence of the United Nations teaches that in this nuclear age international security can be guaranteed only given the strict implementation of and respect for the principle of peaceful coexistence among States great and small with differing social systems and, first and foremost, the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, of territorial integrity, of sovereignty and of the settlement of disputes by political means.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

Today it is more important than ever before that all States and forces in favour of normalizing the international situation co-operate actively. That is the precise thrust of the specific proposals of the socialist countries, including those contained in the recent Declaration issued following the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, held at Sofia in October. In that Declaration, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty stressed that the vital task of the day is to halt the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and to move towards disarmament. In that connection they proposed a realistic programme of action and practical measures. The Mongolian Government supported the spirit and letter of that Declaration and believes that it provides a genuine possibility of improving the international climate in general.

In that connection, Mongolia attaches special importance to the recent Soviet-American summit meeting. My country is gratified that that historic meeting between the leaders of the world's two greatest countries led to positive results in keeping with the interests of world peace and the security of peoples. The two sides declared that nuclear war was inadmissible and that neither would seek military supremacy, and we consider that to be very important. Another very important point is that General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan agreed to speed up the bilateral negotiations now under way between their countries at Geneva on space and nuclear weapons with a view to carrying out the tasks mandated in the Soviet-American communiqué of 8 January 1985: to forstall an arms race in outer space, to end the arms race on Earth, to limit and reduce nuclear weapons and to enhance strategic stability.

It should be noted that the Soviet Union did everything possible to create a political atmosphere likely to ensure the success of the summit. It is well known that the proposals on the limitation and radical reduction of nuclear weapons, in

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

addition to the unilateral Soviet initiatives preceding the Geneva meeting, did much to clear the ground for subsequent agreements. What remains now is the most important task: to seek the implementation in practice of the agreements that were reached and of the commitments set out in the joint Soviet-American statement of 21 November.

My delegation is pleased that our Committee has adopted many draft resolutions on all questions of arms limitation and disarmament. It is significant that the majority of those draft resolutions concern averting the danger of war and strengthening peace and security through disarmament - first and foremost through nuclear disarmament. It is essential that those draft resolutions not remain mere scraps of paper. They must be acted upon. In that connection, we think it is essential to enhance the effectiveness of international forums concerned with disarmament problems, such as the Conference on Disarmament, the Vienna negotiations and others. It is important that the Conference on Disarmament, as a multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, leave behind sterile debate and move on to practical negotiations to resolve pressing problems of nuclear disarmament, the prevention of nuclear war, the militarization of outer space, the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, and the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons.

Speaking of disarmament, my delegation wants to stress again that the questions of preventing an arms race in outer space and of the peaceful exploitation of outer space under conditions of its non-militarization are of extreme importance and must never be lost sight of.

International problems and regional and local conflicts should be settled by political means, through negotiations and through the collective concerted efforts of all parties concerned, on the basis of relevant decisions of the United Nations

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

and other competent bodies, without outside interference, intervention, threats or pressure. It is in that way that solutions must be found to the problems of Central America and the Middle East, the situations in southern Africa, South-East Asia and the Persian Gulf, the situation around Afghanistan, and the problem of Cyprus. That list could grow to encompass a number of other urgent problems which will brook no delay, such as the implementation in practice of the 1971 United Nations Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and the speedy convening of an international conference on that subject.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

There are other declarations which in our view are of vital importance for the strengthening of international security and for whose implementation we must strive. I am thinking of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace (resolution 33/73) and the Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace (resolution 39/11) adopted last year on the initiative of my country.

The founding of the United Nations 40 years ago was one of the main results of the great victory of the people over fascism and militarism in the Second World War. The Soviet Union played a decisive role in that victory. Mongolia joined the anti-fascist coalition from the very outset and participated directly in the elimination of the last pocket of war in the Far East.

Thus, through its policy of peace, Mongolia made a considerable contribution to the common cause of the peoples and forces which cherish peace and to the establishment of peace in Asia. For that reason alone it was fully entitled to be a founding Member of the United Nations. But forces hostile to everything new and progressive in society prevented Mongolia from becoming a Member of the United Nations until 1961. Nevertheless, the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter have formed the basis of my country's foreign policy since well before the foundation of this Organization, indeed since the 1921 triumph of the Mongolian people's revolution, which freed the Mongolian people from the colonial yoke.

I wish to recall here that in 1981 Mongolia put forward a new peace initiative for the conclusion of a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations among the States of Asia and the Pacific. That initiative conforms to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and also seeks to achieve their practical application in the context of the specific circumstances prevailing in Asia. That Mongolian initiative, along with a number of other constructive

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

proposals made over the years by various States of our continent, has laid a broad basis for a common search for ways and means of establishing peace and security in Asia, one of the essential bulwarks of world security.

We base our views on the principle that, in order to ensure collective security in Asia, the common efforts and the political will of all States in the region are essential. We need to adopt a comprehensive, integrated approach to the problem of security in Asia. In that respect we could profitably draw on the experience of Europe. The Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which celebrated its tenth anniversary this year, has demonstrated that through collective efforts by States it is possible to overcome major difficulties and promote the ideas and principles of peaceful coexistence by establishing co-operation and good-neighbourliness among States with different social systems.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall call now on representatives wishing to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

Mr. LOVING (United States of America): The United States delegation is responding to the scurrilous attacks upon the United States made in this Committee by Viet Nam and the Byelorussian SSR yesterday and by Cuba this morning.

The topic before this Committee this week is how to strengthen international security. Regrettably, Viet Nam, Byelorussia and Cuba have chosen to digress from our agenda to give voice yet again to unfounded accusations against the United States and its policies. Needless to say, the United States rejects those allegations categorically and deplores the use of this forum for propaganda rather than for serious debate on agenda items.

What does need saying is what we North Americans call home truths regarding the Governments which have leveled those charges.

(Mr. Loving, United States)

As 114 Members of the United Nations reaffirmed last month, at the seventh consecutive session of the General Assembly, it is Viet Nam which poses the greatest threat to the security and stability of the peoples and the Governments of South-East Asia. Indeed, throughout the past decade Viet Nam has been the leading cause of massive demographic change in Indo-China. In a unique "outreach programme", Viet Nam has encouraged 150,000 of its well-armed "tourists" to take possession of Cambodia, and it has stationed an additional 50,000 "tourists" in yet another country in the region. Viet Nam has also resettled hundreds of thousands of its citizens in Cambodia and has compelled 1.3 million South Vietnamese to flee that nation in search of freedom.

Any Government, such as that in Viet Nam, that denies its citizens their most fundamental human rights and seeks to export its heinous political system through naked military aggression completely meets the definition of the word "imperialist", as contained in Webster's dictionary - or at least in its United States edition.

The United States calls on Viet Nam to heed the expressed will of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations. The United States calls on Viet Nam to withdraw its troops and colonists from Cambodia and enter into serious bona fide negotiations with the States members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations with a view to a just and peaceful resolution of the outstanding problems of that region. Only when Viet Nam fulfils those obligations may it begin to do honour to its seat among the family of nations. In the interim, it ill behoves Viet Nam to accuse any other State of practicing imperialism.

With regard to the situation in southern Africa, the United States delegation takes this opportunity to remind representatives that the United States adopted a

(Mr. Loving, United States)

unilateral embargo on the shipment of arms to South Africa in 1963, seven years before the United Nations adopted its first arms embargo. The United States has complied fully with all provisions of the various embargos adopted by the United Nations since 1970. The United States specifically prohibits the shipment of American equipment to South African military or police forces.

Frankly, the United States delegation is astounded by the temerity of Cuba in making any public reference to the situation in southern Africa, since it is Cuba which has stationed 36,000 troops in Angola. It is Cuba which is responsible for the introduction of extra-continental military forces into southern Africa. That constitutes a flagrant example of outside military interference in Africa by the proxy of a great Power. It becomes even more evident as one recalls that Cuba has thousands of so-called military advisers stationed in other countries. One might be justified under the circumstances in concluding from the evidence that Cuba has been invading Africa for quite some time.

(Mr. Loving, United States)

Let us now focus on Central America. The accusations by Viet Nam, the Byelorussian SSR and Cuba that the United States seeks the forcible overthrow of the Sandinista régime remain as ludicrous as ever. The United States has made it clear on repeated occasions, both in public and in private, to all the parties in the region that we fully support a negotiated settlement of the current crisis in Central America. Ambassador Walters reiterated this long held position of the United States in the General Assembly debate of 22 November on this question.

Nevertheless the United States delegation hopes that representatives will heed the suggestion of the Cuban delegation and review United Nations document A/40/858, which neatly puts into one volume the abundance of evidence in the public domain of Sandinista subversion in the region. If representatives would commend that factual report to the attention of their Governments, Cuba will have indeed rendered a valuable service.

Most of the member Governments of the United Nations know the position of the United States Government on singling nations out for particular criticism in this body. Therefore the United States delegation is pleased to call the attention of representatives to General Assembly document A/SPC/40/SR.10, dated 15 October 1985. Page 15 of that document summarizes remarks made on that day to the Group of Experts assigned to study the refugee problem by Truong Trieu Duong of Viet Nam, a country whose expertise as a generator of refugees is beyond question. The summary of the remarks made by Mr. Duong reads as follows:

"To mention a particular country by name, and the policy it carried out, such as a previous speaker had done, was inappropriate because it was a biased and incomplete manner of presenting the truth. Such an attitude did not contribute to solving the problem; it only created more obstacles in the search for a solution and slowed down the work of the Group of Experts and the Committee." (A/SPC/40/SR.10, para. 87)

(Mr. Loving, United States)

The United States supports the remarks of that Vietnamese expert on name-calling, and invites all delegations to collaborate with us in halting this unfortunate and unhelpful practice.

Mr. LE HOAI TRUNG (Viet Nam): First of all our delegation wishes to reject the statement just made by the representative of the United States as sheer slander against our country and as a violent distortion of the situation in South East Asia. We believe that our statement in this Committee yesterday merely reflected the universal assessment strongly asserted in various forums of the United Nations regarding world developments over the past 40 years as well the realities of some regions of the world. We also believe that everyone knows full well the unpraiseworthy United States past and present involvement in southern Africa, the Middle East, Central America and South East Asia, where the United States has carried out a long and bloody war of aggression against our country.

Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Nothing in our rules of procedure legally denies any delegation the possibility of basing a statement on a right of reply. But there is another issue: the moral right to be able to make such a reply. That clearly was not the case with what we just heard. It was not moral.

The representative of the United States has said that Cuba has engaged in false accusations. I should like him to tell us whether or not the Government of the United States is continuing grossly to violate the air space of the Republic of Cuba. Is it true, or is it not, that the Government of the United States continues manoeuvres in the Caribbean region near our shores, including the naval base of Guantanamo, a territory it holds against the will of the people and Government of the Republic of Cuba?

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

The representative of the United States said that Cuba invaded Africa. We do not deny that we have troops in Africa. Our internationalist soldiers were sent there at the request of a legitimately established Government in support of that Government and against the aggressive activities of a Government supported by the United States, as is recognized by all countries as well as by the Organization of African Unity, namely, the Government of South Africa.

It would really be a lack of moral judgement to continue discussing this question of whether or not the accusation of the representative of the United States is false.

Hence I call on him to substantiate his accusation.

Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The fact that there has been a reaction to a statement made by a particular delegation is quite natural and to be expected. When members react to a statement, one can assume it was at least being listened to. It may have been heard attentively or not, but at least it was listened to.

Reaction to statements is a reflection of how this Committee works. At present, a discussion is under way. A natural part of the process is that members react to certain points made in documents, to facts, or to statements. But what form those reactions take, or whether there is any reaction at all, is quite another matter.

The nature of the United States representative's reaction to the statements of a number of delegations, including my own, causes us some regret. In its statement our delegation presented facts which, despite his impressive terminology, the United States representative was unable to refute in his own statement, but that is a matter for his conscience.

As for facts and the subject we are discussing here, it should be emphasized that we are discussing matters relating to the strengthening of international

(Mr. Sheldov, Byrlorussian SSR)

security. In this context we were told, for example, that the arms race is spilling out into outer space. Preparations are being made along those lines, and we know by whom. Are all the elements of nuclear potential being built up? Yes, they are being built up, and this fact is mentioned by representatives of the United States Administration themselves. Is Israel receiving American military assistance and is it also being provided with political and diplomatic cover for its expansionist activities against the Arab peoples? Yes, this is taking place; it is well known. One has only to go one floor up to the plenary, where this is being said in connection with the question of Palestine, and it will be said once again during the discussion of the situation in the Middle East. Is support being provided to the contras in Nicaragua? Yes, it is being provided, as has been confirmed by facts presented during the discussion on Central America in plenary. Is the United States intervening in the internal affairs of other States in that region? It is - as has been very convincingly demonstrated today by the representative of Cuba. Recently, in November, the United States used its veto in the Security Council during the consideration of the question of Namibia's independence. All these are facts, and well-known facts at that.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

As can be seen, our delegation has not departed from facts or reality. In any event, we did not mention the United States by name in our statement yesterday. But today's reaction by its delegation very clearly indicates who is behind all these conflicts, who is preventing the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

I should like to draw attention to what we are discussing here. If the United States really seeks to avoid criticisms against it, there is a way to do so: it should put an end to its interference in internal affairs and not flout the rights of other peoples.

Mr. TOKO (Angola) (interpretation from French): It is not customary for us to respond to statements, but since the observations of the United States were designed to disinform the Committee my delegation is in duty-bound to cross some t's and dot some i's.

When Angola is being indirectly presented as the creator of problems and as being responsible for the situation in southern Africa, I think the representative of the United States, who must be aware of the real facts in the region, must be trying to deceive this Committee.

The representative of the United States knows full well that the problem of southern Africa stems from many sources to which his Government is directly related, starting with the problem of apartheid. In fact the Government of the United States has never concealed its policy of so-called constructive engagement. The United States is fully aware of the problem of Namibia, which is one of the sources of tension in that region. The representative of the United States is not unaware of the attitude of his Government on the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), a United Nations resolution. The representative of the United States is fully aware of the attitude of his Government regarding my country.

(Mr. Toko, Angola)

It is not the people of Angola who write that the United States is a country directly involved in destabilizing Angola. In the course of last month and this month American newspapers have mentioned the direct involvement of the United States in the subversion in Angola, particularly through the support of certain elements militarily and in other ways by South Africa. To present the problem of South Africa as though the tensions existing in southern Africa came about because of Angola, or because of the Cuban presence in Angola, is to try to deceive the members of the Committee.

First, the Cuban presence in Angola stems precisely from the commitment of certain Powers and their involvement in the question of Angola at the time of independence. In fact, one American agent directly involved in subversion at the time of my country's independence has written books clearly revealing the direct involvement of the United States in the Angolan question.

I do not see why the representative of the United States here in this Committee attempts to present matters in an inaccurate fashion.

Without attempting to engage in controversy - for I am fully convinced that the representative of the United States is very well aware of the realities of the region - my delegation will at this stage merely confine itself to telling the representative of the United States that, if his Government is truly interested in solving the problems of southern Africa, it will not be done by distorting facts. That will not contribute to the settlement of the problems of the region. Perhaps instead of "constructive engagement", it would be better to align oneself with the opinion of the international community and its resolutions in order to solve tensions in southern Africa.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.