



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.30
9 October 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 8 October 1987, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)

- Address by Mr. Ali Hassan Mwinyi, President of the United Republic of Tanzania
- Address by Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, President of the Republic of Nicaragua
- General debate [9]: (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Mr. Al-Eryany (Yemen)
Mr. Gurinovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)

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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

ADDRESS BY MR. ALI HASSAN MWINYI, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

THE PRESIDENT: The Assembly will first hear an address by the President of the United Republic of Tanzania.

Mr. Ali Hassan Mwinyi, President of the United Republic of Tanzania, was escorted into the General Assembly hall.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations the President of the United Republic of Tanzania, His Excellency the Honourable Ali Hassan Mwinyi, and to invite him to address the General Assembly.

President MWINYI: First of all I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your well-deserved election to the presidency of the forty-second session of the General Assembly. I trust that under your able and skilled guidance this Assembly will succeed in realizing the aspirations of all peace-loving people in the world.

I should like also to congratulate our Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, for his untiring efforts to promote international peace, security and co-operation. He needs the assistance of all Member States in this difficult and challenging task. I wish to assure him of Tanzania's continued co-operation and support in this noble endeavour.

Delegates will recall that the last time a President of the United Republic of Tanzania addressed this Assembly was during the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. My predecessor, Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, then renewed Tanzania's faith in the United Nations. He stressed,

"In this, my last address to the General Assembly, I have described events and ... needs as we in Tanzania perceive them. My country will not stop saying those things when the new President takes over. For we are a poor and underdeveloped country, and we have no power in the world except the power

(President Mwinyi)

of speech given by the Assembly - and by our humanity. To be silent when we see danger, to refrain from attacking policies which we see as contrary to the interests of peace and justice, would be to surrender our freedom and our dignity. That we shall never do." (A/40/PV.13, p. 21)

So, as the new President of the United Republic of Tanzania, I thought it would be appropriate for me to come and reaffirm that stand before the international community. My country, which became the 104th member of this Organization in 1961, will continue to use the United Nations rostrum to air its concern for and belief in peace, justice and equality. With goodwill towards all the 159 nations represented here, I wish to renew our faith in the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

For the United Nations has always played and will continue to play a key role in its primary responsibility, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security. We acknowledge that the United Nations has its imperfections, but we must also accept the fact that Member States are largely responsible for these shortcomings. The United Nations can only do what its Member States are willing to do; thus the collective security system envisaged under the Charter has not worked because some Member States have refused to implement certain provisions of the Charter. The permanent members of the Security Council in particular have not co-operated very often in resolving conflicts.

The majority of the Members of this Organization were not represented at the founding of the United Nations because they were not yet independent at that time. It should not be surprising, therefore, when those newly-independent countries advocate the democratization of this Organization. They do so in order to ensure that their views and interests are fully taken into account in the decision-making process. It is for that reason that they have often called for a fresh look at the principal organs, especially the Security Council, but that call has often been

(President Mwinyi)

deliberately misunderstood by those whose vested interests are well entrenched in the United Nations Charter.

Those countries do not want to accept the fact that the changing international scene and the nearly-universal membership of this Organization require that the United Nations be adjusted in order to accommodate the legitimate interests of its new majority. The detractors of the United Nations have used the demands of this new majority as a pretext for undermining this Organization and the spirit of internationalism. They have often adopted unilateral measures to suit their national interests.

We appeal to those countries to reconsider their attitudes towards the United Nations in the interest of global peace. We all agree that there is room for improvement in our Organization. I am sure we can all work together to improve the effectiveness of this Organization. The adoption by consensus at the forty-first session of the General Assembly of resolution 41/213, on the review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations, is an important step towards meeting that objective.

In his report to the General Assembly last year the Secretary-General called upon the United Nations

"to bring to an early end those conflicts which have long brought terrible tragedy to the countries and people directly involved and inhibited the growth of international confidence needed for the resolution of broader global problems". (A/41/1, p. 1)

One such conflict exists in southern Africa. Apartheid, which has been condemned by this Organization as a crime against humanity, continues to pose a threat to peace and security in southern Africa. The South African régime has resorted to unprecedented violence involving the daylight shooting of

(President Mwinyi)

demonstrators, mass detentions, including the detention of innocent children, and the vigorous imposition of a murderous state of emergency. In May this year it opened a new chapter in repression following elections involving the white minority only. In the euphoria of his victory Mr. Botha declared his determination to preserve his culture and to break the back of his opponents, especially the African National Congress.

(President Mwinyi)

While the racist régime is intensifying its brutality against the black majority in South Africa, it is at the same time trying to deceive the world by making flimsy proposals to reform apartheid. Botha's recent proposals to establish a national statutory council and regional service councils with black representation are purely cosmetic in nature. These proposals cannot end apartheid. They are intended to involve the black people in entrenching apartheid. It is not surprising, therefore, that they have been rejected by the African majority and its liberation movements. I wish to emphasize that apartheid is an evil that cannot be reformed. It must be abolished.

In a frantic bid to maintain his minority rule and to direct attention away from his internal crimes, Botha also continues to carry out murderous raids on the front-line and other neighbouring States. Every State in the subregion has been attacked: Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Angola has been invaded by South Africa on many occasions, and parts of its territory have been occupied.

The MNR and UNITA bandits continue to operate with impunity in Mozambique and Angola, respectively. The damage caused to these States by the racist régime and the bandits has been estimated at well over US\$ 10 billion over the past five years. In addition, the front-line States and other neighbouring States have been subjected to economic pressure. The aim of the apartheid régime is to intimidate these States so that they end their support for the freedom struggle against minority rule.

What is even more disappointing is that this crime of apartheid is being committed in the twentieth century, before the eyes of the civilized world. This crime against humanity is being fully documented, aired and viewed day after day in international forums and in the living rooms of many homes around the world. Representations have been made to Governments in all continents, but they seem to

(President Mwinyi)

have fallen on deaf ears. The world appears completely to have ignored the pleas of the oppressed people of southern Africa. There has been no serious move to stop that blatant crime, let alone punish its perpetrators.

Surely, generations to come will wonder how our generation could have stood by so passively while such an abominable crime was being committed, in the same way as we wonder how a past generation could have been so passive in the face of Hitler's crimes against the Jews. We urge Member States and the international community as a whole to act decisively and collectively to put an end to this intolerable inhumanity in southern Africa.

It is encouraging to note that in many Western European countries and in the United States which have long-standing ties with apartheid South Africa, public opinion is increasingly turning against apartheid. Parliaments, individual legislators, trade unions and women's and youth organizations are exerting pressure on their Governments to take concrete action against apartheid.

We were highly encouraged, for example, by the package of sanctions against South Africa which was approved by the United States Congress over a Presidential veto. We hope that Governments in these countries will live up to the expectations of their peoples and to the aspirations of the victims of apartheid.

I wish to stress that the people of Tanzania - and, indeed, the people of the whole African continent - feel deeply grieved by the plight of the oppressed majority in South Africa and Namibia. We consider our own independence and freedom incomplete so long as there is apartheid in South Africa and brutal colonialism in Namibia. We therefore unreservedly support the right and efforts of the majority populations of these countries to regain their freedom and dignity by every means possible, including, when necessary, armed struggle.

I am aware that there are countries whose abhorrence of violence restrains them from supporting armed struggles for liberation. It is a position that we find

(President Mwinyi)

difficult to understand, for we believe that the victim of a violent crime has the right to ward it off violently. Nevertheless, we respect the position of those countries. We hope, however, that they will support the call for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. This is the only peaceful means left by which to end apartheid. Such economic pressure will make the South African régime abandon apartheid. Without it, South Africa will not dismantle apartheid.

We recognize that such sanctions will harm South Africa's neighbours and the front-line States. Their imposition must therefore be accompanied by a practical programme to support these States against the effects of sanctions, including those which a desperate apartheid régime will impose on them. Great sacrifices will be required, but they will be alleviated if sanctions are universally applied and seriously enforced.

I wish to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to those countries which have demonstrated solidarity with the oppressed masses of southern Africa by imposing a variety of sanctions against South Africa. We are especially inspired by the sanctions imposed by the Nordic countries, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and some countries of the European Economic Community (EEC).

It is unacceptable that Namibia remain under the illegal occupation of South Africa in spite of the United Nations having terminated the apartheid régime's Mandate 20 years ago. South Africa has shown its total contempt for and complete disregard of the United Nations by refusing to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

We consider the policy of linking the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of the Cuban forces in Angola to be fundamentally misconceived and practically flawed. Besides prolonging the agony of the Namibian people under

(President Mwinyi)

South Africa's brutal rule, it has sent the régime the message that it has powerful and dependable supporters in its policies of apartheid and destabilization.

Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is the only internationally acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. That resolution, which has the support of all Member States, does not establish any linkage between Namibia's independence and the withdrawal of Cuban forces. We therefore support the Secretary-General's efforts to get the parties concerned to start implementing that resolution. We also reaffirm our total support for the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people in its struggle to free its country from colonial occupation.

(President Mwinyi)

The United Nations cannot avoid its historical duty and its role in assisting South Africa and Namibia to be free. Time for a peaceful or less violent change is fast running out. Without decisive action by the international community the situation in southern Africa will further deteriorate and lead to increased bloodshed. We have a moral obligation to avert such a situation.

Tanzania is equally distressed by the injustices that are taking place in the Middle East. It is nearly 40 years since the Palestinian people were forcibly evicted from their homeland. For 20 years Israel has illegally occupied Arab territories. We resolutely call for the complete and unconditional withdrawal by Israel from those territories. We reaffirm our support for the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to an independent State under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

It is also our sincere hope that a peaceful settlement will be found to the conflict between the Kingdom of Morocco and the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic. It is indeed our hope that the people of that Republic will be allowed to determine their own affairs freely and without external interference.

Regional conflicts where great-Power interests either converge or diverge exist in other parts of the world. We are pleased to note that in Afghanistan and Cyprus the good offices of the Secretary-General have been invoked in order to protect the non-aligned character of those countries.

In Kampuchea, we believe that a political settlement involving all the parties should be arrived at without external interference. This would lead to the establishment of a peaceful, independent and non-aligned country. We believe that the eight-point proposal of the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea and the proposals made by the Association of South-East Asian Nations constitute an important element in such a settlement.

(President Mwinyi)

We deplore the aggravation of the situation in Central America by external interference. We support the efforts of the Nicaraguan people and Government to defend their sovereignty. The Guatemala proposal, which was agreed upon by the five Central American leaders on 7 August 1987, deserves our wholehearted support.

We are equally concerned about the tension in the Korean peninsula. We believe that the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the peninsula is an important condition of the stability of the region. A dialogue between North and South Korea and the holding of tripartite talks between the two Koreas and the United States should be encouraged.

Tanzania has diplomatic relations with both Iraq and Iran. Our people cherish the most friendly feelings towards the Governments and peoples of those two countries. We renew our appeal to them to find a political settlement to their dispute and to stop the war between them. We urge all great Powers to refrain from taking any measures that would escalate the war and create a more serious threat to regional and global peace. We particularly urge the permanent members of the Security Council to shoulder their collective responsibility and to act in unity in the search for a peaceful settlement of that conflict.

We appeal for the exercise of wisdom so that peaceful solutions can be found to all these conflicts. Global peace would be greatly enhanced if all nations would strictly respect the sovereignty and independence of other nations and refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of others. The threat or use of force should never be made a basis for settling disputes. We should all scrupulously observe the norms of international law governing relations between sovereign and independent nations.

Another great threat to the survival of mankind is the arms race, particularly in nuclear weapons. Over \$US 1 trillion is wasted each year in that senseless

(President Mwinyi)

race. Resources which could be used for economic and social development are squandered in a competition which threatens the very survival of mankind.

Some of us had hoped that the Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing would start a process leading to a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. Regrettably, the opportunity was lost. Nuclear tests continue to be conducted by all nuclear Powers. As a participant in the six-nation peace initiative, Tanzania renews its appeal to the nuclear Powers, especially the two major ones, to halt nuclear tests and ban the arms race in space. In the name of humanity we appeal for respect for our right to life, which is now threatened by nuclear weapons.

We are encouraged by the agreement in principle reached between the United States and the Soviet Union to eliminate medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. We consider that agreement to be an initial step towards the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament.

Peace and poverty cannot coexist. The economic underdevelopment of the third world, therefore, is also a threat to world peace. While only one third of humanity thrives in prosperity, two thirds of mankind are submerged in abject poverty. Hunger, disease and ignorance afflict hundreds of millions of our people. Ironically, this is not because the world lacks the necessary resources to meet the needs of all mankind.

We are told by the rich industrialized countries that a fair redistribution of the world's resources can take place only through the virtues of free trade. But we all know very well that the champions of so-called free trade are the very ones that institute strong protectionist measures against the exports of developing countries. As a result of such measures third-world countries are denied access to the markets of the industrialized countries. Prices for their export commodities remain depressed, while the prices of manufactured goods imported from the industrialized countries rise constantly. This has resulted in unfavourable terms

(President Mwinyi)

of trade, severe balance-of-payments deficits and an ever growing debt burden for our countries.

It is estimated, for example, that the third world owes the developed countries about \$US 1,000 billion. In 1985 alone the developing countries paid \$US 115 billion in debt servicing and received only \$US 41 billion in new loans. In other words, there was a net outflow of \$US 74 billion from the poor South to the rich North. The export earnings of non-oil-producing developing countries also dropped from \$US 104 billion in 1980 to \$US 87 billion in 1985. This was caused by declining prices of their export commodities. So, in addition to their export earnings, the developing countries had to look for an additional amount of \$US 28 billion solely to service their debts. There is an urgent need for the creditors and borrowers to discuss this serious problem with a view to arriving at a mutually acceptable solution.

(President Mwinyi)

The increasing outflow of resources from the poor to the rich through debt servicing and unfavourable terms of trade aggravates the already critical economic situation in the third world. This is a direct result of the existing inequitable world economic system, which only works in favour of the rich industrialized countries. The present system has failed to respond effectively to the development efforts of the developing countries. It is for this reason that the gap between the rich North and the poor South has been widening year after year.

It is obvious, therefore, that the success of the development efforts being made by the developing countries, both individually and collectively, through South-South co-operation, will depend to a large extent on the restructuring of the existing world economic system. This is the basis of our pleas for the establishment of the new international economic order.

We, the third-world countries, have always demonstrated our willingness to negotiate with our colleagues of the North on this important issue. We feel that there is an urgent need to take concerted measures which will promote the development of the developing countries and establish more equitable relations between the North and the South. Our efforts, however, have often been frustrated by the lack of political will on the part of some developed countries which wish to cling to their privileged position at the expense of the suffering majority.

We appeal to those countries to reconsider their position in the interest of justice and prosperity for all mankind. We also believe that the United Nations has a moral obligation to ensure that the struggle for the establishment of a more equitable world order succeeds, so that all mankind can be saved from hunger, starvation and abject poverty.

We therefore appeal for the revival and early commencement of the global negotiations aimed at the establishment of the new international economic order.

(President Mwinyi)

These negotiations should put particular emphasis on structural changes in the field of trade and development and on the removal of trade barriers, especially to the exports of the developing countries. The international financial and monetary system should also be restructured. Such a restructuring should take into account, among other things, the need to provide adequate and predictable development resources to the developing countries in order to accelerate their development. Efforts should be made in particular to achieve as quickly as possible the long agreed target of 0.7 per cent of gross national product for official development assistance to developing countries.

For an ailing person the key to recovery is the will and determination to live. This also applies to economic recovery. Africa has demonstrated its will and determination to achieve economic recovery by adopting its Priority Programme for Economic Recovery at the 21st summit of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), in 1985. This Programme stresses the need for increased co-operation between African countries. We recognize, however, that the support of the international community is necessary for the implementation of the Programme. At the thirteenth special session of this Assembly many donor countries expressed their willingness to assist.

I should like to take this opportunity to express our sincere appreciation to countries and international organizations, especially the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), for the assistance they have so far given. We hope that others will make this assistance available as soon as possible.

I wish to conclude by reiterating Tanzania's faith in the United Nations. We believe that the United Nations has a great potential to maintain international peace and to promote the economic and social advancement of all peoples. It is true that the Organization has had some problems, some of which have sometimes threatened its very existence. But we must not let frustration, cynicism or despair

(President Mwinyi)

overcome us. The idealism which gave birth to the United Nations is still relevant and powerful; the principles upon which the Organization was founded remain valid.

We must therefore strive to build a strong and stable world order based on the principles of sovereign equality. We must rededicate ourselves to the cause of fostering coexistence, co-operation and interdependence. We must work with one another constructively to make our Organization both the symbol and the platform for the evolution of a system of universal peace and security, a system which will fully take into account and help to promote the interests and aspirations of all countries and peoples.

I renew Tanzania's pledge to co-operate in meeting the challenge of realizing this noble objective.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the President of the United Republic of Tanzania for the important statement he has just made.

Mr. Ali Hassan Mwinyi, President of the United Republic of Tanzania, was escorted from the General Assembly Hall.

ADDRESS BY COMMANDER DANIEL ORTEGA SAAVEDRA, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF NICARAGUA.

The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now hear an address by the President of the Republic of Nicaragua.

Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, President of the Republic of Nicaragua, was escorted into the General Assembly Hall.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations the President of the Republic of Nicaragua, His Excellency Commandante Daniel Ortega Saavedra, and to invite him to address the Assembly.

President ORTEGA SAAVEDRA (interpretation from Spanish): We pay a tribute to the memory of Ernesto Guevara today, the twentieth anniversary of the sacrifice of his life.

The Bible tells us that Cain killed Abel in the first confrontation between members of the human species. Envy and pride took possession of Cain and made him commit this crime. "Am I my brother's keeper?" - that is the way Cain replied to the question put to him at the time.

The United Nations came into being at the end of the Second World War with the purpose of avoiding further wars, so that Cains should not kill millions of other Abels, so that all of us on earth would have the duty to be our brothers' keepers.

But there have been new wars in various parts of the planet. Millions of us human beings in the developing countries have been and continue to be the victims of such wars. There have been dozens of interventions since 1945 against us, the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Millions of men, women and children have been the victims of these policies.

The North, which is trampling underfoot and crushing the South, continues to impose the kind of relationship which suits it best; it staunchly defends an unjust international order, including unequal trade, external debt, protectionist

(President Ortega Saavedra)

measures, the total closing of markets, and pressures on Governments and organs of multilateral co-operation, disrespect and disregard for the Charter and the bodies of the United Nations and for the international legal order. All that leaves the peoples of the developing countries utterly defenceless.

In the midst of such suffering, we welcome and applaud the progress made between the Soviet Union and the United States towards taking steps to ensure disarmament, including the prohibition and then the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons.

As a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, however, we are concerned about wars between brother peoples. We join in the international clamour for the cessation of the war between Iran and Iraq, and we stress the danger of the presence and build-up of foreign military forces in the Gulf.

Also as a non-aligned country, we ask ourselves what we are doing and what we can do to prevent the death each year of between 20 million and 25 million children under the age of five from malnutrition and disease - deaths which could easily be prevented, according to the Brandt report. According to the latest statistics - those of 1986 - 14.1 million children aged five died from disease and malnutrition.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

Of these, 250,000 were from the industrialized countries - 1.7 per cent of the total - while 13,850,000 were from the developing countries - 98.3 per cent of the total. Who defends this carnage that has caused the death of more than 1 billion children since the end of the Second World War? Who will put an end once and for all to the murderous policy of apartheid, racism and the daily killings of the inhabitants of South Africa? Who will put an end to oppression in Chile, Paraguay and Haiti? Who is concerned about this? Either the countries of the North and the international community can take concrete action to meet the just demands of those peoples, or they will continue to be faced with the fait accompli of change, popular movements and revolution.

The peoples will not wait for permission to struggle, to fight and to triumph. The peoples will give an impetus to their own processes of change, and then there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth by those that never wished to listen to the peoples and were the accomplices of the oppressors.

That is the situation of my country, Nicaragua, where, having intervened militarily and assassinated Sandino, the United States installed the Somoza dictatorship. Against that dictatorship set up by the United States, promoted and defended by the United States, armed and financed by the United States, we Nicaraguans fought to win the freedom which had been denied us.

At that time the United States was not concerned about freedom in Nicaragua. At that time the United States did not care about the human rights of Nicaraguans. In those days the United States did not care about the lack of justice. The United States was not concerned then about the thousands of prisoners who were thrown into gaol - including myself, who spent seven years in such gaols. No concern was voiced by the leaders of the United States about the gaols in which we Nicaraguans were suffering or about the killings and tortures that were inflicted on us Nicaraguans.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

Without asking permission of the United States, and against its policy and will, we overthrew the Somoza dictatorship not only to win our freedom, but also in the hope of establishing a new type of relationship with the United States, one of mutual respect, not relations between slave and master, as had been the case in the Somoza period, but relations between people, between nations, between States. That is what we wanted - that is what we want - respectful relations with the United States. Moreover, we wanted, and want, friendly relations with the United States. But the response of the United States has been to try to wrest from us our hard-won freedom and send Somoza's former guards back to Nicaragua to rule there.

For six years and nine months the United States has been trying to sweep away the Nicaraguan revolution, violating ethic and moral principles, international laws and, indeed, the laws of the United States itself.

The President of the United States is to blame for over 45,714 human victims in our country and the \$2.821 billion loss in our gross domestic product, as a result of the United States policy in Nicaragua. The United States has bled the Nicaraguan people dry and badly damaged the Nicaraguan economy. This policy on the part of the United States has not benefited the people of Nicaragua at all but has come up against the courage, resoluteness, valour and heroism of this people.

The policy of setting up a mercenary army was intended to destroy the legitimately constituted Government in Nicaragua, but it has already failed. The United States has reduced its mercenary army in Nicaragua to 6,500 mercenaries, whereas it wanted to have 30,000 by now. Now all it has is 16,000 refugees in Honduras - people who found themselves obliged to leave for Honduras - and a similar number in Costa Rica, and there are 6,500 mercenaries - freedom fighters, as President Reagan calls them - but they are getting fewer in number all the time, because they are dying in combat or accepting the policy of amnesty which has been in effect since January 1985 for anyone wishing to embrace it.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

The United States policy has failed and President Reagan is running out of time because his second term of office is coming to a close. He has only a few months left now before he has to leave the presidency of the United States, and it was these objective elements, particularly the failure of United States policy in Nicaragua, that led to the Esquipulas Agreement, because, quite frankly, what would have happened if the United States had achieved its objective of destroying the Nicaraguan revolution in a few months, as it suggested to the Governments of Honduras and Costa Rica when it wanted to set up camps there? If it had destroyed the Nicaraguan revolution, as it destroyed the people of Grenada, nothing more would have happened in Central America.

Some people find their ears hurt when the truth is spoken and they are incapable of listening, but that is their business.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

It seems to me that the culprits are annoyed. They have committed aggression against us and they have killed our people, but now they are upset when the truth is told to them. It is thanks to this reality, the capacity of the Nicaraguan people for resistance, that the policy and the mercenary forces of the United States have been defeated; that is what made it possible to sign the Esquipulas II agreements. It is thanks also to the perseverance of the Contadora Group and its Support Group which, in a firm Latin American endeavour, have opposed the interventionist policy of the United States.

The Esquipulas II Agreement is a transcendental instrument dictated by the common sense of the Latin American leaders, and it is the fruit of the action of the Contadora Group and the Support Group.

Nicaragua has taken a number of steps in response to the signing of these agreements, so that on 5 November next, the date which marks the end of the 90-day period for the commencement of the implementation process, there will be better conditions for progress to be made in that process - because the end of the 90-day period is not the end of negotiations but rather a point of departure in the negotiation process.

The General Assembly yesterday gave its unanimous support to the leaders of Central America who signed the Esquipulas Agreement. Nicaragua thanks the Assembly for this act of solidarity in the name of peace of the General Assembly. We hope that the Government of the United States will comply with that United Nations resolution, and not by just saying it agrees with Esquipulas II; it is our hope that it will respect the Agreement by observing the terms contained in the Agreement of Esquipulas II. So far, the United States Government has given no indication of willingness to respect that Agreement.

That was made clear when President Reagan spoke from this very rostrum earlier in this session of the Assembly, when his tone was one of disrespect for the

(President Ortega Saavedra)

Esquipulas II Agreement and disrespect for the leaders of Central America. In the speech he made yesterday before the Organization of American States (OAS), President Reagan once again showed disrespect for the Central American Presidents and for the Agreement. He endorsed a kind of conduct which has been condemned by the highest court of justice of all. President Reagan's speech yesterday was a violation of the charter of the Organization of American States and the Charter of the United Nations.

President Reagan went to the Organization of American States, as he comes to the United Nations, posing as a great judge of the peoples of the world. Who gave him such power? Who gave the President of the United States such representative status?

Let me now take up two aspects he mentioned in his statement yesterday before the Organization of American States. Here I have the Esquipulas Agreement, and here are the signatures of the five Central American Presidents: President Oscar Arias Sanchez, President Jose Napoleon Duarte, President Vinicio Cerezo Arevalo, President Jose Azcona Hoyos, and myself. Our five signatures are right here; President Reagan's is not. If President Reagan wishes to interfere in our negotiating process, let him sign the Esquipulas Agreement. Then he will be fully entitled to talk about the Agreement as he did before the Organization of American States. We should be delighted if the President of the United States were to subscribe to this Agreement; then we should feel he had the right to discuss these matters, for his signature would be on this Agreement. But to start discussing these things and to make allegations, and to try to impose his will in respect of an Agreement he has not signed - that shows disrespect for those of us who have signed the Agreement, because we are the leaders of independent sovereign countries. We are not a colony or a neo-colony of the United States; if we were, the President could feel entitled to come along and

(President Ortega Saavedra)

say that the Agreement needs such-and-such corrections. That is all wrong. The worst thing is that it seems he has not even read the Agreement. I am sure President Reagan has not even read the Agreement.

I am saying this because he said that he was going to ask for \$US 270 million for the mercenaries and that, depending on how the Agreement was carried out, he would pass the money on to the mercenaries.

Paragraph 5 of the Esquipulas II Agreement states that:

"The Governments of the five Central American States shall request Governments of the region and Governments from outside the region which are providing either overt or covert military, logistical, financial or propaganda support, in the form of men, weapons, munitions and equipment, to irregular forces or insurrectionist movements to terminate such aid; this is vital if a stable and lasting peace is to be attained in the region." (A/42/521, p. 6)

That is quite clear, then.

"The above does not cover aid for the repatriation or, failing that, the relocation and necessary assistance with reintegration into normal life of former members of such groups or forces."

(President Ortega Saavedra)

When the President goes before the Organization of American States (OAS) and says he is going to ask for \$270 million, and also says he supports the agreements, he is being utterly inconsistent. The agreements clearly state that President Reagan should not provide new funds for the mercenary forces; if he wanted to approve new funds, it would have to be for the relocation or repatriation of people who, for example, accept the amnesty, who lay down their arms and go along with the peace process. That money would have to be given to the United Nations, to the Organization of American States (OAS), or to organizations of the International Verification and Follow-up Commission, so that they could make certain the money was truly spent on relocation and repatriation.

President Reagan says he supports the Esquipulas Agreement and then he makes a proposal which goes contrary to the agreement.

President Reagan also referred to the question of armaments, military manpower, foreign military advisers, and so on. He said the agreement does not take this into account. But on page 7 the Agreement clearly states:

"Negotiations on security, verification and the control and limitation of weapons:

"The Governments of the five Central American States, with the Contadora Group acting as mediator, shall continue negotiating on the points outstanding in the draft Contadora Act on Peace and Co-operation in Central America with regard to security, verification and control." (A/42/521, p. 7)

Here, too, we are clearly talking about a willingness to have all foreign military advisers leave the region - the willingness of the Central American Governments to undertake not to carry out manoeuvres with foreign military advisers, not to set up foreign military bases on our respective territories, and our commitment to convert the Central American region into a zone of peace, free from any foreign military presence.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

These elements are taken into account in Esquipulas II. President Reagan is wrong to say that they are not. It bothers us that the President of the United States should take such a flippant and disrespectful attitude to this Agreement without being familiar with it, without having read and studied the text carefully. We are really bothered by this, because this is the President of an economic and military power of world standing who is, judging by his remarks, taking this rather lightly. This position of the President of the United States is not contributing to peace, and I think it discredits him further. It bothers us, I say, because it demonstrates a clear decision to press ahead with his policy against all odds. Consequently we are obliged to think that his words are the prelude to the continuation and escalation of a policy which does not rule out the use of United States troops.

Logically, Nicaragua rejects the statement of President Reagan before the OAS. The Government of the United States should not forget that the Nicaraguan people has never turned and run, calling for help. There were several invasions in the last century, but we, the Nicaraguan people, responded to those invasions by fighting and struggling to defend peace. Policies based on force have yielded no results. That must be made quite clear, because when the United States Congress approved the \$100 million for the mercenaries, as a consequence of that policy based on force, the very next day the La Prensa was closed in Nicaragua, and a bishop was expelled a few days later, one who advocated and supported the United States policy of intervention.

The United States policy of force was what drove us to set up a state of emergency in our country. It hardened the situation in our country, if anything. Had it not been for the agreements of Esquipulas II, Nicaragua would not have been able to take the steps it has taken. It is thanks to it that no censorship is

(President Ortega Saavedra)

applied to the press, which is circulating freely in my country. The Catholic radio is broadcasting; a national dialogue has been set up; we have decreed a cease-fire and formed a National Commission of Reconciliation, and we have taken other steps.

We Nicaraguans can reach an understanding fairly among ourselves. But we believe that, just as a dialogue has begun between the Government of El Salvador and the rebels there, the time has come for a dialogue to begin between the Government of the United States and Nicaragua. Although there is no symmetry between El Salvador and Nicaragua, there is a precedent: before Esquipulas II, the Government of El Salvador had engaged in a dialogue with the Salvadorian guerrillas. And there is another precedent: before Esquipulas II, the Nicaraguan Government had engaged in a dialogue with the Government of the United States, at Manzanillo. Those are the precedents, and they correspond to the different realities of the two situations.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

We have nothing to gain from talking with the leaders of the counter-revolution, and we shall not engage in a dialogue with them. If there is a real desire to take up this matter seriously, the dialogue must be between the Government of the United States and the Government of Nicaragua, for at the rate they are going the mercenaries are likely to disappear, thanks also to the fighting spirit of our people and the Nicaraguan Government's amnesty programme. Thus, we can see that the problem is not really the mercenaries because they may disappear, but the United States will continue its policy of aggression against Nicaragua; when it has no mercenaries, it will use its own troops.

The problem is the behaviour of the United States Government and its attitude towards the Nicaraguan revolution. That attitude was clear in Reagan's pre-election platform, before the mercenaries existed. In that political platform, President Reagan advocated the destruction of the Nicaraguan revolution - and there were then no mercenaries. Thus, the issue is not one of engaging in dialogue with the leaders of the mercenaries.

Yet there is indeed a dialogue on the ground between the mercenaries who are there, in Nicaragua, and who are taking a beating from our forces, which gives them an opportunity to accept the amnesty. A dialogue is therefore already occurring on the ground, in order to promote acceptance of the amnesty. What is the point of talking to the leadership of the contra mercenaries? There is no point, because the entire policy is promoted by the United States Government. As I said, the mercenaries could disappear, but the United States Government would carry on using other methods. If the United States does not alter its policy towards Nicaragua, there could be a military blockade against us; there could be "surgical" strikes; there could be a military invasion.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

Thus, resumed dialogue would be the logical thing. I say "resumed" because there is a precedent: there already has been a dialogue between us and the Government of the United States. We received Secretary of State Shultz in Managua, where I spoke with him, and there have been other meetings, at Manzanillo, Mexico - meetings which the United States broke off abruptly.

If we have already had a dialogue, why do we not sit down again and have another?

Here in this United Nations forum, I hereby issue an invitation to the President of the United States: Thirty-five days from 5 November, the United States and Nicaragua should begin an unconditional bilateral dialogue with a view to signing agreements providing security for both States and making possible the normalization of their bilateral relations.

Why should this take place 35 days from 5 November? The fifth of November is when the implementation of the agreements will begin, and there follows a 30-day period, at the end of which the International Verification and Follow-up Commission is to meet, with the participation of the United Nations, the Organization of American States (OAS), the Contadora Group, the Support Group and the Central American countries, to analyse progress in the implementation of the agreements. We therefore think it appropriate that the Government of the United States have an opportunity to observe - not interfere with - the implementation of the agreements, and await the analysis by the International Verification and Follow-up Commission. A dialogue could then begin five days later, after the United States has considered that analysis. We could take up the dialogue where we left it off.

I hope the President of the United States will not act as his delegation acted today. When President Reagan addressed the Assembly, the delegation of Nicaragua listened to him. We are not afraid of words; we are not afraid of political and

(President Ortega Saavedra)

ideological debate. A year ago I myself sat in this Hall and listened to President Reagan.

I hope that President Reagan will not respond to this proposal for bilateral dialogue in the same way his delegation responded here in the General Assembly Hall today. President Reagan should not hasten to say no to that proposal; let him reflect. Let him ask himself why United States citizens such as Benjamin Linder and Brian Wilson have shed their own blood to prevent more bloodshed in Nicaragua. Let President Reagan ask himself why the United States National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the leaders of evangelical churches have issued several messages calling on him to end his policy. Let the President of the United States ask himself why Roy Bourgeois, a Catholic priest, has spent several months in a high-security prison in Louisiana. Other Catholic priests too are being gaoled for civil opposition to the United States Government's policy of death against Nicaragua.

President Reagan should not hasten to say no. Before consulting those who give him hot-headed ideas, such as military options, including outright invasion, let him remember that Rambo exists only in the movies.

(President Ortega Saavedra)

In Viet Nam the result was the death of thousands of Vietnamese and also of more than 40,000 young Americans who were sent over there to die in Viet Nam, young United States citizens who would today be scientists, educators, technicians, clergy, athletes, farmers or doctors.

The peoples do not want Rambos; the peoples want men of peace.

Before responding to my proposal for a bilateral dialogue, we hope that President Reagan will not rush into saying anything. Let him think, and may God enlighten him and help him choose the road to peace and stop harming the people of Nicaragua.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the President of the Republic of Nicaragua for the important statement he has just made.

Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, President of the Republic of Nicaragua, was escorted from the General Assembly Hall.

AGENDA ITEM 9 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. AL-ERYANY (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): It gives me pleasure at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on behalf of the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic on your election to the presidency of this forty-second session of the General Assembly. There is no doubt that the eminent qualities which you possess and your diplomatic skill will greatly contribute to ensuring the success of our deliberations. I wish to reaffirm to you that my delegation will spare no effort in co-operating with you so as to crown your mission with success.

It also gives me pleasure to express, through you, our sincere appreciation of your predecessor, Mr. Humayun Rasheed Choudhury, the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh, who achieved resounding success in guiding the deliberations of the last session.

I am also pleased to congratulate, in my own name and on behalf of the delegation of the Yemen Arab Republic, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, the Secretary-General of our Organization, on his worthy endeavours in the service of this Organization and its objectives in maintaining international peace and security. I wish him further success in the great tasks entrusted to him by the Assembly, the Security Council and other bodies of the United Nations.

The forty-second session is taking place while preparations are under way for the third summit meeting of the two super-Powers, following their summit meetings in Geneva and Reykjavik, which coincided with the two previous sessions of the General Assembly. The agreement in principle achieved by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union and the Secretary of State of the United States of America concerning the final elimination of short- and intermediate-range missiles is a positive move which my country has supported and which we consider to be a step on the right path towards the elimination of weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. Al-Eryany, Yemen)

We feel, however, that the long-awaited détente in international relations continues to be far from being reached, since the weapons to be eliminated under such an agreement constitute only a very modest proportion of the weapons in the possession of the two super-Powers and in their nuclear stockpiles - merely 3 per cent. Furthermore, the arms race remains as intense as ever. Tension and mistrust and recourse to force to resolve disputes continue to endanger international relations in many parts of the world.

Though the last two summit meetings did not arrive at radical solutions for many of the problems which are alarming our world, we still cherish the hope that the forthcoming summit will yield more positive results that will make it possible to arrive at definitive solutions such as the halting of the arms race, the elimination of nuclear weapons, the permanent demilitarization of outer space, the reduction of tension and reassertion of the rights of the deprived peoples.

My country wishes to express its support for the Political Declaration of the Eighth Summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in September 1986 in Harare. In particular we wish to highlight the parts of that statement concerning disarmament and international security.

My delegation supports the Soviet Union's call for the final elimination of nuclear weapons by all nuclear-weapon States by the end of the century, in addition to the repeated calls made by six countries - Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania - on 23 May 1984, 28 January 1985 and 7 August 1986, all of which advocate a halt to nuclear-weapon testing, the consolidation of the economic role of the United Nations and the diversion of the resources consumed by the arms race to socio-economic development, for most of the developing countries are in dire need of them.

(Mr. Al-Eryany, Yemen)

The Yemen Arab Republic believes that the programme for the militarization of outer space means new perils for humanity, perils it can well do without. My country believes that such programmes should be reviewed in the talks on general and complete disarmament, which should be pursued in a constructive and responsible spirit.

The Yemen Arab Republic reiterates its rejection of any military presence in the Indian Ocean and the Arabian Sea and again expresses its support for transforming the Indian Ocean region into a zone of permanent peace and security, free from nuclear weapons. We also support all efforts aimed at creating nuclear-free zones in other parts of the world, foremost among them the Middle East region, which is fraught with danger and simmering with constant tension.

The conflict which has been raging in the Middle East for over 39 years can be attributed essentially to the Palestinian question. The region will remain explosive and peace and security will be threatened, not only in the Middle East but also in the world at large, as long as Israel maintains its unremitting intransigence and its insistence on continuing its occupation of Palestine and other Arab territories, its denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, its aggressive policies against the people of Palestine and other Arab countries, and its brutal practices of repression and terrorism, basing itself on the direct political and military support it receives from the United States of America and other allies.

(Mr. Al-Eryany, Yemen)

It is perhaps not necessary to trace the historical chronology of the implantation of Israel in the heart of the Arab homeland and examine what danger this poses; nor do we need to enumerate Israel's aggressive racist and settlement policies in the region, from the usurpation of Palestine to the wars of aggression waged against the Arab countries, the aggression against Lebanon in 1982 - which is continuing to this day - and the repeated acts of provocation and attacks against neighbouring countries.

It is hardly necessary to remind the Assembly of the various resolutions adopted by the Organization on the Palestinian question and the Middle East conflict, or of Israel's continuing rejection of all those resolutions and its blatant defiance of the international community. That would be merely to state the obvious. It is more important that we focus on a significant reality that has been reaffirmed by developments in the Palestinian question over the past four decades. The time has come for the international community to realize that no initiative, effort or arrangement aimed at arriving at a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement in the Middle East will ever be successful without recognition of the national, legitimate, inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to return to their homeland, to self-determination and to establish an independent State on their national soil, under the leadership of their sole, legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

Some may feel that unilateral solutions are the right means of resolving the Palestinian question and the Middle East conflict. However, the recent past has provided daily reaffirmation of the fallaciousness of such a belief. The Camp David accords and separate initiatives have only complicated the issue, distancing it even further from a just solution, because such attempts ignore the national rights of the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Al-Eryany, Yemen)

Hence, the Yemen Arab Republic continues to maintain that the solution of the Palestinian question and the Middle East conflict can be found only in an international conference on peace in the Middle East, to be attended by the five permanent members of the Security Council and all the parties concerned, on a footing of equality, including the PLO, the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Such a conference would constitute the practical framework for and a sound and suitable step towards a just and lasting peace in the region.

It is more necessary than ever before that the countries that maintain special relations with Israel - foremost among which is the United States - reconsider their partial attitude to Israel and their policies in the region in an attempt to contribute to a solution in a more positive and effective manner, with a view to arriving at a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the region.

The Yemen Arab Republic follows with deep sorrow and alarm developments in the war that has been raging for seven years between Iran and Iraq. It expresses its profound apprehension and alarm at recent developments, which threaten a conflagration and the internationalization of the war as a result of Iran's rejection of the peaceful resolution of the conflict, its continuing attacks against Iraq and its occupation of Iraqi territory, as well as the escalation of its attacks on parties not involved in the conflict.

The international community in general welcomed Security Council resolution 598 (1987), of 20 July 1987, because it sets out the correct path to an honourable settlement and the ending of the war between Iran and Iraq while protecting the rights of both parties. However, we find ourselves facing a refusal by Iran to comply with that resolution. We therefore call upon all countries, especially the members, including the five permanent members of the Security Council, to play their role in the maintenance of international peace and security and uphold the

(Mr. Al-Eryany, Yemen)

reputation and prestige of our Organization by implementing that resolution comprehensively and completely so as to put an end to this war and preserve international peace and security in the region.

At the same time, we call once again upon Iran to heed reason, abandon its recalcitrance, accept Security Council resolution 598 (1987) and have recourse to peaceful means to end the conflict. The continuance of this futile war constitutes an unprecedentedly serious threat to international peace and security, with unforeseeable consequences.

The Yemen Arab Republic has followed attentively the latest round of negotiations on the question of Afghanistan, in Geneva, under the auspices of the Assistant Secretary-General, and believes that the continuing failure to solve this issue is very serious. We maintain that the necessary elements of a just solution are: negotiations between all the countries concerned, the return of the Afghan refugees, the ending of all forms of outside interference in the affairs of Afghanistan, whatever the purpose may be and recognition of the right of the Afghan people to sovereignty and to choose their own social and political system, free from outside influence.

With regard to the question of Cyprus, we believe that negotiation and dialogue are the best means of finding a satisfactory formula for ensuring freedom of religion and equality of rights and duties for both Cypriot communities, while reserving the unity and independence of Cyprus.

The current situation in southern Africa is even more threatening than formerly as a result of the increasingly aggressive actions of the racist régime in Pretoria, which continues to reveal its true hideousness by its acts of repression, terrorism, butchery, torture and arbitrary arrest in confronting the nationalist uprisings in southern Africa. This is also revealed in the continuing occupation

(Mr. Al-Eryany, Yemen)

of Namibia, Pretoria's relentless attacks against the African front-line States and its blackmailing of other neighbouring countries.

The Yemen Arab Republic continues to follow developments in southern Africa and reaffirms its support for the legitimate struggle of the peoples of South Africa to attain their national rights. We condemn all illegitimate acts by the racist régime in South Africa against the national majority in South Africa and denounce all aggressive acts against the African front-line States. My country stresses the need to impose more effective economic sanctions against the racist régime of South Africa. We reaffirm our complete support for the Namibian people, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their authentic representative, in their legitimate struggle for independence and freedom.

The presence of the item on Namibia on the agenda of the General Assembly for the past 41 years, since the adoption of resolution 65 (I) at the first session of the General Assembly, in 1946, presents a great challenge to the international community and makes it incumbent upon it to exert effective, constructive efforts to solve this problem. We believe that the correct procedure lies in implementation of the peace settlement endorsed in Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Al-Eryany, Yemen)

If the situations in the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and southern Africa are threats to international peace and security, the situation in Central America is no less menacing. The Yemen Arab Republic, having followed with great attention the recent developments in Central America, wishes to express its support for the peace plan put forward by the Heads of five States, the aim of which is to restore permanent peace in the region free from outside interference and surmounting the complications inherent in the existing situation.

With regard to the problems afflicting other parts of the world, we believe that the ideal way of resolving disputes and differences is by peaceful means and through dialogue, enabling the peoples involved to express their will without outside pressure, allowing them their right to self-determination, and halting all outside intervention on whatever pretext.

Although the matters I have just mentioned constitute part of the subjects that call for our attention today, there is another matter that is no less important. I am referring to the continuing deterioration in the international economic situation and the resultant great imbalance, due to the setting of the prices of raw materials and to the indebtedness with which the developing countries are overburdened, as well as to the technological monopoly of the industrialized countries, which widens and deepens the abyss separating the industrialized and developing worlds. That situation portends the total collapse of the present economic, financial and monetary order.

We believe that to escape from this vicious circle a new international economic order must be established, in order to provide fair and adequate prices for the exports of the developing countries. Those countries must be enabled to play a greater role in orienting the international monetary system towards the financing of development and towards increasing their production in the industrial field through the transfer of technology, better debt terms, sovereignty over their

(Mr. Al-Eryany, Yemen)

own natural resources and a consolidation of the United Nations role in international economic co-operation. It is incumbent upon us to devote increased efforts towards achieving the new international economic order based on equality among all countries, with balance and justice in all sectors.

The developing countries have submitted a number of proposals designed to overcome the world economic crisis: the Caracas plan of action, the principles set forth at Buenos Aires, the Cairo Declaration and the Economic Declaration issued at the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Harare in September 1986. Because our world needs greater interdependence and integration, an objective response from the industrialized world, based on a comprehensive vision of the dimensions of the crisis, could bring prosperity for all mankind.

The Yemen Arab Republic, while giving due attention to world economic problems, continues to give its attention to many of the world's social and humanitarian problems as well. In this connection my delegation reaffirms the need for the international community to give greater attention to implementing the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons and to observing the United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons, and the need to give greater attention to the situation of refugees and to implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women, along with other social and humanitarian issues.

The Government and people of the Yemen Arab Republic recently celebrated the silver anniversary of the 26 September 1962 Revolution. In those celebrations we were joined by a number of friendly and fraternal countries. Our celebration takes place at a time when the Yemeni people have made great forward strides in all areas - social, political and economic. This is attested to by many of those who knew Yemen prior to its Revolution. The choice of democracy as one of the objectives of our glorious Revolution is one of our people's most important

(Mr. Al-Eryany, Yemen)

victories, and it will culminate in free and direct parliamentary elections to be held at the beginning of next year in keeping with the guiding principles established by our political leadership, represented by brother Colonel Ali Abdulla Saleh, President of the Republic, Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces and General Secretary of the People's General Congress. Our country enjoys security and stability and has made great progress. The beginning of the first year of the third five-year plan, 1987-1991, represents a new phase of self-reliance during which we will export the first shipment of Yemeni oil from the shores of the Red Sea.

As for Yemen's unity, our national leadership is working with our brothers in the southern part of our homeland in order to achieve unity through peaceful and democratic means and to realize the hopes and aspirations of the Yemeni people for unity.

In conclusion, I would ask the Almighty to guide you, Mr. President, to success on your way, and I pray for the progress of our Organization in the service of freedom, justice, prosperity and equality, unimpeded by considerations of colour, creed or race. All members of the human race must live as equals on this earth, however diverse their cultures, however far-flung their geographical locations. Peace will never prevail without equality, security and stability in our world, and this cannot be realized without justice for all.

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic extends its cordial congratulations to you, Comrade Florin, on your election to the distinguished and responsible post of President of the United Nations General Assembly at its forty-second session and expresses the hope that, under your guidance, the Assembly will reach fruitful decisions conducive to peace, co-operation, and implementation of the lofty purposes and principles enshrined in

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

the United Nations Charter. We are pleased to see the office of President of the Assembly held by a representative of a fraternal socialist State, a man who, weapons in hand, fought against fascism, in the territory of Byelorussia, inter alia.

We also extend our greetings to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, who this year paid an official visit to the Byelorussian SSR. That visit demonstrated a common desire to enhance the role and effectiveness of the United Nations as an instrument of peace and international co-operation intended to work in the interests of all States and to lay down guarantees of global security with equality for all.

Hopes and constructive efforts, skepticism and counteraction - those are the poles between which the needle of the barometer of political debate in this representative Hall has been oscillating for decades. Today, it is much closer to the point marking hope and positive prospects. Such a phenomenon has not been very frequent in the political climate in recent years. We welcome this favourable trend. There are sufficient grounds for it. International relations are beginning to move towards a qualitatively new dimension, one of constructive co-operation and broad and honest dialogue.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

The Great October Socialist Revolution was a powerful generator of new, positive processes in international relations. In the course of the World War it was the first in history to raise the question of a just and democratic peace without annexations or war indemnities, as well as complete renunciation of any forms of aggression. This year marks the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution - the most outstanding event of the twentieth century, which has changed the world. There is probably no sphere of social relations that has not experienced its positive effects. The right of nations to self-determination, the equality of great and small nations, the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems, and the goal of general and complete disarmament - these and other progressive political categories were brought into being by the ideas of the great Lenin and the ideals of the October Revolution. The Lenin Decree of Peace brought peoples to the front of the stage of history. It was addressed not only to Governments but also direct to the peoples of the countries at war, something which, incidentally, incurred the acute displeasure of vested interests. These days we hear appeals from the rostrum of the United Nations to the hearts of people and nations and this, too, shows the impact of the October Revolution.

The October Revolution made it possible for the people of Byelorussia to gain statehood, embark on a path of economic, social and intellectual progress in the interests of the working masses, and become a participant in international intercourse.

Over the 70 years, which is historically a short time span, we have travelled a long road: from private property and the resultant exploitation of man by man, to free labour, which released the revolutionary creative energy of the working people; from national inequality to friendship and fraternal co-operation of people of different nationalities; from cottage industry to modern, multisectoral industry

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

with highly advanced engineering, chemistry and electronics; from hunger to productive mechanized farming; from illiteracy to universal compulsory secondary education for young people, with numerous colleges and universities. It took tremendous effort and feats of arms to travel this path; for that reason we treasure its results all the more. It should not be forgotten that as a result of Hitler's aggression Byelorussia lost a quarter of its population and more than half of its national wealth.

A direct extension of the cause of the October Revolution is the process of revolutionary renewal of all aspects of life, which is under way in our Republic and the other fraternal Republics of our country. Greater openness or glasnost, more profound democratism, the new social and political atmosphere in our society, and the radical reform in economic management have regvanized the moral and creative potential of the working people and encouraged their initiative.

We are witnessing stable improvements in living standards. The rates of growth of industrial and agricultural production in Byelorussia have now reached more than 6 per cent. Not too many countries can currently boast such a dynamic rate of economic development.

Our people look forward to the future with optimism. We have set ourselves the goal of doubling our national income and industrial potential by the end of the century, with particular emphasis on improving care of the people and creating all the conditions necessary for a comprehensive and harmonious development of the individual.

Peace is essential for the achievement of these lofty goals. The First All-Byelorussian Congress of the Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Red Army Deputies solemnly proclaimed in its appeal on behalf of millions of Byelorussian men and women the will to live in peace and friendship with all nations. The

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Byelorussian SSR has been invariably guided by that will in its international activities, including here at the United Nations.

Reliable peace can result only from persevering national efforts and the collective reason of all States. In the current strategic situation no single State, however powerful, can hope to have total security without assistance from others. Such assistance can, clearly, be given only on a mutual basis.

Today the collective reason of States is starting to mature. As a result of the efforts of recent years the international community has now come to what appears to be a common realization that nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. This is a very important stage, which mankind has not reached easily. Any thought, however, should be crowned with action, with a logical conclusion sustained in practice. The conclusion of this important premise is that nuclear disarmament is essential. In this context, of special importance is the agreement in principle reached recently between the Soviet Union and the United States of America to conclude a treaty on shorter- and medium-range missiles, which brings us closer to the first step towards real nuclear disarmament. The Soviet-American agreement is the most serious argument against the view held until recently that only armament, not disarmament, brings about greater security.

The significance of this step is not to be measured by absolute numbers of warheads to be eliminated or by their relative proportion in nuclear arsenals. It opens a door which, it has been proclaimed in the past in various political forums, is impossible to open.

It is essential that the movement that has begun should continue its momentum so that the Reykjavik accord between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to halve their strategic offensive arms be put into effect, while retaining and strengthening the anti-ballistic missile Treaty régime,

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

with a subsequent move towards negotiations on further reductions. It is well known that the Soviet Union has declared that it is ready to relinquish, on a reciprocal basis, its status as a nuclear Power before the year 2000.

There have been times in the history of mankind when a transition to the next phase of development required new materials for manufacturing tools as well as requiring new kinds and sources of energy. Those transitions ushered in a new age. Today mankind has reached a time when in order to make a transition to the next stage of civilization - indeed, to ensure the survival of the human species - it is necessary to embrace above all a new way of thinking, which will also usher in a new age: an age of shaping a nuclear-free and non-violent world, a world without wars or arms, an age of moulding a comprehensive system of international security.

When a year ago a number of socialist countries, including the Byelorussian SSR, suggested for the consideration of the community of nations the possibility of establishing such a system, we did not offer any ready-made prescriptions. This initiative is intended for a broad dialogue, for the participation and contribution of all. At this stage the multi-faceted exchange of views has begun to crystallize distinct aspects of the general outline. The article by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Mikhail S. Gorbachev, entitled "Reality and safeguards for a secure world" (A/42/574), which was published at the beginning of this session, offers a basis for serious reflection on this subject, giving promising guidelines for joint work. The article has evoked a positive response among delegations. It is our hope that the current session will continue the process of shaping an agreed understanding of the mechanisms of such a system, a process comparable with the prescription of the great Michelangelo, who, in

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

creating a masterpiece of perfection, simply carved out of a piece of marble everything that was not needed. All the obsolete pieces should be discarded.

The interdependence of today's world makes it necessary for us to start building our common safe house simultaneously from all its corners, taking into account the main areas of international relations. Like a supporting structure, the component areas and units should be permeated with the idea of humanism and the humanization of international relations, for in the final analysis the building is being constructed for the human being. Much has been said here about human rights and the rights of peoples. On the whole, this is undoubtedly a correct perspective. It is incontestable that the foundation of our edifice would be extremely shaky if it were not based on a guarantee of the primary right - the right to life in conditions of peace and freedom. A defect of vision that prevented one from seeing this should be remedied.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

The retention and build up of armaments, above all weapons of mass destruction, are tantamount to a physical repudiation of the right to life, a kind of assertion of the anti-human right to take away life. Conversely, the fewer armaments the greater the chances of staying alive. The transition to a concept of "reasonable sufficiency", the complete elimination of nuclear armaments and other weapons of mass destruction while concurrently reducing conventional arms - this is what constitutes, from the standpoint of mankind's interests, the logical road to follow.

"Security through excessive armament", whether quantitative or qualitative, offensive or defensive, constitutes a logic of a different, anti-human dimension. In particular, space weapons lend themselves to juggling with the destinies of peoples from outer space or underground hardened bunkers, but not to ensuring safe skies above our heads.

The words of Albert Einstein, a towering intellect in the nuclear age - "You cannot simultaneously prepare for war and peace" - are more than ever well founded. In the well-known Manifesto prepared together with Bertrand Russell, he stressed

"... that we should learn to think in a new way, we should learn not to ask ourselves what moves should be taken to gain a military victory over the camp to which we do not belong - for there are no such moves - but rather we should ask ourselves what steps should be taken to prevent an armed struggle whose outcome is bound to be disastrous for all its participants".

In some areas the international community is already on the verge of taking arms-reduction and disarmament measures. We have already spoken about nuclear disarmament. What is needed now is merely to make several substantial additions. At an appropriate stage it is essential that all the nuclear States, without exception, join this process. What is more, the very essence of the emerging

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Soviet-United States agreement on medium-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles would be undermined if there were attempts to "make up for it" through a buildup of armaments, both nuclear in related categories and conventional.

The goal of nuclear disarmament would be brought much closer if the nuclear States and their allies were to renounce the first use of nuclear and conventional arms and the use of force in international relations under any circumstances and in any conditions, as well as discontinue nuclear testing.

In this context, we welcome the agreed draft declaration on enhancing the effectiveness of the principles of renouncing the threat or use of force in international relations, which has been submitted to the Assembly for its consideration, and the Soviet-United States agreement on establishing nuclear risk reduction centres and on commencing before this December full-scale, stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing.

The outline of a future convention banning chemical weapons is being fleshed out. The current phase of work is the result of extensive efforts, and this process must not be obstructed.

The question of eliminating weapons of mass destruction cannot be closed unless measures are taken to prevent the development of new types of such weapons. The lamentable record of abuses of the fruits of scientific and technological progress does not allow us merely to brush off this issue. At the forty-second session the Byelorussian SSR will continue its efforts of many years in this area, with due regard to the positions of other countries.

The important sphere of conventional armaments also requires new approaches. In our view, the main principle is simple, namely, that if there are any imbalances they should be corrected. It is essential that this be done through appropriate balanced reductions, rather than through a buildup or "supplementary armament".

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Apart from arms limitation and disarmament measures, in the direct meaning of this term, serious steps of a different nature can certainly be taken in the military and political areas. The Warsaw Treaty Organization has proposed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) that their military doctrines be compared. The goal is to ensure their strictly defensive nature. The military doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty member States has as its objective the prevention of war, nuclear and conventional. They have declared that "never and under no circumstances will they launch military actions against any State or alliance of States, unless they themselves become the target of an armed attack". To be consistent, one could go even further, that is, to organize armed forces in such a way as to permit defence but rule out offensive operations.

Confidence and openness in the military field should go hand in hand with disarmament. I note that quite recently the exercises in the Byelorussian military district were subjected to the first United States inspection, on request, in accordance with the 1986 Stockholm agreement. The request of the United States side was met without any delay and the inspectors were able to see for themselves that we comply fully with the obligations under the agreement. That is how, through concrete deeds, step-by-step businesslike and productive relations can and should be built. The process of joint negotiation of agreements and documents teaches us the difficult science of mutual understanding and teaches us also to regard the opposite side as a partner rather than an enemy.

Speaking of the search for points of contact and common language on specific matters, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has said:

"What is needed here is not only the faculty of speaking but also of listening. Not only of listening to but also of understanding one another, jointly searching for solutions to the most complex integrals of today's world."

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

In mathematics there is the notion of "imaginary numbers". It springs to mind while listening to some statements made from this rostrum since in many respects they appear to be based on imaginary concepts which, however, are offered to us as absolute. Thus, the term "free world" is enlarged to include several bloody dictatorships; the notion of "struggle for democracy" is adapted to accommodate the maintenance of an army of cut-throats whose task is to overthrow the legitimate Government by committing violence against innocent civilians; and the phrase "strict respect for the United Nations Charter" is easily extended to the armed invasion of a small Caribbean nation, as well as to the all-round support of the aggressor which has seized land belonging to its neighbours.

Surely one should not speak from this rostrum of freedom and at the same time deny in principle and deeds the right of peoples to self-determination and free choice of the means to bring about economic and social development.

The efforts of the Contadora Group and the goodwill of the countries of Central America have initiated a very important positive process of putting a peaceful end to the conflict. Yesterday the General Assembly endorsed by consensus those efforts. All parties concerned should create the best possible conditions for its development and must not impede it. Only then will there be a genuinely humane interest meeting the needs of the peoples in the region, rather than selfish interests. In fact, this was mentioned this morning by the President of Nicaragua.

Somewhat similar and equally positive processes have also got under way in some other conflict areas on our planet. The sprocket-wheels of national reconciliation mechanisms in Afghanistan and Kampuchea have started to move. These are all very difficult and very delicate processes. If we are to heed the voice of reason emanating from the very hearts of the peoples in these countries, what would be more correct - to encourage those processes or to encourage bandit groups to shed more blood? The answer to that question is clear.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

It is also sufficiently clear that by joint and carefully considered efforts the community of nations can and must find a solution to the dangerous impasse in the Middle East, ensure human rights for the indigenous population of South Africa, ensure the independence of Namibia and all other Territories whose colonial status casts a dark shadow on the prestige of the end of the twentieth century, and find just solutions to the problems of Cyprus and Korea.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

What should be the ways of dealing with all these problems? We have repeatedly expressed our views on that, and we stand ready to search together for an answer in each and every particular case. The present situation in the Persian Gulf, however, shows what those ways should not be. The concentration of armaments instead of the concentration of goodwill leads only to the aggravation of the conflict and the escalation of the threat to the countries in the region and to universal security.

Honesty and purity of intent are important not only in relations among human beings, but also in international politics. The prescriptions of Machiavelli, while they might have been deemed admissible in the distant past, hardly correspond to the notions of rules of conduct on the threshold of the third millennium. We should like the United Nations, this university teaching the science of how States can live together, to become also a school for the humanization of international relations.

The transition to this new thinking will not be easy, but this has become an imperative of our age. It is time to abandon State egocentricism and to move towards understanding the primacy of interests common to mankind.

Today it can be stated, with cautious optimism, that the elements of new approaches and realistic policies have taken root in the world community and are now sprouting. That is borne out by documents of the Non-Aligned Movement. The Palme Commission has been developing a concept of "common security". The Secretary-General, in his report on the work of the Organization, stresses a new component: "the growing commonality factor in international affairs"

(A/42/1, p. 2). The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which took place before the opening of the current General Assembly session, emphasized in its Final Document that security comprises

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

not only military but also political, economic, social, humanitarian, human-rights and ecological factors. The Conference noted the importance of a collective approach reflecting the needs of humanity as a whole. That unanimous conclusion drawn by a major conference has great significance and should become a universal guideline for practical action.

Indeed, if the human being and his heart are our point of departure, then opportunities should be provided for material, financial and intellectual resources to be spent not for the preparation for war but for the improvement of the well-being of nations. One billion people in the developing countries live below the poverty line; 780 million suffer from malnutrition; 850 million cannot read or write; 1.5 billion have no access to medical services; and the same number are unemployed. Disarmament is an important and major source of ready resources for development, including that of developing countries.

In the sphere of economic relations, the world community faces immense, complicated problems. It would be, to say the least, an over-simplification to regard private enterprise and the free play of market forces, advocated by some people, as a universal magic wand. Their magic is not the same for everybody. For some it is white, for others it is black. This magic does not produce only shining limousines - a Western symbol of wealth. An army of unemployed, the stone pillows of sidewalks for the homeless, the annual multi-billion outflow of resources from poor countries into the safes of the transnational corporations, the external-debt trap: that is what provides the assembly line that turns out those limousines.

To overcome underdevelopment, to solve problems of economic security, to establish a new international economic order, to remove everything that burdens world economic relations: those are the problems that must be urgently solved. The United Nations is without a doubt the most suitable forum for finding mutually

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

acceptable approaches to those problems on a truly universal and democratic basis, in the interests of all countries. We should like to see its role and effectiveness in this sphere increase in every possible way.

The problems of the protection of the environment have been attracting increasing attention. We have no right to live at the expense of succeeding generations. Elementary decency demands that we turn our Earth over to them fit for life at the very least, and flourishing at best. Meanwhile, dangerous levels of pollution of the oceans, rivers, lakes and air, and desertification, lack of fresh water, the disappearance of entire species: those are not just warning bells; they are the tocsin sounding. For too long mankind has underestimated the scope of the problems, thinking that nature's potential is limitless. Experience has shown, however, that we cannot go on "conquering" it forever. It is time we learned to coexist peacefully with nature, since mankind is a part of it - the best, but also the most vulnerable.

The global magnitude of the tasks facing us in this area makes necessary the broadest possible collective efforts in order to carry them out. It is essential to ponder joint projects to protect the environment against the consequences of economic activity and jointly to work out waste-free and clean technologies. The struggle for a flourishing Earth can become a testing ground to teach States how to act together for the sake of highly humane common objectives.

Co-operation in preventing and treating dangerous diseases is also a promising and necessary area for work. In 1958 the Byelorussian SSR initiated the General Assembly decision for international promotion of research into the treatment of cancer. Unfortunately, the international situation at that time made it impossible to implement the decision consistently. It is even more important now, given the

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

emerging awareness of the commonality of human objectives, to intensify joint efforts for health protection, in particular for combating a disease like AIDS.

Humanism, in the broadest sense of that word, is, as has already been noted, the main support of the common building of security; it is the cement that permeates all the component spheres of international relations. The new thinking requires that a fresh look be taken at the socio-humanitarian sphere, which should be cleared of the pollutants brought about by the cold war, ideological biases and the purely confrontational approach; it calls for finding an effective framework for international co-operation and for focusing efforts on the universal recognition and observance of the rules of international law and inter-State relations worked out in the United Nations system.

Speaking of the need for human contacts, we should also devote attention to the need for mutual understanding among peoples. To that end, it is essential to secure a flow of information that would bring peoples closer together, rather than antagonizing them, which would be objective and unbiased and which would be based on the image of the good neighbours, partner and friend, rather than the enemy.

In regard to individual rights, family reunification, a visa régime, and so on, let us all agree to be guided by the international rules that have been worked out. In Bern, the countries that participated in the Helsinki process jointly worked out an important document on this subject, and it was only the position of one State that prevented it from being translated into a joint international standard for the protection of human rights. Even in those conditions, the Soviet Union declared that it would be guided by the letter and spirit of the document. Others should have followed its example. If one pursues the goal of consolidating human rights, rather than some other political goal, one should not obstruct the

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

convening in Moscow of an appropriate forum, as proposed by the Soviet Union, but, rather, should come to that forum with a constructive position.

There are many tasks to tackle, and the international community would be more than equal to them. The most important thing is to ensure that genuinely humane goals and ideals are not replaced by mere shams.

The United Nations has very lofty ideals and objectives. It is essential that both its status and its authority be at an equally serious level. Regrettably, we must acknowledge that the outdated, selfish stereotypes of politics which are predicated on narrow interests and which have caused the utmost exacerbation of the international situation have also affected the prestige of the United Nations. But the incipient wave of new approaches and the new awareness of realities will inevitably raise it to the proper level. The Byelorussian SSR will contribute to that end in every possible way.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Indeed, there is no international forum more appropriate for finding a joint solution to the principal problems that face mankind than the United Nations system, which is universal in two ways - the States of which it is composed and the range of problems with which it deals. It should therefore become a real centre for harmonizing the actions of States to save the present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war, as envisaged in the Charter. It should be a platform for international law and order. The United Nations possesses powerful machinery for maintaining peace and security which can be used effectively only through the unified political will of States.

The Security Council, its bodies, the Military Staff Committee, the negotiating mechanisms, in particular the Conference on Disarmament, the International Court of Justice, the specialized agencies and other institutions of the United Nations system can make our world much more secure and safe if they work at full capacity. In this process, the Secretary-General is called upon to play an increasingly important role. In addition, and in keeping with the challenge of our times, the United Nations can be charged with new functions, and new bodies may be established. The verification and monitoring of agreements which ensure security and disarmament, and the regulation of fruitful co-operation in a peaceful outer space are possible. Only one thing must be ruled out: attempts to influence undemocratically the course and activities of the United Nations. A financial blockade of United Nations activities is absolutely inadmissible.

In the process of shaping a comprehensive system of international peace and security, and in actively contributing to all the stages of reducing military potentials, the United Nations - especially in a nuclear-free world - should become a regulator for maintaining the balance at a level of reasonable sufficiency, with

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

a constant trend towards lowering it. In summing up, the following could be said of the future role of our common Organization: the United Nations must become a guarantor of comprehensive security.

It has been said, quite correctly, that wars begin in the minds of men. What should be said now is that genuine peace begins with a new way of thinking. The future belongs to a new way of acting.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.