

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
FORTY-SECOND SESSION



FIRST COMMITTEE
50th meeting
held on
Friday, 20 November 1987
at 10 a.m.
New York

*Official Records**

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 50th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

CONTENTS

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

* This record is published in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly. It is published in the original language of the meeting. The original language of the meeting is indicated in the margin of the text. The original language of the text is indicated in the margin of the text.

Contributions will be made after the end of the meeting and separately to the Secretary-General.

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 71, 72 AND 73 (continued)

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

Mr. GARCIA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The First Committee is now considering questions of international security, under agenda items 71, 72 and 73. As we embark on our consideration of those items, it is vitally important to recall a number of principles without which it would be extremely difficult to attain international security and which in one way or another are reflected in the Charter of the United Nations. They are often violated or forgotten, which has a negative impact on the search for a climate of peace and security in which our peoples can live in tranquillity.

It cannot be denied that if international security is to be strengthened, States must not interfere in the internal or external affairs of other States; there must be relations of friendship and co-operation among States; there must be a total elimination of the use or threat of force, intervention, interference, colonial domination and coercive measures of all kinds, whether political or economic, which could violate the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States.

The peaceful settlement of disputes, the elimination of international crisis points and the establishment of a fairer new international economic order would also greatly help strengthen international peace and security.

An extremely important element in strengthening international security and really taking the first meaningful steps towards improving relations among States is unquestionably the ability to curb the arms race and, even more desirable, to begin a process of general and complete disarmament leading to the complete elimination of the threat of war and to the conversion of the weapons industry to the production of the goods that can meet the needs of the world's population.

(Mr. Garcia, Cuba)

But there is another important element in guaranteeing a lasting peace: whatever steps are taken in disarmament should also promote development. The natural, economic and technological resources now devoted to war should go to improve the standard of living of the less developed countries and create an industrial base enabling them to produce enough to meet their needs, to guarantee education and good health for all their citizens. For peace is unimaginable without development, and it is utterly impossible to attain development without achieving peace and disarmament.

Of great importance in this promotion of peace is General Assembly resolution 41/90, entitled "Review of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". The purposes of that Declaration remain crucially important in the light of the present international situation. Clearly, all countries must join in the effort to resolve the complex problems identified in that resolution; we are glad to note that many States have undertaken a process of considering and adopting measures to solve those problems. Those still obstructing the achievement of that desirable end should join in the process.

Unquestionably, the United Nations has a basic role to play in the entire process, both by supporting all initiatives designed to strengthen international security and by taking an active part in that process. The United Nations must step up its efforts to reach a solution of the problems identified in resolution 41/90 and denounce to international public opinion any obstacle that prevents its activities from being transformed into concrete measures to strengthen international peace and security.

Despite the many efforts undertaken by the United Nations, certain areas of tension remain, threatening international peace and security. The situation in southern Africa is a vivid example of such threats; it is most critical in South Africa, where the black majority is subjected to the hateful régime of apartheid

(Mr. Garcia, Cuba)

and where we witness a policy of constant aggression against neighbouring States, especially against Angola, in which the South African army itself has recently been operating side by side with the UNITA bands. The unsolved problem of the independence of Namibia not only exacerbates the crisis in the region but also signals total disregard for the role of the United Nations in respect of that Territory.

In the Middle East, tension continues to worsen. The unresolved Palestinian problem and Israel's position resulting from its "strategic alliance" with the United States continue to pose a grave threat to the region, and in particular to the Arab world. Moreover, the situation in the Persian Gulf is growing more complex and explosive. This makes it all the more urgent to restore peace to the region.

As concerns Central America, we have begun to note constructive steps taken in an attempt to achieve in the near future the strengthening of international peace and security in the region. That process, based on the agreement signed at Esquipulas by the Central American Presidents, shows that it is possible to make progress towards better understanding and improved relations among countries when there is a genuine political will to do so. The praiseworthy initiative of Costa Rica was welcomed by all Governments - or, to be more accurate, by almost all Governments: it was only natural that the mere idea that there could be peace in Central America, that peoples could decide their future for themselves, that it would no longer be necessary to give millions of dollars to help spread destruction and death precipitated a real crisis for the imperialist strategists. They have argued that these agreements threaten their so-called national security and could be nothing more or less than a first step towards enabling countries to decide for themselves what to do: that is not something that figures in the foreign policy of the present United States Government.

(Mr. Garcia, Cuba)

Nicaragua's steps to fulfil the agreement show its Government's interest and good will with respect to the speediest possible solution of the internal problem it now faces solely as a result of the interventionist policy of the United States, in violation of Nicaraguan sovereignty. To strengthen international peace and security in the region that kind of intervention must cease; military manoeuvres in the region, conducted for the purpose of intimidation, must come to an end; political and economic coercion must stop; and the will, independence and sovereignty of States must be respected.

My delegation considers the effective implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security very important. We fully support the Declaration's ideas, for they are based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and are intended to strengthen the role of the Organization in the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The United Nations has an extremely important role to play in strengthening co-operation and understanding among nations, which is vitally necessary in today's world. The Organization should undertake negotiations and reach agreements leading to the settlement of disputes and the strengthening of peace.

This forum holds out real hope to the peoples of the world, especially the peoples of the developing countries, that we can achieve a more stable, just and equitable economic situation that will promote development, that they will be guaranteed the means of subsistence and that inequitable trade will be eliminated through the establishment of a new international economic order. All this will be of decisive assistance in maintaining world peace.

To realize this requires the establishment of a global system of international peace and security that would ensure the adoption of practical measures to implement the principles of the Charter, especially those of the greatest

(Mr. Garcia, Cuba)

significance and importance for world peace, such as those related to disarmament, the peaceful settlement of disputes, economic development and international co-operation. My delegation fully supports the initiative to establish such a system, which would benefit developing countries and meet the realities of the nuclear era correctly and in the framework of the United Nations and its Charter.

(Mr. Garcia, Cuba)

In order to strengthen international peace and security, the international community must rally round the United Nations and display the political will necessary to change the irrational practice of wasting a trillion dollars a year on weapons world-wide, while spending only \$180 billion on education and a little more than \$100 billion on public health. It is of far greater benefit to mankind that every child should have a book to read and bread to eat every day than that a soldier should have a rifle. We must realize that it is better that a doctor should save a life than that a bomb should destroy hundreds of lives.

In conclusion, I should like to quote President Fidel Castro, who recently spoke of this situation:

"We have no doubt that one day history will remember October 1987 as the first time the destruction of nuclear weapons began and the possible start of a permanent period of peace and hope for mankind, which was and is living in terror of self-destruction and in ignominious poverty that annually kills as many children in the third world as 100 nuclear bombs."

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): Throughout its long and turbulent history, the Mediterranean has occupied an extraordinary place on the international scene and had a great influence on overall international developments. Because of its geostrategic and political importance as a crossroads of sea lanes and land routes and of cultures and civilizations, the Mediterranean has been for centuries in the forefront of the interests of outside Powers and the object of competition among them.

The situation has hardly changed today. The piling up of weapons of mass destruction and the increased military presence of non-Mediterranean Powers has transformed the region into one of the main arenas of bloc rivalry. Outside pressure, including occasional resort to armed force, aimed at influencing and

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

redirecting internal developments in certain countries, particularly non-aligned countries, continues today.

The present stalemate and the momentary absence of serious incidents should not lead us to believe that the risk of renewed exacerbation has been eliminated. Existing differences and unresolved disputes in the region are latent sources of new and potentially even more dangerous escalation.

As a Mediterranean, European and non-aligned country, Yugoslavia has been following the developments in the region with keen interest and concern. It has always maintained that the root causes of the situation are to be found in the policy of force, intervention and interference in the internal affairs of the countries of the region. It has always been our belief that dialogue, negotiation and equitable co-operation are the only way to solve the outstanding problems and disputes in the Mediterranean, irrespective of their nature and gravity.

Let me therefore repeat that it is absolutely unacceptable to us that present hotbeds of crisis, rooted in the complex and burdensome legacy of the past, and the waves of terrorism arising in the wake of the failure to resolve the crisis should be used as an excuse for intervention and interference by outside Powers.

Yugoslavia is vitally interested in the promotion and strengthening of peace and stability in the Mediterranean, since this is an inseparable component of its own security. Along with other non-aligned countries, my country has for some time now been striving to bring about the beginning of a process of peacefully overcoming the current situation and of achieving a lasting solution to the problems in the area.

As a result of the efforts of non-aligned countries, the General Assembly, at its thirty-seventh session, decided to add to the agenda of its future sessions a new item, entitled "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region".

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

The activities of non-aligned countries at the regional level have been proceeding along the same lines. The ministerial meetings of non-aligned countries held at Valletta, Malta, in 1984 and at Brioni, Yugoslavia, in June of this year were expressions of those countries' sincere desire and endeavours to redirect efforts and energy to improving the situation in the area; those meetings resulted in a number of suggestions and initiatives aimed at developing all-round equitable co-operation among Mediterranean countries and transforming the region into a zone of peace and security.

The Brioni meeting of Foreign Ministers of Mediterranean non-aligned countries reaffirmed the need for and the importance of dialogue, consultations and joint efforts between the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Mediterranean and other countries of Europe to overcome the outstanding problems burdening the situation and causing tension in the Mediterranean.

The Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries emphasized in particular the importance of intensifying and continuously promoting contacts in all fields in which there exist common interests and real possibilities for co-operation by Mediterranean countries on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. The success of those efforts, which enjoy the full support of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, would greatly contribute to the creation of conditions for the gradual elimination of factors that are hampering the faster social and economic development of non-aligned and other Mediterranean countries.

After the Brioni meeting, dialogue was established between the Mediterranean countries of Europe and the European Economic Community on the need for developing equitable co-operation and partnership in all areas of common interest. This, along with the dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States on the interrelationship between security and disarmament in Europe and the Mediterranean,

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

is very encouraging. The recent developments in United States-Soviet relations and the expected signing of an agreement between the two super-Powers on the elimination of medium-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles - the provisions of which will, we believe, cover the Mediterranean - has given rise to legitimate hopes among Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries that they can positively affect the overall situation in the region.

We are convinced that such a development would greatly contribute to the establishment of greater trust, opening up new avenues towards a comprehensive solution of the current problems in the region. To achieve this, it is indispensable to prevent further militarization of the region, remove the arsenals of bloc and non-regional Powers and make concrete efforts to resolve the existing hotbeds of crisis that for decades have kept the Mediterranean on the brink of an armed conflict of broader proportions.

Attempts to address current problems from the standpoint of narrow bloc interests and with an ambition to change the delicate balance of forces to one's own advantage would not only create new obstacles and difficulties in the process of resolving those problems but have far-reaching negative consequences for peace and security in the world.

We therefore believe that any effort to ease tension and resolve existing problems and difficulties must proceed by taking into account the authentic interests and aspirations of the peoples and countries of the region and their right to decide their destiny freely and independently. It is high time we proceeded jointly within the United Nations, and much more resolutely than we have thus far, peacefully to resolve and eliminate existing causes of tension and crisis in the region. A concrete contribution in that direction would be the early convening of an international conference on the Middle East, with participation on

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

an equal footing of all parties directly concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. In our opinion, that is the only realistic way at this moment to find a just and lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict and to the question of Palestine, which is at its core.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

We fully support the early restoration of the national unity, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon in implementation of Security Council resolutions. An indispensable pre-condition of such restoration is the full and immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese territory, which would enable Lebanon to take free and independent decisions on its own internal development.

We are in favour of achieving an urgent solution to the Cyprus problem on the basis of full respect for the independence, territorial integrity, unity and non-aligned status of Cyprus. In this context, we reject each and every attempt to divide the country. We also consider that there can be no lasting solution to this problem without the complete withdrawal of foreign troops from the island and without an agreement between the two ethnic communities.

In the past few years the Mediterranean has been struck by acts of terrorism committed by individuals, groups and, not infrequently, by certain States.

Yugoslavia, itself a frequent target of senseless terrorist attacks in the past, condemns most strongly all types of terrorism regardless of their motivation and of the perpetrators. I should like to reiterate that my country is fully prepared to remain actively involved and to participate in any action aimed at suppressing and permanently eradicating this evil. Not only do terrorist acts take innocent lives, they also sow suspicion and mistrust in international relations and often threaten the territorial integrity and security of States. However, it should also be pointed out on this occasion that the struggle of colonial countries and peoples and of their liberation movements for self-determination and independence is not terrorism, nor should it be equated with it. After all, the legitimacy of this struggle is reaffirmed in numerous United Nations documents and decisions.

Experience has shown that bloc rivalry and military presence do not contribute

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

to peace and stability. If anything, they only exacerbate the situation and deepen the existing mistrust and differences, particularly so in the Mediterranean region.

The only realistic alternative to the existing state of affairs in the Mediterranean is to lay the foundation for the development of all-round and equitable co-operation and coexistence, with full respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and specific development needs of individual countries, particularly for their internal political system and orientation. The Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have for a number of years devoted specific efforts to launching and promoting equitable co-operation in the region on the basis of mutual benefit in all areas of common interest for the countries of the region and for other European countries that are their natural partners. This is a long-term orientation of the Mediterranean non-aligned countries and therefore, it has broader significance. As stated in the Programme of Action for the Promotion of Economic Co-operation among the Mediterranean Members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, it represents an important contribution to greater security in the Mediterranean region. We therefore rightly expect that the favourable reception that the initiatives and proposals of the Mediterranean non-aligned countries have been accorded by Mediterranean and other European countries will be translated into joint programmes of action and co-operation in the interests of peace and stability in the region.

The initial results in the co-operation among the Mediterranean non-aligned countries in the fields of the environment, the economy, science and technology, tourism, culture, arts and sports reveal only part of the possibilities existing in this area. The regional co-operation of the Mediterranean non-aligned countries has also demonstrated that, despite certain differences among individual countries, there exists a high level of common interest. A meeting of experts of non-aligned

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

countries concerning planning and development, held at Belgrade in February 1987, identified vast possibilities for effective and fruitful co-operation in a number of fields, including information, trade and services, agriculture, food production and fisheries, and finance. Important possibilities for co-operation in the industrial field and in the field of transport have already been mentioned.

Worthy of particular attention in this context is the idea that came forth from the Brioni meeting of establishing a Mediterranean forum as a multidisciplinary framework for the promotion of co-operation in the region, which would include not only government representatives but also scientific, educational, cultural, artistic and other institutions, as well as eminent individuals specialized in Mediterranean studies.

Yugoslavia is in favour of a broader exchange of contacts and information among the countries of the region with a view to promoting mutual understanding since it is only through better mutual knowledge of, and greater respect for specific needs in internal development that numerous misunderstandings can be avoided and allayed. It is expected that the forthcoming meeting of the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, scheduled to take place in Algiers in 1988, will provide fresh impetus in this direction.

The efforts of the Mediterranean non-aligned countries to improve the situation in the Mediterranean and transform the area into a zone of peace, security and co-operation has always enjoyed the full support of the United Nations. We are convinced that the world Organization can make its own substantial contribution to the promotion of peace and security in the region on the basis of the principles of the Charter and, in particular, on the basis of the need for full respect for, and recognition of, the real interests and aspirations of the countries and peoples.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

We also believe that the Vienna follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) will affirm even more strongly the interdependence between the security of Europe and that of the Mediterranean and will respond positively to the appeal of the Mediterranean non-aligned countries for consultation and co-operation between the States participating in the CSCE and all Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries on problems related to the Mediterranean. We are convinced that this could make a significant contribution to the establishment of a better climate and to a relaxation of tension in the Mediterranean region, which is in the interest of all.

What is most important is to allow the countries of the region to resolve the existing disputes and differences by themselves, proceeding from their own specific interests and needs, on the basis of full respect for the United Nations Charter and with a view to strengthening peace, security and stable development in the region.

Mr. MURIN (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The question of a comprehensive system of international peace and security is justifiably arousing great interest and attracting the attention of the States Members of the United Nations. The guaranteeing of international security in the modern world is a cardinal task for all States, and for the United Nations as well.

The socialist States have consistently spoken out in favour of guaranteeing security for all States, on an equal basis and unifying all spheres of international relations. The recent Prague meeting of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the States Members of the Warsaw Treaty pointed out the importance we attach to a constructive consideration of proposals on the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security at the current forty-second session of the General Assembly. It was also emphasized that

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

such a system must function on the basis and within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations. In this connection, the participants in the meeting spoke out in favour of enhancing the role of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretary-General, and expressed the hope that the General Assembly will give new impetus to a productive international dialogue on these questions.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

In the Charter of the United Nations the Member States have laid down the fundamental principles for maintaining international peace and security and sets up a machinery for doing so. Those principles and the collective system of security embodied in the Charter must become the irreplaceable top-priority basis for our joint efforts to strengthen comprehensive security in all spheres of international relations.

The comprehensive system of international peace and security must therefore be viewed first of all as a unified system of guarantees for the effective implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter in consonance with the needs and realities of the present-day world.

The modern world is interrelated, but it is also divided, and not only with respect to social systems. It is also divided into nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon countries, States members of military and political alliances and States that are not part of such alliances, States that have achieved a high level of economic development and States that suffer from underdevelopment. Hence the approaches of the various parties on the international scene to the very concept of international security are structurally different. The growing conflict between the degree to which these contradictions have developed and traditional thinking, as well as the unsuitable form of measures to resolve those contradictions, leads to the growth of global tension and to the weakening of universal security.

In this connection the notion of a comprehensive system of international peace and security entails an urgent call for the establishment of new forms and methods to reach a non-confrontational and highly productive solution to the contradictions of our time. It proceeds from the idea that the most important characteristic of the present-day world is the clear increase in the interdependence and

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

interrelationship of States and peoples and the interconnection of all world processes. Thus, guaranteeing international security in today's world inevitably requires, above all, a change in traditional views and approaches.

The unity of today's world and the interrelationship of the various spheres of international relations also leads to the conclusion that questions of international security must be resolved on a comprehensive basis. We must lose sight of the fact that the parameters of security for any State today go far beyond the framework of military and political matters, however significant they might be within the system of international relations. From the security viewpoint, economic, humanitarian and ecological questions have also become extremely important.

The existence of a whole gamut of interrelated real problems of security in all spheres is an objective factor in international life. A comprehensive system of international peace and security is aimed at establishing conditions under which all those problems would be resolved on the basis of co-operation and by exclusively non-violent means; contradictions between the interests of States not only would not be allowed to develop into confrontations but would, on the contrary, provide the impetus for a positive solution of international problems and the advancement of civilization as a whole.

The concept of comprehensive security must be a dynamic and open model for international relations, based on the consistent and creative implementation of the Charter of the United Nations and on the constant strengthening of the system of collective security set out in it. The dynamic character of that concept lies in its ability to unify and further develop, in line with the requirements of the nuclear and space age and within the framework of a single system, all the advances already made achieved in strengthening international security in individual areas of international relations.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

The attainment of comprehensive international security would ensure mutual respect for the genuine interests of States and would guarantee their balance in all spheres of international relations on a global scale. We must fully recognize that the security of any State can be guaranteed only through security for all, in the context of comprehensive international security, and that it can never be attained by harming the security of other countries.

It is clear that common human interests should have a high place in the hierarchy of general and national interests, which means that the solution of all practical security problems must be based on common human values, and thus on refraining from the use of force in securing the individual interests of States, guaranteeing of every people's and every human being's right to live in peace, and respecting and bringing to reality the right of every people to its own social, political and philosophical choice. We are convinced that the Charter of the United Nations provides a sufficiently broad and realistic basis for guaranteeing the balanced interests of all States and groups of States in the nuclear and space age.

Any policy based on the superiority of some States over others is incompatible with the concept of security. The essential prerequisites for comprehensive international security include systematic and internationally guaranteed compliance with the principles of the Charter and with other universally accepted norms of international life and the primacy of international law in relations between States. International co-operation on questions of security, and especially the observance of fundamental norms in international relations, should not be made subordinate to ideological motivations.

The universal framework for creating comprehensive security and the entire system of present-day international relations must be peaceful coexistence between States.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

The proposal to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security which we are submitting for general international consideration at the United Nations is, in essence, an open concept for survival and for the advancement of civilization in our nuclear and space era.

It is clear that a decisive feature of the joint effort of States to ensure comprehensive and mutual security is curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament, first and foremost in the nuclear sphere.

In our view, the creation of a secure world presupposes above all that nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction will be destroyed, that there will be a radical decrease in the size of armed forces and the stockpile of conventional weapons, with a consequent reduction in military expenditures, military alliances will be disbanded, military bases in foreign territories eliminated, and all troops abroad returned to their homelands. It presupposes the creation of effective machinery to prevent any type of aggression and to maintain peace at a considerably lower level of armaments.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

An urgent problem in guaranteeing security in the military sphere is the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Important steps to lower the level of military confrontation could be taken through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free and chemical-weapon-free zones and of zones with a reduced concentration of weapons and through the mutual withdrawal of the most dangerous forms of offensive weapons from regions where there is direct contact between military alliances.

Of course, the subjects I have enumerated do not exhaust the list of problems whose solution should be part of a comprehensive process of disarmament and the establishment of guarantees for security in the military sphere. We believe, however, that they provide a sufficiently broad view of the possible content of an international dialogue designed to establish a nuclear-weapon-free and violence-free world, as a fundamental prerequisite for the preservation of civilization.

We proceed from the idea that the military dimension of security should be approached in a comprehensive way, giving due attention to both qualitative and quantitative levels of armaments and to both global and regional aspects, that progress can be achieved in successive stages, encompassing various spheres and types of weapons. A key condition is that at each stage of the disarmament process there should be a steady increase in security, at the lowest possible levels of armed forces and armaments. Any imbalance or asymmetry in the existing structures of armed forces and armaments must be eliminated in the process of their reduction, in accordance with the principle of non-aggressive defence.

Important guarantees for military security could be established through the adoption of specific measures to prevent nuclear war, first and foremost through the assumption of an obligation under international law not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons in any circumstances or situations.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia

Closely linked to the achievement of progress in the sphere of disarmament is the implementation of a broad range of confidence-building measures, a constructive solution of verification questions, and the observance of agreements on the reduction of armaments and on disarmament, as well as the need for increasing openness in military affairs, including a comparison of military doctrines on a defensive basis and the comparability of budgets.

The guaranteeing of security in the military sphere, primarily through workable measures in the field of disarmament, is unquestionably the most urgent and complex problem of present-day international relations, to whose solution all States should contribute as much as they can.

Recently, we have seen increasing confirmation of the fact that a radical change in this sphere is possible. At a summit meeting a few weeks from now the USSR and the United States of America will sign a treaty on the elimination of medium-range and shorter-range missiles, which constitutes a step that is also of fundamental and historic significance from the point of view of prospects for disarmament in general. There is a genuine possibility of accelerating the elaboration and conclusion of a convention on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons. There also seem to be realistic hopes for the opening of negotiations concerning disarmament on a Europe-wide scale.

In the direct context of these major initiatives, we consider it most relevant to take advantage of every opportunity for further intensifying multilateral disarmament efforts, for making negotiations on various disarmament problems more broadly international and for genuinely increasing the effectiveness of the entire international machinery of the United Nations in this sphere. At the Prague meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, concrete proposals were made to intensify the work of the

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

Geneva Conference on Disarmament, recommending that all aspects of the Conference's activities should be comprehensively discussed at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to be held next year.

We hope that these initiatives of ours will also be viewed as a component of the overall efforts aimed at the adoption of concrete measures that will make possible the proper functioning of the United Nations and the entire international machinery for the maintenance of security.

An important requirement for ensuring the security of the world's peoples is the early peaceful resolution of existing regional conflicts and the prevention of new ones. Measures for effectively combatting international terrorism also constitute an essential component of the system of security.

The concept of a comprehensive system of international peace and security proceeds both from the need to raise the effectiveness of the United Nations machinery for collective security in connection with the peaceful settlement of international disputes and conflicts and from the special significance which at present attaches to preventing them in good time. It is clearly the strengthening of the preventive function of the security system that is becoming decisive today.

We welcome the fact that this attitude is already making tangible progress in the United Nations, as illustrated by the elaboration of the Declaration on the Enhancement of the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations and the progress made in drafting a declaration on the prevention of international conflicts. We believe that such an attitude will ultimately lead to the establishment of a unified system of guarantees for collective security in the modern world. In this connection, we regard as worthy of attention the proposals for establishing under United Nations auspices a machinery to monitor the military situation in areas of conflict, for making broader use of the institution of military observers and United Nations

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

peace-keeping forces, for setting up a multilateral United Nations centre to reduce the danger of war, and for establishing direct relations between the United Nations, the permanent members of the Security Council and the Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The vital interests of the security of States are also closely bound up with the resolution of world economic problems. The growing trends towards unequal development and unequal economic exchanges threaten global security, inasmuch as they cause an exacerbation of underdevelopment, foreign debt and other economic factors that increase international tension.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

The universal nature of the world economy and the interdependence of all participants in the international division of labour require the unification of efforts for the purpose of ensuring international economic security.

We proceed from the premise that equal economic security must be achieved through the restructuring of international economic relations, including currency and financial relations, on a footing of equality and on a democratic basis, in the interests of all States, including the developing countries, with the establishment of a new international economic order and the elimination of underdevelopment under conditions of a comprehensive and just solution of foreign-debt problems.

In other words, international economic relations must be liberated from everything that weighs them down, prevents the establishment of equal economic co-operation and causes increased tensions and destabilization, which spread from the economic sphere into other spheres of relations between States.

An important contribution to the achievement of these purposes would be made if the funds freed as a result of genuine disarmament were transferred to the needs of social and economic development. In this connection, we believe, it is necessary to pay constant attention to the specific development of the conclusions arrived at by the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, including the resolution of questions connected with the establishment of appropriate international machinery and with the problems involved in the conversion of industrial facilities from military to peaceful purposes.

The establishment of a system of comprehensive security would also be helped by broad and truly equal co-operation by States in the social, humanitarian and human-rights spheres. We believe that such co-operation should be aimed at the full implementation of the basic human rights to life and work, of every person's political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights in their totality and

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

interrelationship, while maintaining respect for the sovereignty of States, and the eradication of all forms of discrimination - apartheid, racism, nationalism and chauvinism - and war propaganda.

We believe that particular attention must be given to measures designed to halt blatant mass violations of human rights, which harm relations between States and can threaten international security.

We favour an extensive international dialogue on all these problems at a global level and as part of a European-wide process.

An indispensable condition for international security and the development of civilization is the protection of the environment, both nationally and internationally.

In nature and in the environment we see the clearest manifestations of the unity and interdependence of the modern world and all spheres of human activity.

Ecological factors continue to exert great influence on international relations and into the life of States threatening their security and stability. For that reason, the international community must establish a concept of international action in the ecological sphere that would reduce the negative effect of these factors to a minimum and would instead make the environment and environmental quality an important factor that would positively affect all other spheres of international relations.

The greatest threat to the environment is the existence and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons.

There are also many other forms of human activity constituting a danger to the environment, such as outdated industrial technology, the devastating development of natural resources, and desertification. Also urgent is the task of ecological adaptation of modern technology.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

Consequently there again arises an objective need to give some thought to the problem of international ecological security and questions of co-operation between States in this sphere.

We believe that international ecological security should be based on a rational attitude towards natural resources and their use, as well as on an international guarantee of the ecological interests of States. This, in our view, presupposes the the elaboration of a global strategy that would encompass the full spectrum of existing and anticipated ecological problems, concrete plans for their solution and international co-operation for implementing those plans.

Accordingly, we believe that the extensive international dialogue started at the United Nations should be continued and intensified in all appropriate bodies on all of the questions involved.

It is precisely in this spirit that we have summarized our thoughts and ideas in the draft resolution presented today to the Secretariat for consideration as an official document of the First Committee.

That draft is a direct appeal for a broad, constructive and non-confrontational international dialogue on problems relating to the security of States, of individual regions and of the whole international community and for their practical solution.

It is our conviction that such a discussion should lead to a new and realistic look at many important questions of current international affairs in their interrelationships and to the intensification of equal and mutually profitable interaction between States in all spheres of international life, to the heightening of the role and effectiveness of the United Nations as a universal guarantor of general security.

I wish to reaffirm that we are fully open to the views of all Member States and ready to co-operate closely with all delegations in order to reach agreement on

(Mrs. Toure, Mali)

a constructive text for a draft resolution on this important question and to ensure its adoption by consensus.

Mrs. TOURE (Mali) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the delegation of Mali I wish to congratulate you, Sir, most sincerely on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. The outstanding way in which you have conducted our work confirms that you are a man of great political and diplomatic experience, qualities which guided the Committee in its choice.

These qualities enabled us in the first phase of our work to keep up with our work schedule and produce documents that, if adopted by the General Assembly and put into effect by Member States, would enable the international community to attain one of its main objectives: peace through disarmament.

My delegation wishes to include the other officers of the Committee in these congratulations.

The Charter of the United Nations calls upon Member States to join forces in order "to maintain international peace and security". The United Nations, created at the end of the Second World War to prevent and remove any threat to international peace and security, has a responsibility with regard to the steps to be taken in order to attain this paramount objective. To enable the United Nations to discharge its duty, Member States must refrain from creating conflict situations by maintaining with one another relations based on political, legal, economic and social principles.

(Mrs. Toure, Mali)

From the political standpoint, we need respect for the equality, sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States; non-interference in the internal affairs of States; the pacific settlement of disputes; and peaceful coexistence. All these can, to a very great extent, establish a climate of peace and confidence in international relations. However, focal points of tension that unfortunately exist here and there, have, as their deep-rooted causes, the violation of those sacred principles, which are enshrined both in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

From the legal point of view, respect for the equality of the rights of peoples and their right to self-determination, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms are absolute imperatives for the strengthening of collective security.

However, 42 years after the adoption of the Charter, the international community has been powerlessly witnessing mass violations of human rights throughout the world, particularly in southern Africa, where the odious system of apartheid, the occupation of Namibia and continued aggression against the front-line States foster hot-beds of tension that pose a dangerous threat to international peace and security.

From the economic standpoint, international co-operation based on equality and mutual advantage constitutes the most appropriate means of emerging from the present world economic crisis, which, if not settled promptly, will not only deteriorate but continue to be a serious threat to international peace and security. Indeed, there is an ever increasing need to reorganize all the structures of the world economy in order to establish a new international economic order based on justice, equity, equality and mutual interest.

Moreover, the deterioration in the international economic situation and the increasing disparity between North and South, one of the consequences of which

(Mrs. Toure, Mali)

is the external debt crisis, are not conducive to the strengthening of international security. The solution to this question, that could come through the holding of an international conference on money and finance, would also foster a climate of greater confidence in international economic relations.

And, finally, from the social point of view, the international community should recognize that each people has the right to choose freely the socio-political and educational system that is in keeping with its traditions and is adapted to its way of life.

Problems of health, education, youth and well-being arise from the ethics of each people and should not be subject to unilateral economic, coercive and discriminatory pressures or practices.

For its part, the Government of the Republic of Mali, in acceding to the United Nations Charter and the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, has only confirmed an external policy that is an integral part of its ethics because Mali is a hinge between the Arab berber world and sub-tropical Africa. This unusual geographical situation has enabled Mali to adopt an external policy in keeping with the deep-rooted aspirations of its people and has enabled it to live in peace and tranquility with the other side while, at the same, learning much from its differences and its experience.

This external policy is based essentially on principles that are written into its Constitution and that have recently been confirmed in its Charter of National Orientation and the Conduct of Public Life. These include respect for the equality, sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States; non-interference in the internal affairs of others States; dynamic and unswerving non-alignment; the peaceful settlement of disputes; positive good neighbourliness; and economic co-operation based on mutual respect and interest.

(Mrs. Toure, Mali)

That means that, faithful to the international commitments it has freely entered into, Mali respects the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, within the limits of its field of action.

Our Committee has just adopted and recommended to the General Assembly 63 draft resolutions, 25 of which have been adopted without a vote, dealing with questions that concern the international community because they range from the cessation of the arms race and nuclear testing to conventional disarmament and the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. For my delegation, that means that the political will exists among Member States to attain the objective that we are all striving towards, namely, to live in a world of peace, security and justice: in a world free from the threat and the use of force. In proclaiming 1986 the International Year for Peace, in resolution 40/10 of 11 December 1985, the General Assembly implied that it was necessary to prepare mankind to live in peace because the establishment of peace requires the constant will to promote among peoples a better understanding, co-operation, dialogue and mutual confidence. The First Committee, entrusted with political, disarmament and security questions, has a responsibility in this endeavour and my delegation expresses the wish that the draft resolutions we are preparing will take account of these elements and that, in so far as possible, they will be adopted by consensus.

My delegation has ascertained that the major decisions on which we have to take decisions are not taken by consensus because of the misgivings and fears of some delegations. It is to be hoped that in the very near future the substance of draft resolutions that call for consensus - and that in our view convey the essence of the aspirations of the international community - will meet with the approval of all so that the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter will be fully implemented.

(Mrs. Toure, Mali)

The international community should not neglect any constructive means of achieving the aim of strengthening international peace and security, as well as the security of individual States. Today mankind is at a crossroads in history. Only respect for the principles and purposes set forth in the Charter of the United Nations could help us make the proper choice between the two possibilities open to us: increasing injustice and inequality, denying human rights, enhancing the arms race and the nuclear threat, or building a world of peace and well-being for all.

The improvement of the international situation, especially from the point of view just referred to by my delegation, is a duty incumbent upon each of us, but above all it is a special responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council. Indeed, they must take all the measures necessary to prevent a further deterioration in the international situation by using, inter alia and effectively, the means that are set forth in the Charter because one of the deep-lying causes of the present crisis and of the threat to peace may be found in a certain disregard for the principles and purposes of the Charter.

(Mrs. Toure, Mali)

Yet, we have reason to hope that, if it is carried out with the clear political will we are now seeing, the dialogue between the two super-Powers will herald new prospects of mutual trust, the prelude to détente in the international climate. The news from Geneva, Moscow and Washington justifies that hope.

The better future we so fervently desire will relegate to a never-to-be-repeated past unjust wars, interference in the internal affairs of other States, overt aggression against the peoples of independent States, the odious system of apartheid, inequality in international economic relations and the massive violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany): At the outset, Sir, I wish to express our appreciation for the elegant and efficient way in which you have been conducting the work of this Committee; we look forward to co-operating with you very closely in this final phase of the Committee's deliberations as well.

My delegation wishes to present the position of the Federal Republic of Germany on agenda items 71 to 73, which deal with international security questions. My remarks are in addition to those made in this Committee by the representative of Denmark on 19 November on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community.

The debate on international security questions traditionally focuses on the Charter of the United Nations and, more specifically, on how the role of the Charter in maintaining international peace and security can be strengthened. Maintaining international peace and security is the paramount task of the United Nations, as is set forth in the very first Article of the Charter.

The Charter defines international peace in a broad way: it proscribes resorting to any form of war as a means of policy; it demands that all Members refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal
Republic of Germany)

political independence of any State; and it calls for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means so that international peace and security and justice may not be endangered.

The maintenance of international peace and security based on the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter is also the foundation of the foreign and security policy of the Federal Republic of Germany. At the same time it is the guiding principle of our active participation in the work of the United Nations.

The growing interdependence of States, of which we are all aware, inevitably affects international peace and security. Our goals can no longer be achieved in an autonomous way. No State should try to guarantee its own security at the expense of that of other States. There is an urgent need for international co-operation, especially in this field, a need which underlines the growing importance of the United Nations. The Federal Republic of Germany is ready to participate actively, constructively and realistically in the task of fulfilling this primary purpose of the United Nations: the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

We have consistently supported all efforts to strengthen the United Nations, in particular its indispensable role in safeguarding peace and security and promoting international co-operation. We welcome any concrete proposal which serves that purpose. In view of the clear structure of our Organization, we feel, however, that new proposals should be dealt with in the appropriate United Nations bodies. The fact that most issues on the agenda of the United Nations are in some way relevant to international peace and security should not lead to the conclusion that the First Committee, notwithstanding its mandate to deal with questions of disarmament and related questions of international security, should discuss other issues on which there is far more expertise in other bodies.

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal
Republic of Germany)

In keeping with the mandate of this Committee let me first make some remarks on the present situation in matters of international security as we see it, and then point out some fields in which the First Committee could, and we think should, consider concrete measures.

When we take stock of the conduct of States in the framework established by the Charter, we realize that, in spite of the verbal adherence of all States Members of the Nations to the principles set out in the Charter, the practical policies of States do not always conform to those principles. Thus, they create a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The world is still full of wars in which people suffer and die. In several areas of the world, the threat or use of military power has not subsided, the invasion and occupation of countries against the will of their peoples and in contradiction to relevant resolutions of the General Assembly continue. Peaceful means are not used sufficiently to solve regional conflicts.

Against that background, the inherent right of individual and collective self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter remains a crucial element of international peace and security and a basis on which our efforts have to proceed. My country has embedded its defence in the framework of the North Atlantic alliance, which is of a purely defensive nature. Its paramount goal is to prevent war in any form, conventional or nuclear.

As the use of military forces can be justified only by the right to defence, those forces should be structured and deployed in a way that is suitable exclusively for defensive purposes. Only defensive strategies are legitimate. The structure of the forces and the strategy of the North Atlantic alliance correspond to that requirement. The world would become a safer place if that requirement were

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal
Republic of Germany)

universally applied. In that context we have noted with great interest recent statements by General Secretary Gorbachev, which seem to reflect a new thinking.

As I stated before, autonomous efforts are no longer sufficient for safeguarding peace and security. Co-operative solutions should play an ever increasing role. Particularly in the United Nations we should try to find co-operative solutions to as many security-related issues as possible. East and West can only gain through co-operation, whereas through confrontation they can entirely deprive themselves of progress.

We are of the firm conviction that as a first step new co-operative security structures could be created by the two super-Powers to the benefit of all States. We feel there are ample opportunities for co-operative solutions, first of all in the field of disarmament and arms control. Our aim should be to reach a stable military balance at the lowest possible level of forces. Imbalances should be removed by eliminating excessive forces. Disarmament and arms control agreements could thus contribute to strengthening stability and reducing the risk of war.

Measures which enhance transparency and build confidence serve the same purpose. At an earlier stage, my delegation set forth in detail in this Committee its position on disarmament issues, so I can limit myself to the present brief remarks. Let me add, however, that we look forward to a verifiable agreement on the elimination of all United States and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles. Such an agreement will serve as a very encouraging precedent for further efforts in the field of disarmament and arms control

Disarmament and arms control agreements will not, of course, eliminate the causes of conflict, but they can contribute to reducing tension and to creating a climate conducive to the settling of conflicts by political means. We shall be able to achieve significant progress in the field of international security only if

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal
Republic of Germany)

we strengthen the numerous existing comprehensive security structures geared to the maintenance of peace and the prevention of war and to dialogue, confidence-building and co-operation. What needs to be emphasized is the importance of observing international law and the existing commitments of States, and of living up to them. Their implementation must be secured not only in international relations but also in internal affairs. Security without respect for human rights is inconceivable. To substitute new slogans for old ones will only deflect attention from the issue of the lack of implementation of existing commitments.

(Mr. Schmitt, Federal Republic
of Germany)

The settlement of conflicts by political means can be fostered by a regional approach adapted to the given situation in each case. Regional organizations can play a significant role in this context. In Europe, the European Community has set an example for ever closer co-operation and, indeed, integration. The process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) process, in which nearly all European countries, as well as the United States and Canada, participate, has promoted co-operation on a broader basis.

It is the object of such co-operation to build a European peace order that is not founded on the supremacy, claims to predominance or security privileges of one side, but on the peaceful accommodation of the interests of all concerned and that will, in the long term, also make it possible to overcome the implications of contrasting social and political systems and of the division of Europe. This approach could serve as a model.

Of course, the role of the United Nations in the settlement of regional conflicts goes of course, far beyond the mandate of this Committee. Let me just mention here the central role of the Security Council in this matter. My country, which is at present a member of that organ of the United Nations, is joining in efforts to find ways to end military conflicts and to promote peaceful solutions. Let me also pay a tribute to the Secretary-General and his assistants in their tireless efforts of mediation and quiet diplomacy. In fact, the Secretary-General remains, as he has said himself, the only channel of communication between the parties involved in a number of conflicts which I do not have to list here. Therefore, his role should be strengthened. In particular, he should be provided with the means necessary for preventive diplomacy.

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal Republic
of Germany)

Let me summarize. In the Charter we have the principles on which international peace and security should be based and the institutional framework for all measures designed to bring about peace and security. We are all agreed on this. What we have to do is to bridge the gap which still exists between these principles and the realities of international relations. Let us build that bridge stone by stone. Let us talk about concrete measures. They may appear modest in themselves but, taken together, they can carry us forward. Let us begin now.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The representative of Denmark to the United Nations, speaking yesterday as the Chairman of the Twelve, expressed the common view of the member States of the European Community on the questions of international security. We therefore endorse that view. Today my delegation would merely wish to add a few comments on these particularly important questions because they are directly related to our common juridical basis, namely, the Charter of the United Nations.

There is an awareness in the international community of the need to strengthen the conditions for international security. There are numerous examples of this. The first, mentioned recently, is, of course, the prospect of a summit meeting between the United States and the USSR together with the signing of a treaty on the elimination of their intermediate-range nuclear forces. It is, of course, too early to judge the real effects of that meeting, but we shall evaluate them when the time comes, viewing them from the viewpoint of France, and more generally from that of Europe.

The time of the bipolar world is over. The two greatest Powers cannot determine, on their own, the course of international relations. Their assistance

(Mr. Blanc, France)

is necessary, essential, indeed paramount in certain cases, but it cannot be sufficient in itself. In different ways each country is guided in its own way to make its contribution to the permanent work of the strengthening of international security in all its aspects.

Each one is of course entitled to have an opinion on the question, and therefore the debate should be open. For the sake of clarity it should be pointed out that, according to us, it is not possible - indeed, it is not desirable - to let it be thought that through some sort of mutation - some sort of swinging back and forth - it is possible today to reorganize the conditions for security on a new, so-called comprehensive and general basis. The only way to make real progress, in our opinion, is to strengthen the Charter of the United Nations, beginning with the actual behaviour of the States which have subscribed to it and which, therefore, have to respect and comply with it, in all its provision.

Today, an attempt is being made to emphasize the need to develop multilateralism. Indeed, who is against multilateralism? It is, by definition, the raison d'être of the United Nations. The real difficulty is to make of it an effective practice adapted to the stakes of the moment. Need I remind the Committee that France is in favour of strengthening the role and effectiveness of the organs of the United Nations? The great debate in which the present international situation invites us to engage cannot, in any event, lead us to complacency, whether with regard to the past or to the future.

If we consider recent developments, we are bound to observe the persistence of serious situations which no one can overlook and which cannot be settled through fine words or by decree.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

The alarming persistence of serious regional conflicts leads us to observe that in Cambodia, Afghanistan, the Near East, southern Africa and the Iran-Iraq conflict, no solution has yet been found. The only positive sign perhaps is that the central role of the United Nations is better recognized in certain instances, especially that of the Security Council. But this progress has yet to be confirmed in deeds and made general. In any case, this is one of the first directions to take.

But in this Committee I must call attention to the great amount of work that remains to be done in regard to disarmament, where it could be said, to some extent, that things have only begun. It is too early - indeed much too early - to proclaim victory.

The improvement in relations between East and West opens up favourable prospects: this no one denies. But two years after the Geneva summit meeting we cannot help noting that the serious work of dealing with the main danger - the overabundance of offensive strategic weapons possessed by the two greatest Powers - has not even begun. This is another priority area in which the action of the two greatest Powers is both urgent and essential.

In our view, the real programme for strengthening international security is already a matter of immediate urgency and depends upon the concrete action of States. It is called the settlement of conflicts, the strengthening of international solidarity, and effective and verifiable measures of disarmament. So we always come back to the fundamental principles of the Charter. Thus, today we do not need any new rules, new priorities, or "new thinking". What we need is the implementation of and compliance with the effective principles and mechanisms.

The preceding considerations determine our attitude towards the proposals made by the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries aimed at establishing a general system of international peace and security, on which I should like to speak of now.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

This proposal can be analysed from two standpoints: that of the Soviet Union and that of the United Nations.

An element of the Soviet Union's policy towards the United Nations, the many recent statements by responsible leaders in the USSR, including those at the highest level, must be viewed with great interest. After years - indeed, decades - of disagreement on highly important points connected with the basic functioning of the United Nations, we now hear sometimes-new language that gives us cause to hope that fundamental disagreements, some inherited from the long-ago cold-war period, are things of the past. France welcomes this will to co-operate that has been clearly evidenced by one of the most highly armed Powers, a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council. We are prepared, for our part, to continue our consultations with the USSR on every point that country has raised in recent statements and to study its proposals in the appropriate United Nations bodies. The dialogue and co-operation between France and the USSR within the United Nations is of long date, and it is fruitful and useful for the full implementation of the Charter. It has never been questioned, even at the most difficult of times. We hope that it will go on under the best possible conditions.

Considering things from the viewpoint of the well-understood interests of the United Nations, we must say that the action proposed by the Soviet Union gives rise to three basic objections, which I should now like to clarify.

First, when it comes to taking into account the inherent complexities of the international situation, the Soviet proposal tends to over-simplify. In particular, we are thinking of the notion that the comprehensive system of international peace and security should go hand in hand with the elimination of nuclear weapons. That correlation once again tends to put in question the principle of deterrence. My country's view in this regard is well known, and I do

(Mr. Blanc, France)

not wish to dwell upon it today. Without entering into a detailed discussion on the matter, I would state that France abides by existing facts and the pertinent provisions of the United Nations Charter, namely, Articles 2, 51 and 52, which retain all their validity.

Secondly, and conversely, where there is a need to be simple the Soviet proposal tends to complicate things unnecessarily. Various Soviet statements have referred to the virtues of dialogue, the effects of interdependence and the need to institutionalize international co-operation in all areas. Judging from the only information available so far, the draft text would propose a series of broad and vague - indeed, indefinable - formulas that do not correspond to the text of the Charter and, in fact, tend to weaken and blur the central role of the United Nations. From what we have read so far, we feel it is important to recall that the non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes are Charter obligations, not so-called reasonable solutions or only some measures among others. Similarly, the insistence on the role of States in the maintenance of international peace and security tends to overshadow the primary responsibility in this area, which the Charter has entrusted to the Security Council. In spite of statements by the sponsors of this text, which has not yet been submitted officially, in which they assure us of their wish to confirm the Charter, experience has long since taught that such attempts to paraphrase or complement the Charter lead to weakening it and altering its meaning or balance.

Lastly, and directly to the point, we cannot subscribe to the method proposed by the USSR to establish such a comprehensive system. Recourse to a group of experts would be tantamount to isolating the debate on international security, in which each country has a role to play in full sovereignty, and to entrust it to a few experts proceeding on the basis of preconceived ideas. In the name of the very rules of operation of the United Nations, of the necessary transparency and of the

(Mr. Blanc, France)

gravity of the stakes, such an action does not seem acceptable. Indeed, what experts would these be, and to do what? The best available groups of experts are the existing United Nations bodies.

The Soviet Union would like to change the United Nations from top to bottom at one stroke. We, for our part, proceed from a diametrically opposite point. As the living expression of a particularly complex international society, which no one today is able to dominate, the United Nations must gradually strengthen its role in the maintenance of international peace and security through the rigorous and daily compliance of all Member States with the Charter.

Nothing but the Charter, but the whole Charter: 40 years after its adoption, the founding text of today's international society still has its entire future ahead of it and deserves, as it did in the beginning, a total and confident adherence sufficient unto itself.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform representatives that at this afternoon's meeting the following delegations have inscribed their names to speak: Morocco, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Bulgaria and Ghana.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.