

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
FORTY-SECOND SESSION



FIRST COMMITTEE
54th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 24 November 1987
at 10 a.m.
New York

*Official Records**

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 54th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADETIO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

CONTENTS

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

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2 750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/42/PV.54
10 December 1987
ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 71, 72 AND 73 (continued)

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

Mr. OLZVOY (Mongolia): It was last year that the socialist countries, including my own, advanced an extremely important initiative in the United Nations by inviting all the other members of the world community to embark upon a broad dialogue designed to lay the foundations for a comprehensive system of international peace and security. That initiative was the result of a scientific and realistic assessment of the contemporary world situation on the basis of acknowledgement of the realities of the nuclear and space era. The socialist countries proceeded from the fact that at the present time the stockpiles of weapons and the arsenals of the most barbarous means of mass annihilation have reached such absurd dimensions that they pose a real threat to the very existence of mankind. Indeed they threaten the entire human race because the nuclear threat entails global ramifications which can be neither limited to national boundaries nor restricted to ideological differences.

Our proposal constitutes an invitation to all, without exception, to look beyond their own narrow class interests and to revolutionize their political thinking with a view to fulfilling their own share of the responsibility to mankind as a whole in enhancing comprehensive security for all through disarmament. It also represents an invitation to join in determined action designed to achieve global peace and security, an invitation to work together in the spirit of a new political thinking based upon recognition of the realities of the nuclear and space age.

Mr. Olzvoy, Mongolia)

In advancing this initiative, we have shown confidence in the wisdom of our neighbours who share the same planet and in their ability to realize the imperative need to coexist and collaborate in common efforts designed to rid mankind of the fears of a general nuclear catastrophe. There are, of course, the other common problems facing mankind which require joint efforts and solutions - the problems of health protection, food and energy supply, environment preservation, peaceful exploration of outer space and so on. In saying this, I should like to underline that the peoples and nations of the world have already acquired experience in tackling global issues. The establishment of our Organization in itself represents an expression of humanity's aspirations to preserve peace on earth and to co-operate in peace and harmony.

The founding fathers of the United Nations set an example of how to overcome the existing stereotypes and work together despite their ideological differences. Our initiative is based on that historical experience and addressed, inter alia, to those who bear responsibility for the conduct of international affairs. We appeal to them to help in strengthening trust among States on the basis of overcoming the confrontational approaches and consolidating the norms of civilized conduct in international relations.

As one of the sponsors of the proposed initiative on the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, the Mongolian People's Republic submits that in today's interdependent world all States, in defining priorities for foreign policies and military doctrines, should proceed from the premise that in the nuclear age peaceful coexistence among nations has become not only a necessity but also a prerequisite for the survival of mankind.

(Mr. Olzvoy, Mongolia)

In their Political Declaration of September 1986 the non-aligned countries pointed out that it was

"imperative that States abandon the dangerous goal of unilateral security through armament and embrace the objective of common security through disarmament". (A/41/697, annex, p. 23),

The Declaration, I believe, eloquently and accurately expresses the main idea that the concepts of security and disarmament are destined to go hand in hand and, what is more important, that security can only be common and universal. Security cannot be ensured by military means. Universal recognition of this important axiom and implementation of the necessary action in this direction have become a pressing priority of today.

There is hardly any need to mention that in its Charter the United Nations proclaims the principal objective to be "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". But my delegation is of the opinion that under present conditions this objective acquires a new meaning; it takes on a new content. It requires that new ways and means should be sought in order to attain it. The purpose of the proposed comprehensive system of international peace and security is to enhance the effectiveness of the collective security system through the strict implementation by all States of the provisions of the Charter and to build a nuclear-weapon-free world, free from violence and hatred, distrust and suspicion. The right of every nation to peace and freedom must be recognized and respected throughout the world. The use or threat of the use of force must be abandoned. International co-operation for the solution of the urgent problems confronting mankind should be strengthened and expanded.

(Mr. Olzvoy, Mongolia)

The advancement of the idea for the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security is intended to enhance further the role of the United Nations as the political guarantor of universal security. As we understand it, the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world is based on the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. It is aimed at full implementation of the Charter provisions in the conditions of the nuclear and space age. In the opinion of my delegation, the time is ripe for thinking together and acting together within the framework of our Organization to take effective measures to strengthen the foundations of the security of all nations. With this in mind, we whole-heartedly support the ideas and proposals put forward by Comrade Gorbachev, in his article "The Reality and Guarantees of a Safe World", to use the United Nations and its bodies effectively in moving towards a world based on universal security for all.

It is no wonder that from time to time, an international organization or a nation critically assesses its activities and behaviour in order to be more responsive to growing challenges of a given historical period. Therefore, the socialist countries' proposal can be qualified as a call for such a review with the purpose of either updating or adjusting policies and strategies of peace and security.

(Mr. Olzvoy, Mongolia)

As a concept, security is not a dogma. It should be constantly reviewed and enriched in its scope and dimensions. From this point of view, the 1986 Delhi Declaration signed by Soviet and Indian leaders is, in our opinion, a significant step forward in the understanding of core issues related to national and international security in our interdependent world.

Mongolia fully shares the conviction, embodied in the Delhi Declaration on principles for a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world, that "the world is one and its security is indivisible". Proceeding from this concept, India and the Soviet Union clearly demonstrated their awareness of a common responsibility for the destinies of mankind and expressed their determination to pave the way to a nuclear-weapon-free civilization. We regard the principles of the Delhi Declaration as a vivid example of the new political thinking. We call upon all States to join India and the Soviet Union in a common commitment to and a a common search for a safer and more just world. To that end, States should work in close co-operation with each other to remove the threat of war and to expand peaceful co-operation in all fields.

One of the important purposes of the socialist countries' proposal is to develop an effective multilateral dialogue in the United Nations and other forums with a view to comparing and bridging different concepts, as well as to elaborate commonly applicable ways and means of ensuring comprehensive security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, bearing in mind the realities of today's world situation. We believe that only collective wisdom and action will produce a generally acceptable concept of equal security for all. On the basis of such a concept, nations can create favourable conditions for the full and permanent exercise by all peoples and individuals of their right to live in peace.

(Mr. Olzvoy, Mongolia)

As we understand it, genuine security for each and every nation should embrace all the spheres of international relations, in particular the political, military, economic, ecological and socio-humanitarian aspects. More than once the United Nations has recognized that disarmament, security and development are closely interrelated. Indeed, one of those elements cannot exist without the others. It is only through disarmament that equal and mutual security can be attained. Furthermore, disarmament and security are the sine qua non for a rapid socio-economic development of all States.

We are therefore of the opinion that questions of international security should be handled with due regard for their interrelationship.

We hold the view that the equal and universal security of the nations of the world cannot be ensured or guaranteed without the reduction and elimination of existing arsenals of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction. Disarmament, and first and foremost nuclear disarmament, constitutes the very foundation of the future edifice of international security. In this context, Mongolia attaches exceptionally great significance to the bilateral and multilateral disarmament negotiations currently under way. The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic and the Mongolian people warmly welcome the forthcoming summit meeting of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, with the President of the United States of America, Mr. Ronald Reagan, at which they are expected to sign a historic treaty on the elimination of two categories of nuclear weapons and to discuss crucial disarmament issues. We believe that the signing of that treaty will mark the beginning of a nuclear disarmament process. We hope that it will lead to further important agreements in the field of nuclear disarmament. The Mongolian delegation calls upon all countries to join in these and other efforts that we hope will bring mankind to a non-nuclear-weapon and non-violent age.

(Mr. Olzvoy, Mongolia)

In this context, my delegation believes that today, as never before, it is necessary for world leaders to display new and responsible political thinking. Such a mode of thinking should not only acknowledge the devastating dangers and catastrophic consequences of a nuclear war but also demonstrate, above all, a political will and honest readiness to undertake negotiations and conclude agreements based on the principles of equity and equal security. It is our expectation that the forthcoming Soviet-United States summit meeting will be held in precisely that spirit.

It is worth mentioning that during this General Assembly session all of us have been witnessing encouraging developments which have occurred not only outside but also inside our Organization. My delegation regards the recent adoption by the General Assembly of the Declaration on the Enhancement of the Effectiveness of the Principle of Refraining from the Threat or Use of Force in International Relations as one such welcome event. Strict observance by all States of the provisions of that important Declaration will undoubtedly contribute to our common endeavours for universal security.

The Declaration proclaims, inter alia, that:

"States should also promote bilateral and regional co-operation as one of the important means to enhance the effectiveness of the principle of refraining from the threat or use of force in international relations"
(A/42/766, Annex, p. 7).

It is most relevant to our Asian and Pacific region, where regional and subregional efforts to promote peace and security are to be redoubled and co-ordinated by means of collective action. Mongolia therefore attaches special importance to the strengthening of peace and security in this vast region, through exclusion of the threat or use of force from international relations on a regional level. By way of example, I wish to refer to Mongolia's 1981 proposal for

(Mr. Olzvoy, Mongolia)

concluding a convention on non-aggression and the non-use of force in relations between the States of Asia and the Pacific. The further advancement of this proposal testifies to my country's willingness to co-operate with all States of Asia and the Pacific in order to have our region integrated into the process of establishing a world free from nuclear weapons and violence.

In conclusion, may I express my delegation's hope that the current discussion of international security and related matters will prove to be an important stage in the elaboration of the concept of a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

Mr. BEJO (Albania): The Albanian delegation attaches special importance to the deliberations on the agenda item entitled "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region", which the First Committee is now considering. This is so for two important reasons: first, the People's Socialist Republic of Albania is a Mediterranean country, and developments in the region must inevitably be of interest to it, because in one way or another they influence all Mediterranean countries. Secondly, the situation in the region continues to be tense; new problems are being added to existing ones, contributing to the further complication and exacerbation of that situation.

The great and serious problems concerning the Mediterranean were not created by themselves or by the Mediterranean peoples, which have historically aspired and worked to ensure that that sea, geographically linking three continents, will become a basin of communication, co-operation and peace. Their wish has been and still is that Mediterranean waterways should carry good things for the region's peoples, and for other peoples as well, and that peaceful boats should navigate those waterways.

But regrettably we are compelled to state that the Mediterranean is far from meeting the aspirations of its peoples. The basin has been turned into a sea saturated with warships which, with their guns, rockets and marines, threaten the coastal countries and which are at the same time an obstacle to peaceful communication. On more than one occasion guns and rockets have been fired and planes have taken off from those warships, causing destruction and death in countries of the basin.

That unwished-for picture in the Mediterranean region has been created by the presence of the super-Powers' fleets and by their imperialist rivalry to control and exploit the region as a way of expanding into the countries concerned and

(Mr. Bejo, Albania)

beyond the continent. The increased military and political presence of the United States and the Soviet Union in those waterways amounts to an expression of their policy and hegemonistic strategy. With their heightened aim to dominate in the Mediterranean region, we are witnessing an expansion of their military presence, intended to achieve their imperialist ambitions, threaten and subjugate peoples which defend freedom and independence and which hamper their interests and are considered by them a "threat" to those interests. That military presence, which has become a permanent factor, bears upon all political developments in the region and has turned into a source of all the conflicts and local wars being waged there.

There is no doubt that it is the Mediterranean countries which feel more than any others the impact of the escalation of the aggressive military activities of the super-Powers in the region. But other European peoples cannot feel at ease either, when such a huge military arsenal is deployed at their southern gates, when in the vicinity of their waters and ports United States and Soviet warships move far and wide in a provocative way, sometimes in demonstrations of force, sometimes for "friendly" visits and sometimes for subversive activities. Another factor must be taken into account when we consider the situation in the region: the local conflicts and grave wars around the region - such as those in the Middle East, the Gulf and elsewhere - which aggravate the situation, making it more sensitive and explosive, with often unforeseeable repercussions.

The course of developments in the Mediterranean leaves no room for the peaceful illusions spread and nourished by the machinery of imperialist propaganda. The aims behind that propaganda are crystal-clear. But we think it proper to reiterate that not even the most optimistic or unrealistic people can reconcile itself to, or be misled by, that repetitious demagoguery. The Mediterranean peoples are well aware of what they want, and they know how to evaluate the reality

(Mr. Bejo, Albania)

of things. Thus they cannot take at face value the statements and initiatives on peace and security in the Mediterranean region being put forward by those who have themselves filled the basin with their war fleets and military bases, which carry out frenzied military activities, seriously threatening peace and security there.

The People's Socialist Republic of Albania, as a Mediterranean country, is following with great concern the developments in the region and all questions linked with peace, security and sincere co-operation. It has continuously expressed its views and has taken principled and consistent stands, guided by good will and by a high interest in the defence of the independence and freedom not only of the Albanian people but of the other Mediterranean peoples as well. Albania has openly declared its stand against the presence of the military fleets of the super-Powers and their gunboat policies, and it has asked for their removal. As the leader of the Albanian people, Comrade Ramiz Alia, has stated,

"In the face of these new developments, opposition to the military presence, bases and fleets of the super-Powers in the Mediterranean has become even more urgent and indispensable. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania declared long ago that their removal constitutes the first decisive condition for turning the Mediterranean into a sea of peace, communication and civilization. Neither the United States of America nor the Soviet Union should be allowed to kindle the flames of war in the Mediterranean, to threaten the peaceful life, independence and national sovereignty of the countries on the shores of that basin".

By defending their freedom and independence, not allowing a single foreign soldier or base in their territory, not granting port facilities to any foreign military ships on their shores or in their ports, Albanians are demonstrating in

(Mr. Bejo, Albania)

deeds their interest in peace and security in the Mediterranean. We favour the development and further expansion of friendly relations with all Mediterranean countries and peoples.

In recent years, in a spirit engendered by a common wish, exchanges between Albania and other Mediterranean countries have been further expanded in trade, culture and various other fields, and reciprocal visits of political personalities and scientists have helped our Mediterranean peoples to get better acquainted and to get closer to one another. The Mediterranean peoples, possessing an ancient history and civilization, share many things in common, and they can benefit one another not only in the economic field but in other fields of mutual interest as well.

In the future too, the People's Socialist Republic of Albania will pay due attention to and foster co-operation with other Mediterranean countries, thus making its contribution to strengthening the atmosphere of friendship and co-operation which is truly cherished by the Mediterranean peoples and which serves the interests of peace and security in the region and the world over.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The lively debate going on in the First Committee abounds in ideas and proposals relating to the question of a comprehensive system of security. The debate has included reflections on the fate of the world, on social choices and on the nature of international relations. Those reflections have been candid and honest and have not evaded complex issues or mutual concerns.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

It is also very important that our debate has not been side-tracked into mutual reproaches and recriminations, but that it has, rather, been aimed at a search for ways to bring different viewpoints closer together. We see it as part and parcel of the ongoing broad democratic dialogue in the world about ways to safeguard international security, a dialogue backed up with actual deeds and one that has therefore taken on a new quality.

Some important areas of close or even identical approaches to ensuring security for all have emerged. No one disputes the idea that comprehensive security is the right formula for survival in the nuclear-space era. That is a manifestation of the new thinking. Even today, it is being translated from the realm of political awareness into the practice of international relations.

We share the view expressed here about the significance of the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting, the hopes for which are rightly linked to a positive effect on the over-all situation on earth. The proposed agreement on the global elimination of Soviet and American medium- and shorter-range missiles will be the first step towards implementing the idea of security without reliance on nuclear weapons. Thousands of nuclear warheads will actually be eliminated, and, for the first time in history, the machinery for destroying armaments will be set in motion. That is undoubtedly in the interests of all States. We regard it as the beginning of a smooth, continuous movement in all areas of disarmament, one certain to stimulate progress in other areas involving international security for all. We intend to continue along this path in order to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction as a factor in world politics.

It appears to us that a broad international dialogue is an essential step towards a conceptual summarizing of new ideas and proposals that would lead to a

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

new period of co-operation and interaction between countries in safeguarding comprehensive and equal security for all.

Security on our planet is not the restricted domain of some élite group militarily, politically and economically most-powerful States. Security can be built on such a basis today. What is needed is a decisive turn-around towards multilateralism. The world is literally saturated with diverse interests, and what is needed is to strike a balance among them that could serve as a foundation for comprehensive security and to work together for a radical improvement in the international situation.

The problem of security in today's world is not only global and multilateral but multifaceted as well. In other words, a safe world can be built only through joint efforts, by providing reliable guarantees of the non-use of violence in any of its forms and manifestations in all spheres of international relations.

The United Nations Charter is, of course, a basis for such collective actions by States. The United Nations also possesses appropriate machinery that could serve as a framework for carrying out such efforts. In short, the United Nations has all that is required to ensure reliable operation of a comprehensive system of international peace and security on the basis of a balance of interests among all States.

The task is now to see to it that the purposes and principles of the United Nations are translated into practice and that the United Nations machinery for maintaining international peace and security is used to the full extent. The security set forth in the United Nations Charter represents the sole system we have providing for interrelationship and interdependence among all the trends in international relations and the resultant need to tackle all problems.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

We note with satisfaction that when this question was discussed in the General Committee of the General Assembly at the forty-first session, the representative of the United Kingdom proposed adding to the concept of a comprehensive system of international security the word "peace," thus recognizing that this was an attempt to put into practice the concepts set forth in the United Nations Charter.

Various aspects of world affairs - military, political, economic, environmental and humanitarian - are dealt with in the United Nations. They are discussed in many bodies, in special committees and in groups. In this, however, there is a sense of an urgent need to pool that joint labour, a need to evolve a common conceptual approach geared to seeking out points of contact, consolidating them and developing them, rather than aimed at emphasizing differences. Until now, it must be said, there has been no such common study of security issues within the United Nations. The debate on a comprehensive system of international security would fill this void. In other words, we must work out, in the spirit of the United Nations, a collective concept of comprehensive security as a whole in the context of nuclear-space-age realities and to combat weakness of will with strength of thought, at the same time mobilizing it for concrete and practical actions.

The dialogue on a comprehensive system of international security is intended to broaden the approach to security and to remove mutual suspicions in all areas, and not only in the military and political areas. We are convinced that if, in the course of such a dialogue, the international community succeeds in working out a systematic approach to the gamut of interrelated security problems it will improve the outlook for achieving specific solutions in some areas of international affairs.

In this connection it is appropriate to quote the wise words of an outstanding political leader of this century, Charles de Gaulle, who, as far back as 1959, stated:

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

"The conditions in which our world exists call for a moral rapprochement and mutual benevolence among thinking people. The struggle of doctrines and interests that influence mankind in its process of transformation is taking on an ever more radical and comprehensive character, and this is more true today than ever before, at a time when gigantic means of destruction are ready to be set in motion at any moment everywhere on earth. In the face of that universal threat to the entire human race, the law of its survival - or is it an omen? - offers us all a way of salvation, namely, brotherhood. Man is the centre of everything. It is a question of his salvation."

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

I repeat: it was as far back as 1959 that de Gaulle spoke those words. Similar thoughts about the need for a comprehensive and systematic approach to the problem of security in today's world have been vividly expressed during the current session of the General Assembly. For instance, the Vice-Chancellor and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Genscher, said,

"On a global scale and in Europe we must create reliable systems for maintaining security on a co-operative basis, as well as mechanisms for the early detection and management of crises". (A/42/PV.10, p. 57)

There is indeed a clear need for such a system and such mechanisms, based, of course, on the United Nations Charter and established within its framework.

The sponsors of this initiative are not proposing some new hypothetical system of security. On the contrary, their purpose is to see to it that the system of international peace and security as provided for in the United Nations Charter, will start functioning effectively on the basis of joint efforts by all States. To achieve this there is, of course, no need to revise the United Nations Charter, either directly or indirectly.

At the same time, we cannot agree with formulations of the question that boil down to something like this: precisely because the United Nations Charter exists there is no need to do anything more. In fact, that is tantamount to canonizing the United Nations Charter, making it a kind of idol to worship on Sundays, while in practice following altogether different concepts on weekdays. Such an approach to the Charter is unacceptable, because it amounts to de facto revision of that document. We cannot agree to that, just as we cannot agree to the idea of breaking up or rewriting the United Nations Charter or even replacing it with something else.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

As the representative of Denmark, Mr. Bierring, said when he spoke in this Committee on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community,

"the drafters [of the Charter] concentrated their efforts on providing the

basic elements of a safe, secure and civilized world" (A/C.1/42/PV.49, p. 46)

A comprehensive system of international security must make full use of, and in some ways even resuscitate, the vast potential of this international Organization: to set in motion the fundamental elements of a secure world in all spheres without exception.

For us, the Charter is the living practice of relations among States, based not on the law of force but on the force of law and its pre-eminence. Of course, the road leading to that practice from the current absurd situation where the entire world has become a nuclear hostage is difficult and long. But it must be travelled, steadily and stage-by-stage, by reducing all armaments to the lowest possible level of reasonable sufficiency and by making military doctrines and the structure and deployment of armed forces and armaments strictly defensive in nature. We believe that this can and must be done even before the end of the twentieth century.

In fact, experience itself provides a convincing answer to the question whether or not work on the concept of comprehensive security is a philosophical exercise in futility. Comprehensive discussion and understanding of the prospects for the shift to a stable world are inseparable from practical deeds. We are convinced that as soon as the process of actual nuclear disarmament gets under way the United Nations should become decisively involved in safeguarding security in the military sphere and in making the search for that security truly multilateral. Here there is considerable untapped potential. Why, for example, should the Security Council not discuss problems of nuclear disarmament?

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Concrete action is required not only in the field of arms limitation and reduction but also in all other areas. We consider it necessary that the United Nations should specifically address conflict situations. The unanimity achieved in the Security Council on the question of quickly ending the Iran-Iraq conflict proves the feasibility of multilateral consensus decisions to settle such crises.

The new thinking does not shrink from any issues of international security. We are convinced that there are no crisis situations that could not be solved jointly, with the assistance of the United Nations. This applies to the situation around Afghanistan, to Central America, to Namibia and to other issues. Mutual understanding must be achieved in the awareness that only consistent implementation of the principle of preserving a balance of interests, rather than a desire to achieve one-sided transitory advantages, can lead to positive solutions. In other words, a dialogue on comprehensive international security involves both finding common approaches and producing generally acceptable recommendations on individual issues, in order to facilitate their solution through specific negotiations.

The factor of concurrent and parallel movement in various areas, such as the military, political, economic, environmental and humanitarian spheres, should serve to ensure that progress in one area will stimulate results in other areas. We are firmly convinced that the process of a joint multilateral search for generally acceptable conceptual views, with practical deeds in mind, is conducive to the democratization of the conduct of international affairs and to the involvement of all States, and the international community as a whole, in the process of making decisions on fundamental issues.

It is particularly important that the most vital and acute problems of security be given priority in multilateral discussions. It appears to us that dialogue on such problems should be substantive in nature. There can be no forced

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

solutions, no excessive haste, no categorical imperatives. It is necessary to work consistently for consensus and to travel one's sector of the road, step by step, moving towards one another.

The trend towards expanding the sphere of consensus decisions is emerging in an ever clearer way. I need refer only to the results of this Committee's consideration of disarmament issues, during which, as is well known, 25 out of 63 draft resolutions and decisions received the unanimous support of all States. It is important that this positive trend come to cover a greater range of ideas and proposals coming from Member States and the Secretary-General. Among such ideas is the Secretary-General's proposal for the establishment within the United Nations of a multilateral military risk-reduction centre.

Our draft resolution, including its proposal on institutional forms for dialogue, was also prepared with consensus adoption in mind. We continue to believe that a group of experts would be one such useful form. In fact, we have not heard any particularly cogent argument against the idea of forming such a group. But since it was revealed in the course of discussions that some States have misgivings about whether such a group's decisions could be unbiased and that they are therefore not ready for its establishment, the sponsors of the draft resolution have decided not to press for the creation of such a group at this time. But we think it is important that the Secretary-General should examine possible involvement by outstanding political figures and scholars in a dialogue on comprehensive security; that would be consonant with his own ideas, as contained this year in his report on the work of the Organization.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

It stands to reason that, as in any new endeavour, there will be questions and that hopes and misgivings will be voiced. At the same time, and we know this from the experience of perestroika in our own country, there are forces that hamper the process. All this is probably inevitable in any new endeavour.

During the discussion the Soviet delegation also raised questions, and we were somewhat bewildered by some statements. Frankly, we cannot understand how the idea of an open and democratic dialogue on the problem of security can be questioned here in the United Nations, which is one of the most democratic of international organizations. Yet we did get the impression that it was being questioned. We would be glad to find out we were wrong.

We are also surprised at the diversity of opinions expressed by States and to hear some countries scoff sarcastically at democratic forms of conducting dialogue. For instance, nuances in the statements made by the sponsors of the proposal on a comprehensive system of international peace and security were noted, but different shades of opinion are only natural in any joint search for anything new. Here, they have been regarded as somehow a negative development. In my opinion, such an approach does not fit the concept of democratic discussion or, indeed, of democracy itself.

We are convinced that differences of opinion should not grow into polemics, with arguments designed to aggravate the situation. We have always considered, and quite rightly, that the respectable presentation of positions, even extreme positions, contributes to clarity and helps in better understanding the logic of one's opponents. An example of such a businesslike and respectful attitude towards the views of the other side was set by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, during her visit to the Soviet Union in April 1987, when she had occasion to express her views on television and in meetings with our

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

people. I should like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of the representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Birch, to that.

In our view, it is important to maintain the purpose-oriented character of the dialogue, to make it more specific, and to direct it towards a discussion of existing problems. We, for our part, do not claim to possess ultimate truth, and we stand ready to discuss any and all proposals and initiatives, whatever their origin. The logic of confrontation is alien to us when it is used to reject a proposal simply because it has been put forward by the other side. We are prepared to make a constructive contribution, together with all others, to the conceptual development and practical implementation of any thoughtful proposals.

We sincerely hope that prejudice and confrontational logic will be banished from United Nations activities once and for all. We attach great importance to this, for we view dialogue on comprehensive security as extremely important. Indeed, we regard it as a school for co-operation and interaction among States Members of the United Nations on a broad, democratic basis. For us, it is a kind of perestroika, or restructuring, and a development of glasnost as applied to international relations.

We trust that the current session of the General Assembly will adopt a decision in favour of continuing and promoting a productive and democratic dialogue on the question of a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): The review of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security provides the General Assembly with an opportunity to present its perception of the issues related to international security, to assess the situation in international relations and to point to ways and means for resolving the problems that beset the world today.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

The crossroads at which we have now arrived and the new vistas that are being opened for a positive development of international relations have made the United Nations an even more important forum for reaching agreement among the members of the international community on an equal footing and for democratic decision-making on all important issues concerning their common future.

First, concrete results in the field of nuclear disarmament are within our reach. The agreement in principle between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles provides realistic possibilities for taking a resolute forward step in the process of nuclear and conventional disarmament and represents an immediate contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security.

Equally encouraging is the progress made in the negotiations on chemical weapons. The negotiations have raised hopes that we can soon expect the conclusion of a comprehensive convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, as well as the destruction of those weapons of mass annihilation.

Particularly noteworthy is the successful completion of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, the present final phase of the follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), and the results of the meeting of the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Brioni, Yugoslavia, last June.

In spite of progress made in some areas, however, contemporary international relations are still characterized by numerous negative tendencies. The confrontation between the super-Powers continues unabated. Bloc policy, aggression and the aspiration to maintain and expand one's own influence and to secure

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

domination in the world have not ceased to plague the world in which we live. We are witness to continued threats to the independence and territorial integrity of sovereign States, to interference in internal affairs, to military interventions and to other forms of pressure in relations among States. The basic rights of peoples - the rights to self-determination and a free choice of internal development - are being denied and violated.

The arms race continues to follow its own logic, consuming the vast human, material and technological resources so badly needed for the development of the world at large. It does not lose in intensity, but threatens to engulf an ever greater number of participants, against their own will.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

Peace and security in the world are integrally linked with ensuring development, particularly that of the developing countries. Today most of those countries are faced with great problems in their development, on whose solution directly depends not only their economic but also their political stability. The dramatic widening of the gap between the developed and the developing world is fraught with unforeseeable consequences. The debt burden of the developing countries not only threatens their economic development but also jeopardizes the process of world reproduction.

The preoccupation of the rich and mighty with their own interests, their desire to subordinate the overall system of international relations to those interests, and their reluctance to seek through dialogue at least initial solutions for numerous development problems of those who have not been favoured by historical, political and natural conditions have brought about in the economic position of developing countries a permanent deterioration whose the political and security repercussions are being felt ever more frequently. In the long run it cannot but have a negative effect on both development and the security of the developed countries themselves.

There is no doubt that hotbeds of crisis remain the major source of instability and tension in international relations, with serious consequences for international peace and security. Although their historical, social, economic and other causes should not be disregarded, it has been proved that the root causes of all hotbeds of crisis are violation of sovereignty and independence, denial of the right of peoples and countries to take decisions freely on their destiny and the ways of their internal development, and attempts to solve outstanding international problems from a position of force and to interfere in internal affairs.

The current situation is particularly dangerously complicated by the aspirations of foreign Powers to use existing contradictions and conflicts as an

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

excuse for their own interference and their attempts to impose such solutions of existing crises as would promote their narrow bloc and geostrategic interests and goals.

It is obvious, however, that the only possible way to a lasting solution and the final elimination of existing hotbeds of crisis lies not in the continuation of bloc rivalry and the policy of force but in respect for the authentic interests of peoples and countries and in ensuring their legitimate rights to freedom, independence and self-determination. This is, at the same time, the only acceptable basis for a lasting solution of the Middle East crisis and the question of Palestine which is at its core; the realization of Namibia's independence; the elimination of apartheid in southern Africa; the solution of the questions of Central America, Korea, Afghanistan and Kampuchea; and ensuring the independence, territorial integrity, unity and non-aligned status of Cyprus.

Recently there have been intensified attempts to find political solutions for some hotbeds of crisis in the world which have burdened international relations for years. Efforts in this direction are noticeable at the bilateral, regional and broader international levels. They are yet another proof that only by political means, with respect for the interests of all parties directly concerned, can we achieve solutions that will be a comprehensive contribution to stability and to the positive development of international relations.

As a European and non-aligned country, Yugoslavia is particularly interested in the development of relations in Europe, the continent on which bloc confrontation has been most evident. Along with other non-aligned and neutral countries, Yugoslavia is striving to make a direct contribution to positive development in Europe. We are convinced that the ongoing negotiations at Vienna, conducted within the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), will lead to new arrangements aimed at reducing tension in that part

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

of the world and promoting co-operation among European States. We believe that the final document of the Vienna Follow-up Meeting should also contain provisions on the continuation of the Conference on Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, whose task is to elaborate further constraints to reduce the danger of military confrontation, including air and naval activities.

Peace and security in Europe and the Mediterranean are mutually contingent and firmly linked. The Mediterranean is a region burdened with increasing military might and armaments, hotbeds of crisis and conflicts, with possible far-reaching consequences for international peace and security. Along with other non-aligned countries of the region, Yugoslavia has been making efforts to transform the Mediterranean into a region of peace and co-operation. An important contribution to the efforts of those countries is provided by the results of the said Ministerial Conference of the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Brioni, which gave vigorous expression to the aspiration to open up new avenues through the intensification and promotion of co-operation for resolving major problems that burden the situation and lead to tensions in the region.

Disarmament, development, peace and security are the issues on which the destiny of the world depends; therefore, they cannot be solved within the narrow circle of the great Powers. Precisely because of the importance of those issues, all countries, regardless of their size or military might, must participate in their solution. There can be no stable peace in the world if it depends exclusively on decisions of and deals between the great Powers and their bloc organizations. Likewise, there can be no stable international security if it does not include equal security for all countries and peoples. It has been borne out time and again that the relaxation of international tension, in order to be a

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

positive factor in international relations, must be universal in nature; it must encompass all the countries of the world and all areas of international relations.

The United Nations remains the irreplaceable forum for the maintenance of international peace and security and for seeking global solutions to all the questions with which we are faced in this interdependent world. We are therefore also entrusted today with the most important task of strengthening the role of the United Nations and its importance as the unique centre of international co-operation aimed at realizing the goals contained in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. This can be achieved only by joint efforts aimed at bringing the consideration and solution of all major issues of international relations back within the purview of the United Nations. When international security is at stake, a special place belongs to the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretary-General.

Certainly the Security Council bears the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The effectiveness of the Security Council in this field and the strengthening of its authority and role are of particular importance, considering its duty with regard to preventive actions and its responsibility to take concrete measures when necessary, including those under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

Every proposal aimed at strengthening the efficiency of the United Nations and promoting the system of collective security which it represents deserves to be considered with due attention. That is also true of the proposal submitted by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, contained in document A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive system of international peace and security".

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

As with any other similar proposal, we approach it with openness and without prejudice. We consider it a positive indication that the authors, when thinking of the implementation of the system of security they are proposing, have in mind primarily the United Nations and strict compliance with the Charter. We have also noted that it contains a number of concrete and interesting ideas and suggestions, the adoption of which would, in the opinion of its authors, more adequately reflect the needs of the international community at the present level of the development of international relations.

The comprehensiveness of the proposals submitted implies their long-term nature and, in their complexity, the need to analyse in detail and from every angle all questions that have been raised, their common link and interdependence and, on that basis, to draw appropriate conclusions. On the basis of such considerations we, for our part, are ready to participate.

Mr. MURIN (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The debate being held this year in the First Committee on the subject of international security and the way of reliably ensuring it, has undoubtedly evoked a number of new, inspiring ideas, which significantly enrich the broad international dialogue on these matters. The intensity and the openness of the discussion has, once again, reaffirmed the special importance which the States Members of the United Nations attach to finding a constructive solution to the whole range of key problems relating to international security on the basis of, and within the framework of, the United Nations Charter.

Confirmation of our confidence in the purposes and principles of the Charter as the basis for building a secure world in present conditions and of the need for its implementation, has become the guiding idea behind our activities. We believe that it is precisely in this unity that the viability of this universal document

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

and the lasting importance of its principles are being reaffirmed. There is also basic agreement that the purposes and principles of the Charter have not always prevailed in the security policies of States, as envisaged in the Charter. In this context, we fully agree that peace and security are threatened by the conduct of States in international relations and that this is by no means due to the inadequacy of the Charter. The more the practical actions by States in their relations with one another diverge from the generally recognized basic norms of international life and the more they run counter to them, the more fragile becomes the entire structure of international peace and security.

The ultimate aim of the Charter is to preserve international peace and security. During the 42 years in which the Charter has been in existence, the conditions and prerequisites for attaining this common objective have changed substantially.

In the present conditions, in view of the increasing complexity of the whole system of international relations, the existence of nuclear weapons and other new factors that influence international developments, the comprehensive functioning of the system of collective security is a need that is qualitatively higher than it was in the past.

Unfortunately, the creation of military groupings confronting each other has shifted the focus of the efforts of States to provide for their national security still further away from the system of global collective security embodied in the Charter.

Instead of the collective security enshrined in the Charter, other security mechanisms - primarily structures of military security based on factors of strength - have been increasingly strengthened, with all their inherent contradictions. The real possibilities for a consistent and comprehensive implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter, as well as effective

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

performance by the United Nations as the universal instrument of global security, have thus been considerably curtailed.

Mainly as a result of this, the serious problems of security facing approximately a hundred new, independent States that have come into being since the adoption of the Charter have not been tackled properly. Moreover, the security of mankind is directly jeopardized by the division of the world into rich and poor countries, the latter being forced to bear the heavy consequences of the colonial era as well as neo-colonial exploitation. International relations are thus being exposed more and more to growing economic and social tensions.

Serious international disputes and conflicts have emerged and are continuing to emerge in various parts of the world - in the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, Central America, southern Africa and other parts of the world - and there is a risk that they may become global confrontations.

The negative trends in respect of the environment and the lack of suitable norms of behaviour for States in this sphere of activity are also elements conducive to mounting tensions in international relations. Moreover, major and realistic opportunities to find effective solutions to all the crucial problems of world security to eliminate their causes have often remained untapped.

We therefore regard it as of extreme and vital importance for all to elaborate such a modus operandi for resolving all the basic problems of the present-day world, one which would ensure that contradictions would not be magnified into clashes and that their resolution would become a productive factor making for the joint harmonious development of civilization as a whole.

The socialist countries envisage such a modus operandi in establishing a comprehensive system of international peace and security, which is precisely the subject of today's discussion.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

We regard the establishment of such a system primarily as a process of gradually shifting from security based on the balance of nuclear weapons and other instruments of strength to security based on the Charter and guaranteed by the international community. In other words, we see it as a process of intensive implementation of the basic goals of the Charter in today's radically different circumstances and consistently based on the application of the fundamental norms of international law.

Historically, efforts with a view to the implementation of the main objective of the Charter did not stop at the moment when it was adopted. They have been reflected, albeit with insufficient speed and energy, in the elaboration of a whole system of important international documents aimed at harmonizing the actions of States in various spheres of international life, in the development and codification of international law and also in gradually improving the working procedures of the United Nations and its main organs.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

Among documents of lasting significance we may mention the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, whose unanimous adoption 17 years ago represented an important milestone in designing a modern concept of international security and strengthening co-operation among States in this area.

The implementation of this Declaration is also an important item on the agenda of our Committee, and its language provides objective criteria for gauging the tasks facing the world community regarding the solution of the basic problems of international security, including the peaceful and just settlement of international disputes and conflicts which threaten international peace and security.

The Declaration was an important step in the direction followed and further developed in the concept of a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

Similarly, the main international principles at the present time include, first and foremost, the resolution of all disputes exclusively by peaceful means and the inadmissibility of the use or threat of the use of force in international relations.

Accordingly, a specific response to the particular needs of the present-day world in the conditions of a nuclear and space age was the drawing up this year of a draft Declaration on the Strengthening of the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations. We regard that Declaration, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly a few days ago, as an expression of an ever-growing awareness of the joint responsibility incumbent upon all States to preserve peaceful and friendly relations of co-operation and as an expression of a growing sense of realism in international relations.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

We are convinced that the Declaration on the Strengthening of the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations will occupy a prominent place among the documents through which the General Assembly has, in recent years, been helping to strengthen the political and legal basis for international security.

In this context, we wish to point out once again the progress made in drafting a declaration on the prevention of international disputes and conflicts, the adoption of which should become yet another significant component in the basis for the overall operation of a system of collective security.

New and stimulating insights into the resolution of questions of international security in their interrelationship were also afforded by the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held this year, as well as by its Final Document, whose implementation is, in our view, bound to play an important part in the process of ensuring comprehensive international security.

There is increasing international recognition of such important ideas for maintaining general security as educating societies to live in a spirit of peace and good-neighbourliness.

It is perfectly logical, therefore, that in the development of events, objectively substantiated by the actual requirements of the present time, we see more and more clearly the adoption of integrated approaches and an attempt to take a comprehensive view of the problem of international security in all its aspects and all its interrelatedness.

The concept of establishing a comprehensive system of international peace and security is a reflection and a further development of this kind of thinking. It represents a concept designed to integrate all partial instruments for strengthening

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

international peace and security on a radically higher level, where the functioning of each of them would be organically augmented in the framework of a unified and dynamically developing system.

During the discussion we have heard some expressions of apprehension as to whether the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, including the elimination of nuclear weapons as an essential component, might jeopardize the integrity of the Charter.

We frankly declare that the purpose of a comprehensive system is to create the sort of model for international relations which would facilitate the transition to a world free of nuclear weapons and violence. We are convinced that this purpose not only does not run counter to the Charter but indeed represents a return to it, a restoration of the Charter's rightful position of predominance in the structure of global security.

That is exactly why we entertain serious doubts about the kind of logic that emphasizes the inviolability of the Charter while simultaneously asserting the indispensability of nuclear weapons as a means for attaining the purposes of the Charter - as if nuclear weapons were, in the light of a collective system of international security, a necessary supplement rather than a contradiction of the Charter. We would like to express our conviction that all States, in the interests of global security as well as their own security, will gradually abandon those destabilizing military options for seeking security and return to the model of a global collective security which would be fully provided for by the means based on the Charter.

The projected establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, as has already been emphasized, is an open-ended concept. Therefore it cannot be squeezed into precise boundaries which would necessarily limit the

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

ability of States to give expression to their own specific interests and ideas in its formulation, nor is it limited to any artificial choice of principles or specific questions of international peace and security, or any individual disputes and conflicts.

At this stage, the sponsors of this initiative are moved by the need to open a broad and democratic dialogue on the whole range of matters pertaining to international peace and security, on the basis of which it would be possible to start developing and gradually implementing the proposed system in concrete form. In the interest of such a dialogue, they are ready, by agreement with other Member States, to make use of the existing working procedures established in United Nations practice.

In the revised version of the draft resolution circulated this morning (A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1), the sponsors propose that the Secretary-General should explore ways and means of organizing an exchange of views on the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, with the participation of eminent personalities, and that he should submit a report to the General Assembly at its forty-third session. It is our belief that such a course of action would create the conditions needed for reaching a convergence of views on the main directions and the most effective forms and ways and means for further considering the problems involved in comprehensive security.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

Several of the statements made in our Committee in this connection convincingly expressed the idea that it would be appropriate for all Member States to be given a full opportunity to participate from the outset in the process of elaborating a comprehensive system of security. In this spirit, the representative of Singapore stated yesterday:

(spoke in English)

"as we are discussing fundamental political principles here, principles that impinge on the life of each and every Member State, we feel that each and every Member State should be allowed to participate fully in the evolution of this proposal." (A/C.1/42/PV/.52, pp. 34-35)

(continued in Russian)

The Czechoslovak delegation views those observations as the expression of a genuine and constructive interest in developing a productive international dialogue on a comprehensive system of international security and believes that they should be given careful attention in an equally constructive spirit.

We believe that if there is a convergence of views, then consideration can also be given to the possibility of convening a special session of the General Assembly on the subject of comprehensive security, as the forum most competent to engage in a serious examination of the topic with the broadest international participation.

During the discussion held thus far and in their joint memorandum, the sponsors have offered their views on the substance and main lines of the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security and have expressed their receptivity to the views of other Member States.

On behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, I should like to express our conviction that the course and content of the discussion are creating a broad and essentially constructive basis for achieving the required consensus.

Mr. MAKSIMOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Today the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic would like to speak as one of the sponsors of the proposal to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security, which was put forward in the United Nations by a number of socialist countries in 1986.

Neither then nor now has there been any intention on the part of the sponsors to force any rigid blueprints or ready-made solutions upon other countries, our partners in discussing this question.

The initiative in question is essentially an invitation to a dialogue - a very broad, multilateral, democratic and, perhaps most important, unbiased dialogue - on the question of paramount importance: what will happen to the international community in the future?

The proposal of the socialist countries is motivated by two factors: first, an analysis of the situation that now exists in the world and, secondly, thoughts about the way in which truly dependable security could be shaped in existing circumstances.

Mankind has indeed reached a point in its advance at which the historical necessity to choose has become quite clear: either we continue to lose our way in the maze of nuclear dead-ends - and there is every chance that it may become a tomb - or we chart a clear road, with well-controlled traffic, and move together along that road towards a safer world.

Prominent among the factors that have now become especially relevant in the evolution of the international situation is the close interdependence of everyone in the world. It not only has become an indisputable fact of life but is continuing to grow steadily, and this is a natural process. Furthermore, interdependence in the world encompasses both of its main dimensions, namely, the

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

interdependence of States and the interdependence of the main spheres of international relations.

That factor brings us to the realization of another indisputable logical premise: in an interdependent world the security of some States cannot be safeguarded by damaging the security of others. Such an approach can create only imaginary security, the illusion of security, a security that would actually jeopardize global security. The experience gained by mankind during the period of development immediately following the Second World War has convinced us of that, as well as of the futility of any attempt to safeguard security through military and technological means. The relation between the two variables - the level of armaments and the level of security in the world - is clearly an inversely proportional one.

The intertwining of those aspects of contemporary realities is vitally important, in the literal sense of those words, a fact that is becoming unmistakably clear in the light of another factor of a comprehensive nature, namely, the existence of a nuclear and space threat which affects everyone and which casts doubt on the future of mankind, both as a civilization and as a species.

Consideration of those factors plays a key role in elaborating the basic principles of the joint initiative taken by the socialist States. What is required is a concept and a system of international security that would make security real and not imaginary. The Byelorussian SSR strongly feels that the idea of a comprehensive system of international peace and security is indeed precisely intended to achieve that. Its roots, which go deep into the realities of our day and age and thus give it a reliable foundation, lie in the following analysis of the key factors involved.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

States should be guided by the priority of the universal interests of mankind. Genuine security can only be global. All States have an equal right to security. Security can be safeguarded only through political means. A security system should be comprehensive in a dual sense: it should encompass all States, large and small, being constructed through their joint and collective efforts, and it should encompass all the principal spheres of international relations.

The question arises: what is the most appropriate forum for organizing the joint construction of genuine security? We are convinced that that forum should be the United Nations. That is why the socialist countries have introduced their initiative here.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

The United Nations is indeed best suited to the tasks of setting up a comprehensive security system. The United Nations is universal, both in terms of its membership and in terms of the range of international problems it covers. All its Members participate on an equal footing. The United Nations has a wealth of experience in efforts designed to build security. The Charter of the United Nations is a universal code of international relations. The concept of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, which by definition must be created through the collective efforts of States, is in no way inconsistent with the collective security system of the Charter of the United Nations; rather, it is the embodiment of all the ideas and provisions of that collective security system in the context of the realities of the end of the twentieth century. Everyone in this room will, I am sure, agree regretfully that the system set out in the Charter has thus far not functioned as it should. Fresh efforts and fresh approaches are required of States, leading to the establishment of workable machinery in the sphere of security, on the basis and within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations. It is precisely such an approach that the socialist countries have proposed. We see a need for a substantive and serious enhancement of the role of the United Nations as a universal forum in today's world. The United Nations should become a real centre for harmonizing the actions of States and realizing the potential contained in the Charter, and ultimately for gradually assuming the functions of a guarantor of reliable comprehensive security for all States and peoples.

The Byelorussian SSR notes with satisfaction that there is an increasing awareness of the need to make security comprehensive; that awareness is beginning to make itself felt in a tangible way. This is shown by bilateral documents such as the Soviet-Indian declaration on a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world,

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

by the documents of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Palme Commission, by the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development and by the numerous draft resolutions adopted by the First Committee during the recently concluded stage of its work devoted to disarmament problems. It was also demonstrated by the recent unanimous adoption of the Declaration on the Enhancement of the Principle of Refraining from the Use of Force in International Relations.

In all the areas in which a comprehensive system of international security is taking form - military-political, economic, environmental and humanitarian - the socialist countries, both individually and jointly, have put forward serious, specific and far-reaching proposals. I do not intend today to go into detail on the substance of those proposals, since the most important of them have already been described in statements made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Byelorussian SSR, Comrade Anatoly E. Gurinovich, in the general debate in the plenary General Assembly on 8 October and in this Committee on 19 October of this year, and by other representatives of the Byelorussian SSR in the relevant Main Committees. The task of the First Committee at this point is broader, and therefore we shall do our best to single out what we view as the most important tasks in each area and to highlight what is paramount in promoting the establishment of comprehensive security.

In the military and political sphere we are convinced that it is necessary to give up obsolete ideas about how to ensure national security. Security through disarmament is the programme dictated by our times. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have put forward specific proposals, accompanied by time-schedules, for carrying out such a programme, with a view to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, the prevention of an arms race in outer space and the achievement of substantial

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

reductions in armed forces and armaments, based on the principle of reasonable sufficiency. The goal of our efforts along those lines is a nuclear-free and non-violent world, a world without wars or weapons. If we do not approach the matter from old positions based on narrow selfish interests but are guided by a new political thinking, that goal will be quite realistic and feasible.

The feasibility of progress - genuine progress - along the road towards nuclear disarmament was demonstrated by the conceptual breakthrough achieved at Reykjavik and by its first fruits, which are now ripening: the Soviet-United States treaty to eliminate medium-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles. A great deal has already been said about the significance of that treaty, but I wish to emphasize once again that it represents a door opened for the first time, beyond which lies a road leading to a nuclear-free future. It would be oversimplification to suggest that moving along that road will be easy, but it must be travelled. The next step should be a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive weapons, as agreed at Reykjavik, subject to strict compliance with the anti-ballistic missile Treaty.

The emerging motion towards a nuclear-free world should be accompanied by agreements to reduce drastically the levels of non-nuclear weapons.

In addition to agreements in the field of disarmament as such, we can and must reach agreements of other kinds in the military-political field, especially with respect to defence strategy and military sufficiency, which would change the structure of armed forces so as to meet defence requirements while consistently preventing the carrying out of offensive operations.

There has been considerable progress in the area of confidence and openness in the military field. We have already had such agreements - which are unprecedented in world practice - and are now acquiring valuable experience translating them

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

into practice. Confidence-building should be the result of efforts by all sides and should be based on reciprocity.

An indispensable condition for universal security is strict compliance with the Charter of the United Nations and respect for the right of peoples to make their own independent choice of ways and forms for their development, without outside interference.

We must devise effective machinery for the prevention and peaceful settlement of international conflicts. We must think specifically about implementing the Secretary-General's proposal on the establishment within the United Nations of a multilateral centre to reduce the threat of war, and we must make broader use of the institution of United Nations military observers and United Nations peace-keeping forces. The whole range of means for the peaceful settlement of disputes should be not a museum piece but a useful set of tools with practical applications. We might also give joint consideration to using non-governmental commissions and groups to analyse the causes and circumstances of specific conflicts and the means of settling them.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

The strengthening of peace would be facilitated if the permanent members of the Security Council would undertake to refrain from the use or threat of force and to give up any demonstrative military presence. Those States could assume the role of guarantors of regional security.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted in 1970 and the consideration of its implementation at the sessions of the General Assembly continue to represent an important instrument in international practice. The Byelorussian SSR attaches great importance to this, and on 29 October 1987 it communicated its response to the Secretary-General's request on this matter (A/42/592/Add.1).

Can a world in which the malaise of underdevelopment has afflicted so many countries truly be a safe one? The answer to that question is clear enough: we have entered an age in which the indissoluble link between the right to live and the right to development is being ever more keenly felt. It is imperative to combine our efforts in order to overcome underdevelopment, to secure the establishment of a new international economic order and to advance towards economic security. Delaying a solution is tantamount to putting mankind at very serious risk, because we are now witnessing a very rapid accumulation of flammable materials of tremendous explosive power comparable to a nuclear threat.

Our future is also darkened by threats to the environment. Here too, only joint efforts and a global strategy for the protection of the environment and for the rational management of resources can reverse the current dangerous trends. The formulation of a strategy to that end could be begun within the framework of a specialized United Nations programme.

A world in which human rights are violated cannot be safe. Our approach to human rights must not be speculative; it must be serious and comprehensive. It is important to ensure that necessary conditions are created for the full exercise of

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

fundamental human rights - the right to life and the right to work. In the humanitarian field, the gap between words and deeds must also be closed. First and foremost, it is essential that national legislation everywhere should be brought into conformity with international obligations and norms. Human contacts are needed to help bring peoples closer together, to help strengthen mutual understanding and to eliminate bias and prejudice. Strict compliance by everyone with the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace can be an important contribution to the attainment of those goals. It would also be useful to co-ordinate and reach agreement on uniform international-law criteria for dealing in a humanitarian spirit with all questions related to human contacts.

A framework already exists for a dialogue on humanitarian problems; new modalities are also possible. The convening of an international conference on this issue at Moscow, as proposed by the Soviet Union, could further foster that dialogue.

Concerted efforts in the spheres of culture, medicine and humanitarian rights constitute an important component of a system of comprehensive security.

We have already emphasized that the establishment of such a system calls for resolute enhancement of the role and responsibility of the United Nations. In our view, joint action should be undertaken to ensure that all the existing organs and institutions of the United Nations work at full capacity. The General Assembly, the Security Council, the International Court of Justice, the Military Staff Committee, the deliberative bodies, the specialized agencies and other mechanisms of the United Nations, as well as its Secretary-General, should all become actively involved in resolving common problems.

New and broader tasks may also require broader functions. In particular, in order to strengthen confidence and mutual understanding, it might be possible to establish under the auspices of the United Nations a machinery for broad

(Mr. Makaimov, Byelorussian SSR)

international monitoring of compliance with agreements on the reduction of international tension, the limitation of armaments and the military situation in conflict areas. Another question to consider is that of setting up a world space organization.

In our view, a broad, constructive and committed dialogue by States will make the United Nations equal to any of those tasks, the solution of which is so essential if we are to progress towards genuine universal security for all mankind. That is why we advocate such a dialogue, on the initiative of the socialist countries, for the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR hopes that further work on that initiative will be met with a similarly open and constructive attitude on the part of other States.

Mr. IMMERMANN (United States of America): Before beginning my prepared remarks, I would like to make an announcement that I think will be of interest to the Committee. Just a couple of hours ago, in Geneva, Secretary of State Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze together announced to the press that the United States and the Soviet Union had reached agreement on all of the outstanding issues in the proposed treaty to eliminate their intermediate-range nuclear missiles.

The United States delegation welcomes this opportunity to share its views with other delegations on how the United Nations can best strengthen international security.

My delegation agrees with virtually all the other delegations in this room that the Charter of the United Nations serves as the most effective means of fortifying the foundations of international security. The United States is proud to have participated in the drafting of the Charter and has always fully supported the principles that it embodies. For almost half a century this carefully elaborated and very flexible document has successfully provided the basis for

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

collective security arrangements throughout the world, as well as for the peace-keeping activities of the Organization intended to bolster such security. Therefore my delegation supports, as a high priority, efforts aimed at fully implementing the Charter of the United Nations.

It is in that spirit that my delegation finds it necessary once again to call to the attention of the Committee its concern about a draft resolution which, while purporting to strengthen international peace and security and enhance the role of the United Nations system in achieving that goal, would, if fully implemented, have the opposite effect. The proposal to which my delegation is referring is contained in draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89, which would create a so-called comprehensive system of international peace and security.

My delegation acknowledges that draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89 does indeed invoke the noble principles upon which the Organization was founded over 40 years ago. It talks about the maintenance of international peace and security, the advancement of the socio-economic well-being of all peoples, the protection of their human rights and the development of friendly relations among States.

However, even as it pays homage to those Charter principles, the draft resolution contains a sweeping and ill-conceived initiative which could ultimately distort and subvert the very foundation of the Charter. As the representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Birch, reminded the Committee on 20 November, the title of the draft resolution refers to peace only because the United Kingdom delegation insisted on amending it when the General Committee considered it last year.

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

As the principal spokesman for this proposal acknowledged to this Committee on 19 November, what its sponsors are interested in is nothing less than creating a "new way of organizing life [on our planet]" (A/C.1/42/PV.49, p. 31). The sponsors of this initiative have begun to pursue the establishment of a new "system" in several United Nations bodies, but have carefully refrained from defining it.

In this connection, the representative of Singapore, Ambassador Mahbubani, spoke for many of us in this Committee yesterday when he posed a fundamental question:

"... if we are to make full use of the potential contained in the Charter, why do we need to introduce a new proposal for comprehensive peace and security?"

(A/C.1/42/PV.52, pp. 29-30)

My delegation shares the view that the United Nations and its associated bodies already constitute a world-wide system fully capable of maintaining international peace and security.

The United States delegation is fully prepared to discuss proposals to improve the United Nations system, in the appropriate committees and specialized agencies. However, my delegation believes that it is neither necessary nor desirable to create duplicative mechanisms in order to strengthen the United Nations. What is needed is for Member States to comply fully with the political commitments they undertook when they subscribed to the Charter.

The sponsors of the concept before us argue that the many regional conflicts which have brought such turmoil and suffering to the world in the decades since 1945 demonstrate the need for some new global "system" of international peace and security. In passing, the United States delegation would note that in all too many instances individual sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.83/Rev.1 have themselves contributed to that turmoil and suffering. None of the sponsoring

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

delegations has seen fit to discuss how the new "system" proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1 would apply to such conflicts. Is this an oversight? Do the sponsors expect their "system" to be applied selectively, in certain regions only? In the view of the United States delegation, the persistence of regional conflicts is the result not of any alleged deficiencies or failings in the Charter or system of the United Nations but rather of the failure of Member States to live up to the principles of the Charter.

Draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1 is not just ambiguous; it is loaded with the same kind of rhetoric with which its sponsors have overburdened documents of the United Nations over the years. My delegation is at a loss to understand precisely what this draft resolution seeks to accomplish in concrete terms. Its sponsors have so far failed to explain its purpose and have declined to discuss specific details. Indeed, phrases such as "interpenetration of principles governing the decision-making world" and "moral-psychological guarantees for peace" are themselves not comprehensive; they are incomprehensible. My delegation remains wary of this proposal. In our view, until its specific details are clarified there is simply no good reason for this Committee to accept it.

Moreover, the First Committee should not be asked to consider proposals relating to non-military aspects of security. The proponents of this initiative now have such proposals pending in the Second, Third and Sixth Committees, where they rightfully belong. Those Member States have the ability to select other appropriate forums within the United Nations system in which to put forward concrete proposals in given subject areas. By the same token, if those same Member States lack concrete proposals of their own to strengthen international security but wish merely to encourage other Governments in that regard, the proper vehicle for that purpose could be an appropriately worded draft resolution on review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

That said, the proposal to involve outside personalities, however eminent, remains particularly undesirable. That proposal presupposes that there are fundamental deficiencies in the existing United Nations system. That concept is nothing less than an attempt to remove consideration of the organization and future of the United Nations from the agenda of its rightful owners, the General Assembly, and place it in the hands of an anonymous group removed from national control. Such a group would of necessity derogate from the authority of the Member States under Chapter VII of the Charter to supervise the functioning of the Organization. It would also duplicate the work of the Charter Committee, whose full title, the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization, best describes its scope and mandate. Clearly, the First Committee has no business considering a proposal best left to the legal experts in the Sixth Committee and its sub-group on the Charter.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1 remain unable adequately to describe and defend this proposal. What greater success would an unknown group of experts have? What is their composition to be? How will they be selected? How many will there be? What will be their mandate: a review of the entire international system, including economic, social, environmental, humanitarian and disarmament issues? The very existence of such a group, for no matter how long, could prevent the General Assembly from considering new initiatives from Member States on the grounds that their adoption could prejudice the work of the experts.

It is ill-advised to launch such a massive ill-defined initiative during this period of great financial stringency for the United Nations. If the General Assembly were to do so, it would only confirm the judgement of those critics who claim that we do not focus on specifics and are unable to control our budget.

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

The United States delegation wishes to emphasize that it opposes the concept of a new allegedly comprehensive and global system, not because of its origins, but because it would be the first phase of a major restructuring of the United Nations system along lines which would be duplicative, highly ideological and financially burdensome. The United States would oppose any draft resolution similar in thrust to A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1 because we believe that its basic premise is unfounded and dangerous to the system of collective security enshrined in the Charter. The United States cannot support any effort to redefine, amend or rewrite the Charter, a document that has served the Member States well for four decades.

We have seen that after two years this proposal to create a new global "system" purporting to address issues relating to international peace and security still has no meat on its bones. It continues to have indeterminate financial implications and has carried with it the threat of usurping the authority of the General Assembly and placing the future of the United Nations in the hands of unknowns. In these circumstances, the United States delegation can only express the hope that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1 will indeed not attempt to make this Committee, as we say in colloquial English, buy a pig in a poke by bringing it to a vote.

The United States delegation reiterates its willingness to consider revised and more specific proposals at subsequent sessions, and in the appropriate Committees, of the General Assembly. In that manner, such proposals would be assured of proper consideration by the representatives of the Member States in the pertinent organs of the United Nations, in short by the finest group of experts available and answerable to us all.

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

The United States Government is genuinely committed to strengthening international security. For that reason, my delegation looks forward to the signing in Washington next month of a treaty which will reduce the number of nuclear weapons on this planet. We firmly believe that the meaningful actions to eliminate weapons called for in that treaty, rather than the ambiguous language of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1, will promote the work of this Committee and the United Nations as a whole in our collective efforts to maintain and strengthen international peace and security.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom): On behalf of my delegation I should like to welcome most warmly the news that Mr. Shultz and Mr. Shevardnadze have just announced agreement on the terms of a treaty to eliminate their intermediate-range nuclear forces. We offer our sincere congratulations to the delegations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on this historic achievement, congratulations in which I am sure everyone in this room will join us.

In his statement earlier this morning, the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union sought to throw stardust in our eyes. He invoked a number of personalities on his behalf, including my Prime Minister, Mrs. Thatcher. He then made the extraordinary suggestion that in some way Mrs. Thatcher and I had different views on the Soviet proposal for the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. Anyone who knows anything about Mrs. Thatcher would know that the quickest way for me to get a ticket to London would be to make statements here which did not accord with my instructions and I should like to assure the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union that I plan to spend Thanksgiving in New York.

Mrs. Thatcher believes in deeds rather than words, in business rather than vague philosophies, and she believes that observance of the Charter of the United Nations is the way to a civilized and humane world. I know that she made this abundantly clear during her visit to Moscow in April. And this is precisely our approach to the current Soviet initiative. The additional sweet gloss provided this morning by Mr. Petrovsky does not meet our misgivings about the Soviet draft resolution before us.

The proposed expert group has been changed to the participation of outstanding personalities, but this does not answer our question why they should be better equipped than we, the Member States of the Organization, to determine how this

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

Organization should function. I note that in his speech, Mr. Petrovsky said that the sponsors had only given up their idea of an experts' group for the time being. We are ready to discuss all the issues and concerns that have been raised during this intensive and interesting debate, but let us do it within the existing forums of the United Nations and let us not exclude any country, large or small, rich or poor, from these deliberations.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Denmark, who will speak on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Community.

Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): In our statement of 19 November on international security, we referred briefly to agenda item 73, which was first introduced at the forty-first session of the General Assembly.

From the outset, the Twelve have welcomed the renewed interest in the United Nations which the originators have demonstrated through this initiative. We agree that in the light of the many problems facing the world, a strengthening of multilateral co-operation in all fields remains indispensable.

The Twelve would again underline that, as indicated in the Charter, the United Nations has an essential role to play in the maintenance of international peace and security, the development of friendly relations among nations, and the promotion of international co-operation in solving problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, with respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. We are convinced that this is the fundamental approach that should be shared by all.

As reiterated in our statement of 19 November, it is the objective of the Twelve to strengthen the role of the United Nations in all these fields. The

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

Twelve were not however convinced of the value of the approach reflected in the draft resolution submitted last year under this agenda item, and we were unable to support it.

Since then we have continued to study with great care and attention a number of subsequent texts and statements relating to the subject of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. We have also listened carefully to the statements made by the sponsors of the draft resolution before us.

However, the further commentaries made by the sponsors have not brought any elucidation of the meaning and intent of this initiative. None of the views we have heard have persuaded us that it is necessary or even useful to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security or, in consequence, to set up an expert group to study the matter.

The Charter of the United Nations already provides the basis for the maintenance of international peace and security and the Twelve remain prepared to co-operate with a view to ensuring that the security system constituted by the Charter is fully implemented. We believe that the existing United Nations system provides ample scope for considering and implementing detailed proposals to that end. The problem does not lie in the system but in the effective implementation of the obligations of the Charter by all Member States.

Consequently, we hold the firm view that there is no need for any alternative or complementary system or for an expert group to study it. At best this would divert attention from the problem of inadequate implementation of existing Charter commitments. At worst, we fear it would lead to a reformulation or redefinition, directly or by implication, of the United Nations Charter.

We share the preoccupation voiced by others in regard to the group of experts as it is proposed. To consign this issue to an expert group could call into

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

question the system of security found in the Charter which has served us for over four decades. For the Twelve this is not acceptable. Indeed, we are obliged to wonder whether such an exercise would be warranted inasmuch as the United Nations system itself has the capability and the flexibility, for instance in the Committee on the Charter, to examine and develop proposals for strengthening the role of the Organization, in particular in the maintenance of peace and security in all its aspects. The Twelve remain fully committed to the operation of these existing mechanisms. Our commitment to co-operate with all other Member States to this end remains undiminished.

As we said in our statement of 19 November, we welcomed a constructive and purposeful discussion to this effect and drew attention to specific areas. In pursuing this initiative, the sponsors of the draft resolution may be doing an injustice to the founders of this Organization. Those who wrote the Charter fully appreciated the interrelationship between problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian nature, as well as the need to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms. Indeed, the very first Article of the Charter spells this out.

(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

In conclusion, we would like to say again that we welcome the renewed interest the sponsors have demonstrated in the United Nations.

The fact that the Twelve see no need for establishing such a comprehensive system or for an expert group to prepare a study on the matter, or for the assistance of eminent personalities does not mean that the debate has been unproductive. Rather, it has focused attention on the importance of ensuring the effective implementation of the fundamental obligations of the Charter. The Twelve stand ready to consider constructively all concrete proposals formally introduced in the appropriate organs and contexts, with a view to strengthening international peace and security within the framework of the United Nations and its Charter.

Mr. NOWORYTA (Poland): I have the honour to introduce revised draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1 on the question of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. I do so on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Viet Nam and Poland.

The present draft is a result of extensive consultations with a very wide range of countries, which presented many valuable suggestions and matters for consideration. The sponsors strove to take those considerations into account to the fullest possible extent. In undertaking the consultations, we were guided by the spirit of constructive dialogue and the conviction that it could make an important contribution to ensuring reliable international security.

The idea of a comprehensive system of international peace and security arises from the United Nations Charter and today's international practices. The world has reached a stage in its history which calls for a new approach and joint action on the part of the entire international community.

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

In drafting the revised text the sponsors relied, to the greatest possible extent, on consensus language of previously adopted resolutions on problems related to international security. This language can be found throughout the text of the draft resolution. In particular, we have drawn extensively from the recently adopted Declaration on the Enhancement of the Effectiveness of the Principle of Refraining from the Threat or Use of Force in International Relations. We were also inspired by suggestions coming from different delegations in the process of consultations as well as by the specific language communicated to the sponsors.

In the preambular part, the draft resolution emphasizes that since the adoption of the Charter, great political, economic and social changes and unprecedented scientific progress have taken place. At the same time, the emerging challenges to the survival of the human race posed by the nuclear threat and the pressing global problems have given rise to the interdependence of nations. In view of those challenges and the growing interdependence among nations - a factor which is generally recognized - the need arises to promote a comprehensive approach to security that will seek the security of all nations, by their joint action in all fields. This major conclusion of the Palme Commission is reflected in the sixth preambular paragraph. All this gives increased importance to the purposes and principles of the Charter and to the need for more effective application of them in the conduct of States.

The draft resolution proceeds from the need to develop a productive and meaningful international dialogue on ways and means of ensuring comprehensive security on the basis of the Charter and within the framework of the United Nations. In keeping with the feelings expressed in the ensuing dialogue, the draft resolution solemnly reaffirms that the collective security mechanism embodied in the Charter constitutes the fundamental and irreplaceable instrument for the preservation of international peace and security.

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

The draft resolution also emphasizes the need to fully utilize existing means of peaceful settlement of international disputes and conflicts in accordance with the Charter.

Taking into account the need for a comprehensive approach to security, the draft resolution in the operative part, urges all States to focus their efforts on ensuring integral universal security through peaceful political means in all spheres of international relations - disarmament, the peaceful settlement of crises and conflicts, economic development and co-operation, preservation of the environment, and the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. To meet the concern of a number of delegations, there is included in the operative part of the draft resolution a call for implementation of General Assembly resolutions.

With a view to further facilitating discussion of the concept of comprehensive security in a democratic and open manner and to drawing on the intellectual resources of mankind, the sponsors proposed that the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of experts, prepare a relevant study.

As that proposal did not meet with general approval, the sponsors, guided by the spirit of compromise and good will, ventured another approach, which envisages that the Secretary-General should be entrusted with looking into the ways and means of organizing an exchange of views on the subject with the participation of outstanding personalities and should report to the General Assembly at its forty-third session.

This approach follows closely the suggestion contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization to the effect that:

"... the United Nations must develop a greater capacity to associate with its global mission statesmen and scientists of the highest calibre from around the world". (A/42/1, p. 18)

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

Such a novel approach could facilitate the task of devising ways and means of ensuring security in the years to come.

In the course of the current debate, a clear tendency has emerged to engage in dialogue on comprehensive international security. For this reason we suggest the inclusion in the agenda of the forty-third session of the General Assembly of the item "Comprehensive system of international peace and security".

The sponsors presume that the implementation of the provisions of this draft resolution will not have financial implications. We hope that the spirit of compromise displayed by the sponsors of the draft resolution will enable the First Committee to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on Mr. Kheradi, Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1: Madagascar, Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic; and A/C.1/42/L.91: Cameroon and Ethiopia.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform the Committee that the following delegations are scheduled to speak at this afternoon's meeting: Brazil, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Netherlands, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic, Afghanistan, Algeria, Nigeria, Liberia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Nicaragua, Oman and Iraq.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.