



CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Agenda item 9: | |
| General debate (<i>continued</i>): | |
| Speech by Mr. Camilión (Argentina) | 85 |
| Speech by Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) | 88 |
| Speech by Mr. Castañeda (Mexico) | 95 |

President: Mr. Ismat T. KITTANI (Iraq).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. CAMILIÓN (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, let me begin this statement on behalf of the Argentine Republic by expressing our sincere congratulations to you on your assumption of the most important post in the General Assembly. Your election represents not only an acknowledgement of your personal distinction, but also shows the respect of the community of nations for your country. The Organization may be sure that it has entrusted this high mission to an experienced diplomat who is aware of the grave responsibilities that his task involves.

2. In your recent visit to Buenos Aires, in the company of the Vice-President of Iraq, our two countries restated the importance of their cordial, longstanding and fruitful relations.

3. Argentina would also like to reiterate and reaffirm its high esteem for the ability and efficiency with which your predecessor, Mr. von Wechmar, of the Federal Republic of Germany, carried out this particularly difficult task during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly and the emergency special session.

4. We express our satisfaction at the admission of the new independent State of Vanuatu as the one hundred and fifty-fifth Member of the Organization. We are sure that it will contribute to the fulfilment of the Organization's goals of peace and development.

5. At the same time, I should like to express the satisfaction of the Argentine people and Government at the independence of Belize which was actually proclaimed yesterday and which constitutes an example of how the outstanding problems of decolonization may be resolved with a sense of history and realism, with decisiveness and without premature discouragement in the negotiations.

6. May I therefore convey to each of those new States the Argentine Republic's desire to broaden relations of friendship and co-operation with them.

7. This new session of the General Assembly brings with it, as usual, a world round of analysis and thought, which indeed is one of its main purposes. As it is opening at the start of a decade that appears to be tense and full of conflict, it demands above all a balance-sheet of the essential elements inherited from the 36 years that have elapsed since hope emerged after devastation without precedent.

8. Today, as in the beginning, a single idea has remained defined with a clarity that does not allow for nuances: it is the idea of peace. There is no alternative to opting for peace. The Organization came into being under that inspiration and with that as its objective. The technology for destruction that has been developed since then has excluded world war as a conceivable instrument in any political programme. The essentially immoral instruments of destruction that mankind has created have ensured an option that cannot be challenged; one that, so far, neither the ethical approach nor justice has been able to secure. Unfortunately, this lack of alternative to peace has neither improved the conditions of world security nor made it possible to achieve progress along paths that seemed promising only a few years ago. The international society, for some time multipolar in the political and economic fields, is still supported by a bipolar arc in the field of final military power. This situation at present gives rise to growing tension.

9. The disappointing developments in the recent negotiations on disarmament in the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the virtual paralysis as regards SALT have occurred at the same time as the emergence of new conflicts, which follow those that for years have been receiving the attention of the Organization.

10. The idea of disarmament has been replaced in practice, first, by the concept of a slow down of the arms race and, secondly, by the parity of military power. This has tended to dispel many illusions; indeed, we all know that a vicious circle has been created. True parity can never be established in such times of technological build-up. Every effort to close any real or imaginary gap inevitably creates yet another gap, imaginary or real.

11. This process has a strong inherent logic. The increasing arms build-up comes from a sense of insecurity. This feeling persisted among all the protagonists despite all the unquestionable progress made during the cycle of so-called détente. Viewed in retrospect, it is clear that that necessary progress was far from sufficient and that today a further effort is needed, under much worse conditions. There is not the slightest doubt that the distrust between the main protagonists has increased. Nor is there any doubt that nothing deserves higher priority at this stage than efforts to recreate appropriate conditions for dialogue.

12. The obvious crisis through which the world security system is passing is aggravated by the equally unacceptable crisis affecting the system of ideas underlying it. For example, there is the clear care of those ideologies that believed they had grasped the meaning of history and were capable of building a final model society free of contradictions. Any observer today can clearly see that some of the most ominous changes threatening peace derive expressly from the objective existence of the contradictions supposedly overcome in that model.

13. Insecurity and the ideological crisis are at the root of the emergence and universal spread of terrorism. It is evident that this real scourge has not only new dimensions but also a new essence. Contemporary terrorism constitutes one of the most dangerous assaults on the human condition. It is, above all, an assault on reason, similar to many assaults that history has known before, and it lacks any ethical motivation. Present-day terrorism is a highly professional manifestation of naked power, with a worldwide organization, which is increasingly refined and threatens even those who succumb to the temptation to support it, directly or indirectly.

14. We Argentinians cannot but recall in this dramatic context the attempt on the life of His Holiness Pope John Paul II, whose efforts to promote understanding among peoples are clearly exemplified by his welcome mediation in the border dispute between Argentina and the Republic of Chile.

15. A look at the world situation reveals a picture with many shadows, among which problems that have been included for many years now in the agenda of these sessions and those that have been added recently stand out. The common denominator is the element of national, regional or world insecurity.

16. A single thread characterizes the most serious cases. The persistent delay in the solution of the Palestine problem, the non-recognition of Israel by most of the Arab countries, the unacceptable risk of annexing the territories occupied after the 1967 war, the bombing of Iraq's nuclear reactor, the attack on Lebanon and the attack on the Vienna synagogue represent stern appeals to the conscience and sense of responsibility of all countries represented here. Another such is the continued illegal interference in Afghanistan, where one super-Power is expressing its idea of national security at the cost of the security of a neighbour which by no stretch of the imagination can be classified as dangerous. Exactly the same can be said of Viet Nam's interference in Kampuchea—another instance of a threat to regional security. In this world in which colonialism is now in its twilight, its continuing existence in the flagrant example of Namibia and the unacceptable delay in the process to independence of that country demonstrate how a situation of this kind can directly threaten not only regional but also world peace and security.

17. These four situations, which constitute extreme cases in the present international scene, all have a common denominator, namely, the violation of fundamental principles of world order and of the Charter of the United Nations. They all involve the self-determination of peoples, a violation of the principle of non-intervention, a breach of territorial integrity and an attack on sovereignty. The invoking of their own security by the interested par-

ties is a cover for conduct that clearly violates the security of others and thus threatens the security of everyone. It seems both clear and rational that the security that they supposedly desire to preserve would be better guaranteed by a precise definition of its own limits.

18. In so far as those problems fall within the specific competence of the United Nations, some comments on the methodology of their handling by the Organization are called for. The first concerns the need to adopt realistic political approaches that include activities and explore prospects, and lead to specific solutions. Those solutions must take into consideration both the objectives aimed at in each case and the purposes and principles of the Charter, in order if possible to obtain consensus among Members of the Organization. When the defence of a principle or worthy cause is at stake, it is much more effective to obtain the minimum common denominator acceptable to all than to put forward extreme proposals that inevitably give rise to reservations that neutralize them in practice. The second comment underlines the need to place more emphasis on negotiations and dialogue between the countries directly involved in each problem, with the participation of the United Nations Secretariat where necessary, without prejudice to the concerted action agreed upon in the resolutions addressed to all Member States.

19. From the point of view of Latin America, these considerations seem timely. It is evident that this continent, and Central America in particular, has entered an extremely critical phase. Possible or actual violations of fundamental principles that have led to serious disputes in other areas are now a matter of real concern for the people of Central America, as shown clearly by the case of El Salvador.

20. The highly dangerous potential for an escalation of conflicts in Latin America does not seem to be clearly perceived in other areas, especially in some developed countries that appear to see those disputes as a problem of spheres of influence relating to the prevailing political trends in Europe.

21. This false perspective, especially prevalent on the part of industrialized European countries, has also been, and is being, committed, although in a reverse sense, in the field of human rights. In the name of human rights there has been, and still is, an uncalled for and, by some sectors a distinctly superficial, interference in situations of internal security which in no way affect international peace and security. That interference is clearly a violation of the spirit and letter of the Charter. It constitutes, in fact, a very significant and decisive support of the subversive terrorist activities that really might create actual situations endangering international peace and security.

22. Obviously such peace and security must reflect all of the elements underlying the system of international relations. The Organization was founded at a time when there was hardly any discussion of economic development and underdevelopment. However, as far back as 1945, San Francisco was the meeting point of highly industrialized countries and others that had not even taken the first steps towards modernization. The great campaign to dislodge colonialism, in which many of the battles were fought in these halls, multiplied the number of developing countries. Their political weight increased, but that did

not narrow the gap separating them from the big centres of finance, industry and technology.

23. The 1973 crisis, in which the new oil prices acted as a catalyst, did not change the essence of the problem, but introduced into the situation aggravating elements of decisive effect. In order to check these, on the initiative of the Group of 77, a more extensive dialogue was begun based on the fact that the fates of developed and developing countries were clearly linked through their interdependence and they must therefore join in seeking a global agreement that would make it possible to find the basis for a sustained and balanced growth of the world economy. Our scepticism about developments thus far in no way detracts from the validity of that programme or that approach.

24. It is now more urgent than ever to reverse the trends that are becoming more marked in a situation of acute recession, but it must be on the basis of a realistic analysis of the situation.

25. The increase in oil prices generated a regionalization of profits and a general spread of losses as a consequence of such a monumental redistribution of world earnings without the establishment in the meantime of structural measures designed to correct the inherent distortions. During the whole process, the developing countries—oil-producing or non-oil-producing—maintained their solidarity and unity, in spite of the fact that most of them were the worst affected.

26. After some hesitation as to whether priority should be given to checking unemployment or inflation, this new situation led all the industrialized countries to emphasize action against inflation, and adopt measures that reinforced the recessive trends in their own economies.

27. But as the recycling of financial surpluses was finally channelled to the industrialized States through private banks, those States availed themselves of a series of mechanisms which helped them to overcome their main basic problems. They introduced more streamlined protectionist policies, passed on the higher cost of money and oil to the prices of their products and services, and made aggressive inroads into the international market with new subsidized exports that compete unfairly with the traditional exports of the developing countries.

28. Obviously the non-oil producing developing countries are the ones that meet the cost of balancing the accounts. They have to pay more for energy, for capital goods, for industrial inputs, for finished products and, more specifically, for currency.

29. There being no other solution, the balance of payments on current account of three quarters of the international community has become structurally deficit-ridden. Because of this development, members of the international community have responded to these negative trends with measures designed to remedy or alleviate them, although they do not yet form part of an effective concerted effort consonant with the problems identified. It is a proven fact that the developing world remains united in solidarity, in spite of the fact that some of those measures were also designed to divide it.

30. The most important factor after 1973 has undoubtedly been the recycling of financial surpluses in the petroleum-exporting countries to the economies of the industrialized countries. This is a fact that can only be remedied with large-scale measures. Otherwise, in a few years time the present trends will lead the international community to completely unacceptable situations. The oil-exporting countries and the industrialized nations today have an inescapable responsibility for the global redistribution of resources and growth. If the need for a solvent world demand was very clear 20 years ago, it is out of the question to sit idly by today watching the extension of insolvency to the entire world.

31. While international dialogue is pursued in New York, Caraballeda, Ottawa, Nairobi, Paris and Cancún without our getting any closer to a global approach to substantive policies, our conscience is struck by the situation eloquently described by His Holiness John Paul II in his recent encyclical *Laborem Exercens*, a document which is a virtual programme of action for the countries assembled here.

32. One could devote a great deal of time to the analysis of the situation, but the diagnosis would always be the same: there is no solution that does not involve reactivating the world economy, and this calls for a massive increase of co-operation with the developing countries. This is tantamount to saying that there will be no future prosperity for the great world economies of today if industrialization is not extended to all countries in the world.

33. Argentina is the only developing country which is both self-sufficient in the energy sector and a substantial food exporter. It is therefore in a better position to judge the present trends. I would stress that the world food situation is as serious as ever and that the reduced interest which it evokes only reveals a shameful acceptance of backwardness, injustice and hopelessness. A world in which, *pari passu*, missiles and misery are built up threatens an explosion somewhere.

34. I have taken the liberty of expressing some viewpoints of the Argentine Government, which are those of my people. The Argentine nation, as all representatives are aware, has inherited Western culture. It shares all the values that are inherent in that culture: a profound belief in freedom, in the alienable rights of the human person, in their defense through the mechanisms of a pluralist society, in the sovereignty of the people and in the republican form of government. Its national and international ideals were formed by men like Sarmiento, Calvo, Drago, Sáenz Peña, Pueyrredón, and Saavedra Lamas.

35. In this Organization, as in the one that preceded it, Argentina has always played an active role, which has been permanently documented, through the most diverse Governments and in the most difficult internal situations. My country passed through one such situation a few years ago, when it suffered one of the most violent acts of aggression ever perpetrated by international terrorism. Argentina overcame that aggression by its own means, not asking for anyone's help. No one can say that my country is a threat to the peace or security of anyone. For that reason, we have not been prepared to permit interference in our internal affairs by anyone, either in the events that are part of history or in the present process of democratic reconstruction in which we are engaged, although our

doors are open for everyone to see what we are doing and we are ready for a dialogue with anybody.

36. In that dialogue Argentina will be, as it has always been, a zealous defender of international order, of the rights of the national State, of the principles of sovereignty, of non-intervention, of self-determination of peoples and, above all, of peace among nations. Argentina reaffirms those principles, which it has always adhered to and which it shares with the States members of the non-aligned movement in which our country plays a part and whose principles we hope will be vigorously reaffirmed at the next summit conference in Baghdad in 1982 in the face of any attempt to weaken the Movement. Those principles, as well as the repudiation of all forms of racism or discrimination such as *apartheid* or any other kind of discrimination based on creed, culture, caste or class, are inherent in a nation that attained freedom at the dawn of the process that put an end to the colonial empires.

37. It is a strange paradox that our country, which was in the vanguard of the struggle for national independence, should still suffer from a breach of its territorial integrity, an anachronistic persistence of colonialism.

38. The Malvinas Islands have not been restored to Argentina despite the long interval that has elapsed since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2065 (XX) in 1965. The Malvinas are a colony to this day, with the formal status thereof, basically exploited by a company built on the pattern of those of the time of the mercantile States. Perhaps a unique case in these times of demographic explosion, the Malvinas at present have a population smaller than that which inhabited them at the time of the above-mentioned resolution. Large food and energy resources are awaiting exploitation, which is not possible as long as the present illegal occupation continues.

39. That situation is still less understandable when the islanders have had every practical opportunity of realizing that their association with Argentina is a source of benefits that are otherwise unattainable. Obviously the Malvinas cannot remain a colony, nor can Argentina passively accept that part of its territory should be one of the last colonies. I should like to inform this Assembly that Argentina has addressed to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland a proposal designed to give a decisive impetus to the negotiations regarding sovereignty over the Malvinas, South Sandwich and South Georgias Islands. The Argentine Republic hopes in due course to be able to report to the General Assembly that the series of negotiations concerning the Malvinas, South Sandwich and South Georgias Islands which we hope will begin soon, has proved to be the last.

40. The clear awareness that we must have of the serious problems that we face does not hide the enormous capacity of the instruments available to mankind to solve them. The main one among them is the Organization. A single example would suffice to demonstrate the possibilities that open up when the international community works in an organized fashion towards common goals: the success of the intense efforts to ensure the establishment of a just and balanced system to govern the orderly and peaceful use of the oceans and the rational exploitation of their resources.

41. In that connection, Argentina hopes that the draft convention prepared at the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea¹ will be adopted in the course of next year and that it will be open for signature in Caracas.

42. There is no alternative to peace; nor is there any alternative to development. Peace and development require the effort of each and every State forming part of the world community. There is no substitute for our own work, but it is also necessary to have the contribution of everyone. Peace and development presuppose a demand for reason and a call for moderation. Reason and moderation are the specific instruments of culture and the human condition. They can forestall any threats that hover on the horizon. They can ensure a proper synthesis of the demands of security and the sacred principle of the self-determination of peoples. They can also foster the realization that the economic growth of the richest among us is not incompatible with, but rather requires, the development of the poorest among us.

43. In this world there is no place for lethargy in the struggle for peace or in the development effort. We have reason to hope, not only because there is no alternative but also because the cause is good and just. In the pursuit of those ideals, Argentina identifies with the brotherly peoples of Latin America, whose destiny it shares, whose more active presence in world politics is one of the best assurances of the attainment of the goals of those who gave birth to this Organization and whose authentic leaders are all men of goodwill.

44. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Speaking from this rostrum today, I should like first of all to recall that the United Nations enjoys solid credibility among the peoples of the world as a forum whose principal objective is to serve as an effective instrument for the maintenance of peace.

45. It is well known that the birth of the United Nations was the result of the peoples' determination to preclude another world tragedy. Its establishment reflected the awareness, deeply rooted in people's minds following the great victory over fascism, of the need for them to unite closely in the name of peace and to prevail over the forces of militarism and aggression.

46. That is why the very first lines of the Charter proclaimed the goal "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". These are clear and emphatic words.

47. I should like to express the confidence that these words will never fade and will never lose their profound meaning. They are a solemn oath taken by the founding States when creating the United Nations. Today that is the duty of all the 155 countries represented in the United Nations.

48. True, there are some who now try to contend that there are things more important than peace. However, it is obvious that the peoples have never authorized those leaders to say this on their behalf. Peace is a priceless asset of all people on earth; it is a decisive prerequisite to progress in any sphere of human endeavour. That was true in the past, and it is all the more true now.

49. As Leonid Brezhnev has stressed, "The safeguarding of peace—no other task is more important now at the international level for our party, for our people and for all the peoples of the world. By safeguarding peace we are working not only for the people who are living today, and not only for our children and grandchildren; we are working for the happiness of countless future generations."

50. Acting on that fundamental assumption, the twenty-sixth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—the highest forum of the Soviet Communists—recently put forward a whole series of proposals on the key problems of international life, which have evoked a broad response in the world. They provide for far-reaching steps designed to limit arms, eliminate hotbeds of tension and strengthen confidence among States. They cover both the political and the military fields, deal with nuclear-missile weapons and conventional armaments and bear upon the situation in Europe, in the Near, Middle and Far East and in other regions of the world. Underlying these proposals is one single desire: to improve the international climate, to ward off the threat of war.

51. In the international arena the Soviet Union stands shoulder to shoulder with other socialist States. Recently, during their meetings in the Crimea, the leaders of the parties and countries of the socialist community had an opportunity once again to harmonize those countries' assessments and actions in the light of the situation taking shape in the world. The same purpose is served by regular meetings of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty and by the activities of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

52. The foreign policy of the socialist countries has been and continues to be a policy of peace. It follows from the very nature of our social system, of whose advantages we are deeply convinced. It is determined by the fact that under this system there are no social strata which would make profits out of war and war preparations or derive benefits from militaristic policies. Nevertheless, we do not impose our social system on anybody. The peoples themselves determine, and should determine, their destinies. That has always been and remains the cornerstone of the scientific world outlook that guides us in both our domestic and our foreign policies.

53. In building a society free from social and national exploitation and oppression, the socialist countries are following an unexplored path. This is not always easy; but the laws of social development and the strength of our ideals ensure for the socialist countries a steady advance in all spheres of life.

54. Futile are the attempts by certain circles in Western countries to interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist States. Such attempts are being made, in particular, with regard to the Polish People's Republic. No small effort is being made to shake loose the socialist foundations of the Polish State. It will be recalled, in this connection, that the leaders of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty made the following statement:

"It was reiterated that socialist Poland, the Polish United Workers' Party and the Polish people can firmly count on the fraternal solidarity and support of the Warsaw Treaty countries. The representatives of the Polish United Workers' Party stressed that Poland has been, is

and will remain a socialist State, a firm link in the common family of the countries of socialism."

55. The Republic of Cuba is coping with the tasks of socialist development and pursuing a policy of peace in difficult external conditions. The Soviet Union has invariably supported and will continue to support the Cuban people in their struggle to safeguard their sovereignty.

56. Hostile, criminal intrigues against Cuba on the part of the United States, which have of late been stepped up, must cease. Washington does not like socialist Cuba, but it may well be asked whether the social system of the United States is to everybody's liking. No one has the right to tell the Cuban people how they should manage their internal affairs.

57. In a bid to besmirch the socialist countries, their social system and their peaceful policies, all kinds of fabrications are being resorted to, and those who resort to them seem to be competing with one another as to who can come up with the most preposterous invention. Some even go so far as to predict an early sunset of socialism. I wonder how long it took them to find that word "sunset". These people seem to be endowed with a remarkable gift of inventiveness, but I must say that they do not seem to have a very good idea of the objective processes of historical development. Are they looking for the sunset in the right country? Is that where they should be looking? Are they not looking in the wrong direction?

58. How many were the prophets who predicted the downfall of socialism, but what of it? Their prophecies have invariably fallen by the wayside, while history has continued inexorably to follow its course.

59. The Soviet Union has never threatened and is not threatening anybody. Since the days of Lenin, peace and friendship among nations have been inscribed on the banner of the Soviet State, and we have invariably been true to this ideal. Today it is as dear to the people of our country as it was in Lenin's day.

60. In examining and solving international problems we rely on the ideals of the freedom and progress of nations, on the principles of respect for the independence of all States and all peoples, and aim to consolidate the foundations of life rather than prepare the funeral of mankind.

61. There exists, however, another trend in world politics, which has quite different goals. It is the course followed in the militarist circles of imperialist States. The sum and substance of that course is to seek domination over other countries and peoples, a domination that means imposing one's will upon them, their economic exploitation and the use of their territories for military strategic purposes. Washington is ever more frequently heard to speak about the American leadership of the world, though no one has entitled the United States to claim such leadership.

62. The architects of that course see as the main instrument for achieving their objectives the whipping up of international tensions and the use, as they put it themselves, of methods of force in politics. Even when they occasionally recognize in words the possibility of a diplomatic alternative they hasten to make it clear that diplomacy, unless it relies on force, does not suit them.

63. The most typical manifestations of that policy line are: a further whipping up of the arms race; an overt claim to military superiority over the Soviet Union; the setting up of a wide network of military bases and the stationing of American troops on foreign territories; the undermining of the basic principles of Soviet-American relations worked out earlier as a result of tremendous effort; pressure on other States, particularly in Europe, to curtail their political, trade and economic ties with the socialist countries; and slanderous propaganda against countries adhering to the positions of peace and rejecting claims to world leadership by no matter whom.

64. And what great pains are taken to drag the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] allies into following that policy. When arguments are lacking—and there is a constant lack of them to support such a hopeless and dangerous course—crude pressure is brought to bear, so as to give no respite to those who are not always eager to accept militaristic schemes alien to their interests.

65. It is sometimes said that Washington's present policy does not rule out prospects for developing relations between the USSR and the United States. However, in the same breath it is immediately demanded that our country should change—neither more nor less—its conduct in international affairs to satisfy American interests. In other words, the Soviet Union must give up defending its legitimate interests, give up its foreign policy.

66. To put forward such demands is to show a lack of seriousness. The Soviet Union will continue to pursue its course of Leninist peaceful policy. Our country does not intend to deviate from it. We do not encroach on the legitimate interests of others, but nor shall we forgo legitimate interests of our own, including commitments to our allies.

67. It is to be hoped that Washington will yet be able to take a more sober view of the actual state of affairs, adopt a more realistic approach to international affairs and not overestimate its capabilities while underestimating the capabilities of others.

68. In order to build policy on a realistic basis one should seek, not clashes and conflicts with other countries, even though those other countries have a different social system, but rather the settlement of controversial problems at the negotiating table.

69. For our part, we reaffirm once again—and the USSR delegation is authorized to say it from this rostrum—that the Soviet Union has not sought, nor is it seeking, confrontation with the United States of America. We should like to have normal businesslike relations with the United States. As is known, we are in favour of a dialogue in order to seek mutually acceptable solutions to controversial problems. But we are not begging for such a dialogue, we are proposing it.

70. At every session of the General Assembly many States emphasize, quite rightly, that the peoples are greatly endangered by the policy of crude interference in the internal affairs of other countries, support for blood-thirsty dictatorial régimes hated by their own peoples and an all-out encouragement of oppressors and hatchet-men of every stripe, including the Pol Pot experts in genocide.

71. The methods and forms employed in pursuing such a policy are varied. Recently, the United States has all but launched a crusade against international terrorism, leveling accusations against one country after another. These accusations, however, are misdirected. They are utterly false. Terrorism is looked for not where it should be sought and where it really is to be found.

72. The scheme here is simple—to tag the label of terrorism on the struggle of peoples against colonialism and its vestiges. In other words, it is the policy of oppression, cursed by peoples, which is pictured as a struggle against terrorism. At its basis lies unwillingness to take into account the rights of peoples to manage their domestic affairs as they see fit, and refusal to accept social changes occurring in the world.

73. And surely, the events in El Salvador are a fitting illustration of the policy of imperialist interference in the affairs of other peoples. A real massacre has been committed there before the eyes of the whole world. Patriots defending the independence of their country, thousands of peaceful civilians are being killed. It is well known who is in charge there. And all this goes on at the very moment when we are all sitting in session here in the General Assembly Hall.

74. What is happening in El Salvador arouses the legitimate indignation of all honest people on earth. Regrettably, the United Nations has not yet lifted a finger to assist in putting an end to these crimes against a whole nation.

75. And how should one view the policy of shameless pressure exerted on Libya and, in particular, the recent armed provocation against that country? Or take the so-called rapid deployment force. Apparently, its formation is regarded in Washington as a great invention. But there is nothing great in it. It is nothing but a policeman's club intended to ensure crude interference by the United States in the affairs of independent States and to stifle the freedom of peoples.

76. At this world forum one cannot ignore either the concept of "American vital interests" cited in justification of such a policy. This concept is importunately repeated in almost every official statement by Washington on the subject of the international situation. It is interpreted in such a way as to enable the United States to declare any part of the world a sphere of its interests and to take any steps there, all the way up to the use of force.

77. Europe, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America, they are all there. It seems that the only area still missing is the South Pole, but it too may soon be added. Everything is there except the right of the United States to do all this. Neither the United States nor any other country has been granted the right to hold sway over the entire globe. This is nothing but arbitrariness.

78. As is known, a whole United States naval armada has been assembled in the Persian Gulf. This action is directed against Iran, against the Soviet Union and against a number of independent countries of Asia and Africa. The United States Navy must leave this area. It has nothing to do there, nothing to defend. That would be a sensible act.

79. Neither the size nor the power nor the resources of this or that State give it the right to impose by force or threat of force its will on other countries and arbitrarily to declare any part of the world as a sphere of its vital interests. If such a right were to be recognized for any country or group of countries, then, apparently, all instruments of international law should be destroyed. Indeed, little would be left then of the United Nations Charter itself.

80. The ruling circles of a number of NATO countries now worship but one god—an unrestrained arms race. Everything that serves this end is acceptable to them. This arms race is invariably accompanied by a torrent of speeches and permeated with militarist frenzy, including speeches by top-level statesmen. Those who advocate inflated arms programmes resort to any means imaginable. Deception is held in special esteem by them. They deceive one another, they deceive the people, they deceive their kin and strangers alike. They launch a rumour and the next day they quote it as the truth.

81. The most salient element of deception is the myth of a "Soviet threat". It is repeated endlessly, to the point of stupefaction, day and night. In this manner it is easier to confuse people and extort money for armaments. In these conditions decisions are taken on a huge increase in military expenditures such as history has never before known.

82. The urge to expand their military presence wherever possible has now acquired the element of a real Bacchanalia, with half a million United States troops stationed in more than a dozen countries.

83. Today the policy of the United States is beset by such an obsession, especially in setting up military bases near the borders of the Soviet Union and the areas adjacent to it. Of course, the States against which these bases are aimed have to take all this into account so as safely to protect their security.

84. Who would believe that it is concern for peace that motivates the accelerated pace of the development of ever-new types of weapons, including MX intercontinental ballistic missiles, Trident submarine-launched missiles, the new strategic bomber, various types of cruise missiles and many other things?

85. What is the purpose of all this? The purpose is to try and upset the established strategic balance, obtain military supremacy and, on this basis, impose one's will upon others.

86. The Soviet Union condemns this policy as adventurist. The whipping-up of the arms race is madness. This has been repeatedly recognized by many political and public figures in the world, scientists and men of culture. Mankind must be saved from it. The present balance of military power is fully in line with the interests of peace and international stability.

87. Our country has never sought, nor is it now seeking, military superiority. Those who make claims to the contrary should not be believed. Leonid Ilich Brezhnev has said this to the entire world many times and, *inter alia*, directly to American Presidents on various occasions. But we shall not permit others to become superior

to us. We shall of course adequately meet any challenge so as to maintain the balance of power.

88. However, the Soviet Union has not done, and is not doing, anything beyond what is absolutely necessary to ensure a peaceful life for its people and the security of its allies and friends. We believe that the ruling circles of NATO know all that. Yet, they do not want to admit that there is no Soviet threat whatsoever, nor do they want to give up practising deception.

89. Indeed, what would then be left of exhortations about the need for the notorious "additional armament of the West"? Nothing would remain. That is the reason why use is made of incomparable indicators and of falsified data on strategic arms, on medium-range nuclear systems in Europe, on armed forces strength of the two sides in Central Europe or on any other aspect of the correlation of forces.

90. If, by any chance, some NATO official happens to concede that the Soviet Union has really never overtaken the United States and that parity is still there, there immediately follows a tongue-lashing from above. And then the record of "Soviet military superiority" is played again in order to support another increase in military appropriations and to substantiate some freshly baked militaristic doctrine.

91. In some capitals such doctrines pop out as if rolling off the assembly line. Things may well reach the stage where any bureaucrat, especially if he is in the spotlight, will, once installed in an executive office, immediately come up with a strategic doctrine of his own concoction. Thus, quite recently, the world was presented with a "discovery" according to which nuclear war in general should not be feared too much, that it is "admissible" and "acceptable". This is a shameless deception designed to mislead the peoples and paralyse their will to struggle against the nuclear threat.

92. If the arguments of the proponents of the militaristic policy course are left free of deliberate vagueness and intricacy, and of claims to originality, there remains only one thing, namely, the urge to intensify the arms race, in breadth and in depth, without any restraint.

93. But have the authors of these militaristic doctrines asked 500 million Europeans, 470 million Africans, 360 million Latin Americans, 2.5 billion Asians and, finally, their own people whether they want to perish in the flames of war? Certainly not. They just do not care.

94. The instigators of the arms race would like to discard everything that hampers their plans. If to this end it is necessary to renege on the obligations already assumed, that is what they do. Thus, the United States refuses to ratify the SALT II Treaty.

95. Negotiations had been under way for many years before the Treaty was finally agreed upon and signed. Now they say that this Treaty is not to the advantage of the United States and that it is inequitable. Of course, this is not true. The balance of interests of the sides was accurately established and preserved in the Treaty. This is known to anyone familiar with its contents. Therefore, that is not the point. The point is that it is this very prin-

ciple of equality and equal security reflected in the Treaty which is not to someone's liking.

96. Counting on people's ignorance, they seek to sap the Treaty by alleging that it does not envisage strategic weapons reductions. But this is not true either. The Treaty explicitly envisages such reductions, and on a substantial scale.

97. It is also obvious that, once agreement has been reached on strategic arms limitation and the initial reduction of their levels, it is easier to solve the task of their more radical reduction so that the balance reflects a lower arms level.

98. All that convincingly proves that the significance of the Treaty already agreed to and signed is as great today as at the time of its signing.

99. How numerous were the cases when talks on the limitation of armaments were held both in the period between the two world wars and after the Second World War. Yet any unbiased person will undoubtedly admit that none of those talks produced results that could be compared even to a small extent to the SALT I agreement, which is in force, and especially to the SALT II Treaty, which has not become operative.

100. Now a question arises: why smear both the treaty and the SALT process itself? Yet exceptionally reckless politicians are now saying that the entire problem is not urgent at all, at least not till the United States implements its most sweeping arms buildup plans.

101. Just think of the absurdity of such a stand. The nation which claims to be the most powerful in military terms says "Let me first increase by so many times my armaments and then perhaps I shall talk about their limitation."

102. What is the main factor in such a stand? Is it aggressive designs in politics, great-Power expansionist ambitions, a striving to impose on the world monstrous plans for an ever greater stockpiling of weapons for the annihilation of people instead of manufacturing things of material goods, or a desire to have an inexhaustible source of excess profits for those who manufacture armaments? It is hard to say. Most likely it is a complex mixture of all these things.

103. The United States decision to start the production of the neutron weapon aroused great indignation in the world. That decision is a new step towards intensifying the arms race, towards aggravating the world situation.

104. The peoples clearly say that they strongly oppose the fiendish neutron weapon, rightly considering it to be a particularly inhuman type of mass-destruction weapon. The neutron weapon must be totally banned. A ban must be imposed on both its production and its use.

105. Washington has long been making attempts to hold back or even to wreck the negotiations initiated earlier on a number of important problems. Unfortunately, quite a lot has already been done to that end. That was the case, for example, with the talks on the Indian Ocean, on limiting conventional arms transfers, on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, and on the prohi-

bition of the production of chemical weapons and the destruction of their stockpiles.

106. It is also appropriate to mention here the current efforts to cast aside the results of many years of work by States within the framework of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

107. Other developments in international life also have their impact on the world situation. Attention is attracted to the ever-increasing closeness between Washington and Peking.

108. Who would object to the desire of two countries to have normal relations between them? Nobody would, of course. It is the basis on which this is done that matters. In this particular case the basis is openly hostile to many States, above all to the Soviet Union, and hostile to the cause of détente.

109. It has been proclaimed to the world that the United States intends to sell weapons to China and to help it build up its military potential. And this is done at a time when Peking is pursuing a policy that runs counter to the interests of peace, a policy of hegemonism and aggression.

110. The establishment of military co-operation between the United States and China—with Japan, for reasons that no one knows, getting involved in it—will be duly taken into account by the Soviet Union and, we believe, by other States.

111. For its part, the Soviet Union has repeatedly expressed the conviction—it was recently reiterated by Leonid Brezhnev from the rostrum of the Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—that the Chinese people's interests would best be served by a policy of peace. The Soviet Union would like to build its relations with the People's Republic of China on a good-neighbour basis. We have repeatedly reaffirmed that our proposals for normalizing these relations remain valid.

112. These are the main reasons, as we see them, for the recent exacerbation of the international situation.

113. What is the conclusion that follows from all this? According to the ideologists of militarism, mankind is to expect a pitch-dark night, an endless spiralling arms race, further conflicts and clashes.

114. The Soviet Union and, we are sure, many other countries hold different views as to the prospects for world developments. Pessimism and a feeling of doom are alien to our nature. We are convinced that to prevent war is not only necessary but also possible if this is actively fought for. Hand in hand with all States, our country is prepared to wage the struggle for curbing the arms race, removing the threat of war, settling outstanding problems. In this respect we are not politically allergic to any partner, irrespective of differences in social systems or ideologies.

115. The immediate and most pressing task today is to struggle for easing world tensions, curbing the arms race, eliminating the threat of war.

116. The Soviet Union proposes that the General Assembly, acting on behalf of all Member States of the United Nations, adopt a declaration solemnly proclaiming that States and statesmen who would be the first to use nuclear weapons would commit the gravest crime against humanity.

117. There are and can be no grounds or motives, there are and can be no circumstances or situations which would give a State the right to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It would be a crime against all the peoples, against life itself on earth.

118. It is likewise necessary to warn that there will never be any justification or pardon for statesmen who would make the decision on the first use of nuclear weapons. To proclaim this in a declaration so that these words be heard in every capital, in every part of the world, would be to remind statesmen who, by virtue of their official position, are involved in making decisions on the use of nuclear weapons, that each and every one of them is personally responsible for the destinies of mankind.

119. We propose that the declaration further state loudly and clearly that any doctrines allowing for the first use of nuclear weapons are incompatible with human moral standards and the lofty ideals of the United Nations.

120. It is also most important to draw the attention, especially of leaders of nuclear-weapon States, to the fact that their supreme duty is to act in such a way as to eliminate the risk of outbreak of a nuclear conflict.

121. The declaration should stress that the nuclear-arms race must be stopped and reversed by joint effort, through negotiations conducted in good faith and on the basis of equality. What is meant here is that the energy of the atom should be used not against life but for the sake of life, not for the production of weapons but for scientific progress, for improvement of the living standards of people, that is, exclusively for peaceful purposes.

122. This is the essence of the political document that we are proposing for adoption. We hope that this proposal will meet with wide support.

123. The adoption of such a document may become a major landmark on the path towards complete elimination of the threat of a nuclear conflict. No single country should stand aside from the solution of this problem.

124. The Soviet Union is in favour of a dialogue on all aspects of the problem of ending the arms race, on all controversial international issues, in favour of a bilateral or a multilateral dialogue.

125. From time to time statements are made which seem to express willingness to negotiate. However, attached to this willingness are all sorts of conditions, linkages and unequal approaches of all sorts. If someone really intends to negotiate in this vein, we must say outright: nothing will come of it. Negotiations can be successful only if they are conducted on the basis of compliance with the principle of equality and equal security.

126. The Soviet Union is prepared and has been prepared for a long time to resume negotiations with the United States on the limitation of strategic weapons.

Given mutual desire, headway in the solution of this problem can be made, relying on what has already been achieved and preserving the results achieved.

127. The Soviet-American negotiations on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe will apparently be resumed unless winds start blowing again in Washington in a different direction. Of course, the question of limiting medium-range nuclear weapons and those of corresponding forward-based nuclear systems of the United States should be examined and settled concurrently and in organic interrelation, with due account of all factors determining the strategic situation on the continent.

128. Our country has proposed that the moment negotiations begin, a moratorium should be imposed on the deployment in Europe of new medium-range nuclear-missile systems of NATO and the USSR. This proposal is based on the existing approximate parity of their respective armaments. The establishment of a moratorium would certainly exert a favourable influence on the climate of the negotiations.

129. The Soviet Union is prepared to reach agreement on limiting and, what is more, on reducing medium-range nuclear systems in Europe. As Leonid Brezhnev stated at Berlin on 6 October 1979:

“We are prepared to reduce the number of medium-range nuclear weapons deployed in western areas of the Soviet Union from their present level, but only, of course, in the event that no additional medium-range nuclear weapons are deployed in Western Europe.”

130. At the same time we must make it quite clear that should the other side artificially drag out the negotiations and start to deploy new medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe, the Soviet Union will have to take measures to restore the balance.

131. For the purpose of strengthening peace in Europe, it is also important to break the deadlock at the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. The socialist countries have done a good deal to ensure progress at the Vienna negotiations. Should the Western partners show a minimum of goodwill, a solution could be found.

132. Of great significance is the question of convening a conference on military détente and disarmament in Europe. As is known, this question is under discussion in Madrid at the meeting of representatives of the States participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

133. Wishing to contribute to success, the Soviet Union has gone far to accommodate the West and has declared its willingness to include the entire European part of its territory in the zone of confidence-building measures, provided, of course, the Western side makes a corresponding step in turn. What is required now is precisely such a step.

134. Military détente on the European continent is intended to strengthen and complement political détente. But this does not depend on us alone.

135. The Soviet Union is prepared to hold negotiations on all areas of limiting the arms race and of disarmament.

136. Under current conditions, it is becoming increasingly important to prevent military competition from extending to outer space. Each day brings new evidence that outer space can become an arena of the arms race.

137. At the request of the Soviet Union, an item entitled "Conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space" has been included in the agenda of the present session [item 128]. The Governments of all States represented here have had an opportunity of familiarizing themselves with the Soviet draft of that treaty. The draft takes into account all major aspects of the problem. We would like the exchange of views on the basis of the Soviet Union's proposal and its outcome to be constructive.

138. With reference to the need to take measures for curbing the arms race and for disarmament, special note should also be made of the importance of efforts to resolve conflict situations in various parts of the world and to prevent the emergence of new hotbeds of tension. States are capable of coping with this problem provided they strive to ensure a more durable peace.

139. The struggle of Arab peoples to defend their legitimate rights, trampled underfoot as a result of Israel's aggression, elicits understanding and support on the part of an overwhelming majority of countries. If justice has not so far been restored and the situation in the Middle East remains dangerous, it is because those in Israel's ruling circles persist in their expansionist policies and do not stop their brutal terror against the people of Lebanon, while influential forces outside that area actually encourage this policy and seek to follow the pattern of the anti-Arab Camp David deal.

140. Peace and stability in the Middle East can be assured only through a comprehensive political settlement which would not infringe on the rights of any country or people of that region. Such a settlement must envisage the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967 and the exercise of the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including the right to establish their own State.

141. The Soviet Union consistently comes out in support of the Arabs' rights and stands for the elimination of the consequences of Israeli aggression. There is growing understanding that the path to a Middle East settlement lies through the convening of an international conference with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO].

142. A political settlement is needed for the situation created around the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, against which an undeclared war is still being waged. The principal role in this is played by the United States, and Peking is not far behind.

143. Unfortunately, Pakistan, whose territory serves as the main bridgehead for armed incursions, in effect avoids negotiations with the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Yet, who else but Islamabad should be primarily interested in establishing lasting peace in the region?

144. There has been some talk recently about the proposal by certain Western countries to convene an interna-

tional conference on Afghanistan. But what is striking is that, while the conference is to be on Afghanistan, the main party concerned, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, has been forgotten. This forgetfulness conceals the attempt to have the internal affairs of Afghanistan, a sovereign non-aligned State, examined in a forum composed of other States, without even the participation of the Afghan Government. Of course that approach is unacceptable.

145. There is a basis for a political settlement; it is simple and, given goodwill, can be translated into reality. A constructive programme to this effect was set forth in the statement by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan on 24 August of this year [see A/36/457].

146. The political settlement must ensure the termination and non-resumption of armed or other interference in the affairs of Afghanistan. Such a settlement, including reliable international guarantees, would permit the establishment, by agreement between the Afghan and Soviet sides, of modalities and timing for the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

147. In South-East Asia, too, there is no other way but negotiations to reduce tensions in the area. We support the well-known proposals by Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Kampuchea [see A/36/86, annex I, para. 4], including the proposal to hold a regional conference with the participation of the countries of Indo-China and the States members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations.

148. However, no one should assume that the manoeuvres under way around the non-existent Kampuchean question can result in anything but harm. It is inadmissible that, under the cover of some pseudo-conferences, executioners overthrown by the people of Kampuchea or former princelings should be imposed once again on that people. They have already made their choice.

149. Also doomed to failure are the attempts to cast a shadow upon the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, which extended a helping hand to the Kampuchean people in their struggle for freedom and independence.

150. Attention is drawn to the fraudulent allegation put forward in typical Washington wrappings that someone somewhere in South-East Asia used toxic chemical substances said to be of Soviet make. It is quite obvious that at work here are those who are themselves guilty of such crimes. Now they are trying to cover their traces.

151. The situation in the Far East, too, offers possibilities for positive political action. One such could be an agreement on the application of confidence-building measures in the region. The implementation of such measures on a collective or a bilateral basis would make a useful contribution to the cause of détente in that region. The Soviet proposal on this question² has been communicated to all the States concerned. We expect that in this regard they will display the required sense of responsibility.

152. The Korean question—still unsettled and thus an old source of tension in the Far East—can and must be solved by peaceful means. In our opinion, a suitable basis for solving the problem is provided by the proposals of

the Democratic People's Republic of Korea presented by its President Kim Il Sung at the Sixth Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea.

153. Recently the Mongolian People's Republic has taken a timely initiative by proposing a convention on mutual non-aggression and renunciation of force in relations between the States of Asia and the Pacific [see A/36/388]. Our country supports that idea.

154. The Republic of India is making a major contribution to maintaining stability and peace in Asia and ensuring international security. We value highly its peaceful constructive policy. Soviet-Indian relations, which rest on the solid basis provided by the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation, are in the interest of our two peoples and positively serve the interests of peace.

155. Political means can also be effective in settling other dangerous situations and controversial problems, including the conflict between Iraq and Iran, the Cyprus problem, the situation in Western Sahara and that in the Horn of Africa. The indispensable requirement in this regard is that nobody be allowed to pit one State against another and to capitalize on conflicts between them. There should be no room for imperialist intrigues in those areas.

156. As is well known, the South African racist régime and its accomplices are engaged in manoeuvres aimed at thwarting the decolonization of Namibia. It is a matter of honour and is the immediate duty of the United Nations to help the people of Namibia gain their freedom. The racists and all those on whom they rely must realize that the time of colonialism is past.

157. An end must be put to South Africa's aggressive gangster-like actions against the People's Republic of Angola and a number of other African countries. It is necessary to condemn those actions, to demand that South Africa cease its armed intervention and to adopt international sanctions against it. It is precisely this approach that has recently been manifested by the overwhelming majority of members of the Security Council in voting on a draft resolution submitted by Mexico and other countries.³ However, the United States has prevented that United Nations body from taking an appropriate decision, thus openly defying the African peoples and world public opinion.⁴

158. The United States support for South Africa constitutes direct assistance to the aggressor. Such a course must be resolutely condemned. The United Nations should do everything that is needed to put an end to the aggression and call the aggressor to order. The resolution recently adopted by the General Assembly at its emergency special session on Namibia [resolution ES-8/2] is a step in the right direction.

159. The non-aligned movement, which has recently marked its twentieth anniversary, has become an important factor in world politics. The Soviet Union expresses its solidarity with the anti-imperialist orientation of the non-aligned movement and supports its activities in the interest of strengthening peace.

160. Much is now being said about the problem of relations between the industrialized and the developing

States. Various bodies, narrow and broad, of the North-South type are being proposed. It is obvious, however, that no body will produce positive results unless developed capitalist States radically change their approach to developing countries, cease discrimination in economic relations with them and renounce the economic plundering of those countries.

161. Our country will continue to give developing States the necessary support in their struggle for economic independence and for the restructuring of international relations on a genuinely equitable and democratic basis.

162. The activities of the United Nations cannot be assessed in terms of standard units of measurement. A formal one-dimensional assessment cannot be applied to them. There are, however, grounds for saying that the United Nations has done quite a lot to enable the peoples of the world to live with greater confidence in their future.

163. Working actively with other socialist countries in all areas of international politics, the Soviet Union continues to make proposals aimed at strengthening peace.

164. No problem, no matter what its magnitude, can or should overshadow the principal purpose for which the United Nations was created, that is, to preserve peace. It is the individual and collective duty of all States and the duty of every statesman to do for this purpose everything within the capability of human beings, of their intelligence, of their energy and of their dedication to life and its most noble ideals.

165. It is clearer now than ever before how enormous are the challenges confronting the peoples—to meet the rapidly growing needs in the fields of energy, food, health and education, to explore the oceans and outer space, to preserve nature. These problems can be solved provided mankind saves itself from war.

166. Everything should be done to ensure that in the remaining two decades of the twentieth century people can live in conditions of peace and can cross the threshold of the third millennium of our era, not with fear for the future of our civilization, but with confidence in the boundless prospects for its development. All nations, large and small, that work towards this end will always find the Soviet Union at their side.

167. Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, your recognized diplomatic skill and your familiarity with the workings of the Organization augur well for the success of this session of the General Assembly. I sincerely congratulate you on your election.

168. On behalf of the Government of Mexico I convey the most cordial welcome to the new independent State of Vanuatu, which is joining our ranks and thus enriching the Organization.

169. I should also like to make specific reference to the other recently emergent sovereign State whose independence was proclaimed yesterday—I am obviously speaking of Belize, a sister nation so close to Mexico not only by virtue of geography but, most importantly, in its aspi-

ration to build its own future. My Government was the first to support its admission to the United Nations.

170. Mexico views the independence of Belize as an example of how, through the organizations set up by the international community for the purpose of living together in peace and harmony, it is possible to ensure prevalence of the loftiest principles, particularly that which governs my Government's foreign policy: the self-determination of peoples. In the process which ended yesterday, the resolution adopted by the Assembly last year [*resolution 35/20*] was decisive. In that resolution the Assembly unreservedly supported the right of the people of Belize to independence. As for Mexico, it is our firm intention to cooperate politically and economically with the new State so that it should fully consolidate its independence. Nonetheless, we are concerned at the additional element of tension introduced into the area and around our frontiers by virtue of the Government of Guatemala's failure to recognize the independence of Belize. We hope that the two neighbour nations of Mexico—Belize and Guatemala—will shortly find a mutually acceptable solution by the only effective means: negotiation. We offer our co-operation to that end.

171. It is almost trite today to say that the international situation is getting considerably worse. All the Member States and peoples know this because they daily suffer the consequences of that worsening situation. What is important today as far as Mexico is concerned, what is essential, is carefully to consider the reasons why the tensions afflicting the world are becoming more acute, so that the international community as a whole can take action to halt the trend.

172. In our opinion, there are two major factors which have caused that deterioration in the international climate: first, the growing political confrontation between the two super-Powers, taking the form of a real war of words which has shattered détente; and secondly, the increasing number of obstacles facing developing countries in their struggle to change both the internal structures of their countries and to transform international economic relations.

173. Today, we cannot talk about a mere stalemate in the détente process which was begun about 20 years ago and on which so many hopes were placed throughout the world. It is in open rout. We are going back to the era of strident rhetoric, of the arms race, a race which is absurd, because there can be no winner. Again, we are faced with a lack of dialogue or even of communication, and above all, we are seeing a situation in which the selfish interests of the major Powers are placed before the higher interests of the international community. A few years ago, during the era of détente, it was possible to talk of imposing on the rest of the world the joint force of Soviet-North American understanding; today, with greater reason, we can say that a worse joint force is being imposed on mankind—that of confrontation.

174. It is not up to any individual country to hand out prizes or lay blame or point the accusing finger at those allegedly responsible. But it is the obligation of every country clearly to state its position when faced with the growing number of disputes between the two great Powers. For one clear reason: they affect us all and not only the parties concerned. From our point of view, the

present crisis in relations between the super-Powers can be traced to two recent causes: the armed intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan; and the decision by NATO to install euromissiles in response to the Soviet deployment of SS-20 missiles.

175. My Government made clear its disagreement with the armed interference of one of those Powers in Afghanistan and continues to consider that that act, which violates the norms of international conduct, has largely contributed to creating a climate reminiscent of that of the cold war.

176. Mexico viewed with concern NATO's decision to install in Europe the Pershing and cruise missiles, a concern which we expressed to the Assembly last year. None the less, we consider that the other decision taken by NATO, inseparable in principle from the first, concerning the start of negotiations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO itself on nuclear disarmament in Europe, was encouraging. But today we must say how concerned we are to see that there has been a break in what should have been inseparable. At present there are no negotiations going on, nor can we discern the political will that would guarantee their success if they did take place. On the worst hypothesis, we see an unattainable desire to achieve military superiority by rearmament with warlike undertones. On the best hypothesis, we see the will to restore an allegedly lost military balance, solely by means of the arms race, including the use of the odious neutron bomb.

177. We ask the leaders of the great Powers: when are you going to start genuine negotiations? The peoples of the world have a right to call upon them to stop the escalation of their verbal exchanges and fruitless polemics, to stop provoking each other, to stop the new and absurd arms race and, above all, to stop intervention or threats of interference in the internal affairs of other countries, in the name of the crusade that each of the super-Powers has undertaken against the other; a right to call upon them to start immediate negotiations, to begin a dialogue at the highest level, between the Governments of the United States and of the Soviet Union. When the great Powers forget their responsibilities towards the international community, the other members of that community have the obligation to jog their memories.

178. That is so because, although it is true that a new war would have disastrous effects for all countries without exception, the present crisis is already affecting in the main the developing countries. This is the second major factor to which I referred earlier: the resurgence of opposition our peoples are meeting in their struggle to free themselves from internal and external structures of domination and injustice. We reject the argument that conflicts and zones of tension in Central America and the Caribbean, in southern Africa and in South-East and South-West Asia are merely a reflection of the rivalry and confrontation of the two great Powers. They are primarily a result of local conditions. However, it would be naive to shut one's eyes to the fact that this confrontation between the super-Powers worsens local conflicts, which are the results of the struggles of peoples against injustice and oppression. The great Powers are injecting their conflict into existing tensions in the southern part of the world, exacerbating them and bringing them dangerously close to the international threshold.

179. That is true of what has recently been happening in Central America and the Caribbean and in southern Africa, the two areas of greatest tension at the moment, in our opinion, to which, of course, must be added the Middle East. We cannot understand the support that a country with exemplary democratic traditions is giving to the racist régime of South Africa and to its acts of aggression against the peoples of Namibia, a country illegally occupied, and of Angola, illegally invaded, in a desire to oppose the other super-Power in a so-called strategic area. The only viable solution in southern Africa is respect for the genuine aspirations of the peoples of the region, secure and recognized borders for Angola and true independence for Namibia, and the ending of the *apartheid* régime in South Africa. If in the struggle to achieve those aspirations the peoples of the region do not receive support from the democratic countries of the West, then inevitably they will turn, as they have already done, to those who will indeed give them such support.

180. The mere presence or absence of one great Power or the other is not what really counts in giving a political description of a situation. The military presence of one or the other of them is not *per se* necessarily something good; nor would the presence of the other *per se* necessarily be something bad. Everything depends on what each one is up to. It is politically commendable to assist a country to fulfil its legitimate desire for independence and justice; it is not politically commendable to help an oppressive and repressive régime to maintain a people in subjection. We feel that that is true both for Namibia and for Afghanistan.

181. The situation in Central America and the Caribbean has also worsened seriously in the past year for the reasons I have just given. For some time now my Government has taken the view that all countries in the area or with interests in it must do everything possible to reduce these tensions, while maintaining that the only means of attaining that goal is to act on the basis of the legitimacy of the struggles being carried out in those countries. It is inconceivable that peace, democracy and prosperity can prevail in a region while long-standing structures of injustice and domination persist. The region being what it is, it is hard to see how such structures could be changed without any disturbance or struggle.

182. In the light of those comments, the Government of Mexico has developed a multifaceted policy towards the area, and its various facets are not always easily maintained in an over-all approach. We have sought, on the one hand, to keep the lines of political communication open with all Governments in the area, and that would include meetings at the presidential level. This has made it possible for us to hold talks and to exchange views on the Central American crisis and as far as possible to avoid any breakdown in communications between Governments which should be talking.

183. Thus we are taking part in programmes of regional economic co-operation which, although they cannot of themselves resolve the present crisis, can help. That is the purpose of the San José Agreement, signed by Mexico and Venezuela, more than a year ago,⁵ concerning the supply of oil to the area on concessionary terms, an agreement which is the first step towards the possible achievement of the world energy plan proposed by President López Portillo. We have always said that pro-

grammes of economic assistance must be completely devoid of political discrimination; we have accordingly acted within the framework of the San José Agreement, and have therefore requested that there should also be action by those countries which met in Nassau in July of this year⁶ to seek ways of contributing to the real economic prosperity of the region.

184. Furthermore, the Government of Mexico feels that the regional and world situation calls for closer links of friendship and solidarity with certain countries in the area. This is a fundamental and constant position in Mexico's foreign policy, and it could not be otherwise. We are bound to Cuba and Nicaragua because of a common origin: all three countries know what a revolution means, however different or divergent ours may have been. The Government of Mexico knows from experience what regional isolation resulting from such a revolution means. We also know what tensions can be caused through such isolation.

185. Therefore on many occasions in the past year we have said at private meetings what we are saying today in the Assembly: the lack of communication between the Government of Cuba and that of the United States and the increasing deterioration in the dialogue between Nicaragua and the United States are the basic causes of the Central American and Caribbean crisis. We state this with the force and authority conferred upon us by our excellent relations of friendship with both countries: as long as there are no talks, discussions or approaches between Cuba and the United States there can be no harmony in the area.

186. We continue to seek means to put an end to the bloody crisis in El Salvador. A short while ago, with the Government of France, we appealed to the international community to help find a political solution to the civil war raging in that country. Only a political solution can have the substance which can make it a just, viable and lasting settlement. A political solution means negotiations between the parties to the conflict. Hence, we recognize the organization set up by the opposition in the country of El Salvador, that is, the Frente de Liberación Nacional Farabundo Martí and the Frente Democrático Revolucionario, as the representative political forces which have a legitimate right to take part in any negotiations.

187. Some have said to us that such an acknowledgement is a matter of interference and, further, lacking in basis in so far as the forces of opposition do not form more than a small sector in the broad political spectrum. The Government of Mexico has summarized its position in three points.

188. First, we do not accept pressures, whatever their provenance.

189. Secondly, the appeal by Mexico and France⁷ for a negotiated political solution between the two parties to the conflict is not interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador.

190. Thirdly, as President López Portillo has said, the best proof of strength, representivity and popular support for the El Salvador opposition is to be found precisely in the fact that the Government junta has felt constrained to call for foreign intervention in order to retain power, and

other countries have felt obliged to respond favourably to that request.

191. To our mind, it is a dangerous generalization to say that the problems of Latin America must be resolved by Latin Americans, unless it is made quite clear that each country, and only that country, not its friends, neighbours or protectors, has the right to self-determination. Otherwise, we could be legitimizing self-appointed vigilante committees or regional watchdogs of a clearly interventionist nature, which would thus be unacceptable.

192. We agree that the conflict in El Salvador must not be a repetition of the tragedy of the Spanish war—that is why we urge a negotiated settlement—but if that were to happen, Mexico, just as 40 years ago, would be opposed to foreign intervention and would be on the side of the true interests of the people.

193. My country holds too dear the principles regulating its conduct and its sense of tradition to neglect its responsibilities. We shall continue on our chosen path together with friendly countries such as France and many others until reason triumphs. Mexico could not act otherwise and has no reason to change its stand, today or tomorrow.

194. If the confrontation between the two major Powers has served to hamper the endeavours of peoples to change their internal structures, it has also hindered any change in international economic relations.

195. In this regard, and before going into the essential matters of the global round and the International Meeting on Co-operation and Development which is to be held at Cancún, I must refer to the situation concerning the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. The attitude of some industrialized countries, in particular the United States, to the achievements already recorded is a source of serious concern to my Government.

196. When the international community began this negotiating process it did so in good faith, trusting that the time had come to regulate the oceans. Those negotiations, in which more than 150 sovereign States took part, were on the point of completion. We continue firmly to believe that within the codification process there was and there continues to be the greatest endeavour ever undertaken.

197. If the work of so many years is today not acceptable to such countries, the entire multilateral negotiating process will be seriously affected, because it will be hard to ask us to start negotiations again with the same trust if we know in advance that the results of our labour may be undone by one or several countries taking part in the negotiating process.

198. Furthermore, I consider that everyone should give more careful thought to the serious consequences if there is no convention. In our opinion, and in the opinion of almost all developing countries, the failure of some countries to sign, or even the failure to open a convention for signature, does not mean that the world can go back to the situation which prevailed before any attempt was made to draw up this convention; in other words, go back to the 1958 Geneva Conventions as if nothing had happened. This is a mistake. To our mind, the activity of the Conference and the extremely important agreements im-

PLICIT in the articles drafted gave rise to a great many practices among States, many of which undoubtedly had the nature of customs and led to genuine legal rules. But the lack of a convention will indeed be an enormous disadvantage, creating uncertainty and even chaos and anarchy in a field in which there is a vital need for the international community to have clarity and stability.

199. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to appeal to everybody to renew our efforts, complete negotiations and conclude a universal convention, which, as we see it, is the only way to find solutions to matters relating to the use of maritime resources.

200. The imperative need to have effective answers to the pressing problems of the international economy is striking this thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly with unprecedented force.

201. As it was 12 months ago, the Assembly is called upon to decide the fate of the most important initiative in multilateral economic negotiations taken in the first half of the 1980s: the global round of negotiations. Like other developing countries, Mexico has expressed its dismay and concern at the fact that almost two years have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted by consensus the resolutions on the global round [*resolutions 34/138 and 34/139*] and as yet no agenda has been drawn up and no procedures have been defined for the conduct of such negotiations, so that they have not yet begun, despite the pressing and serious problems with which the negotiations will have to deal.

202. In taking this initiative of the global round, the General Assembly was fully aware that the path would not be an easy one. In the light of experience of multilateral economic negotiations, many countries were convinced that the success of the global negotiations would depend upon efforts being made at the same time, but independently, to meet the conditions which must be fulfilled in order to ensure that success. Those additional efforts were not only to facilitate agreements in the global round but were also to contribute to other negotiating bodies. They should be designed to mobilize the necessary political will to make effective progress, to recognize the new realities of the world economy and the consequences for international co-operation for development.

203. In view of this situation, Chancellor Kreisky of Austria and President López Portillo of Mexico took the initiative of convening the International Meeting on Co-operation and Development at the level of heads of State or Government, which will be convened in Cancún within a month. As was clearly established in the consultations among the 11 countries which initially launched this initiative and as ratified by the 22 participants, the meeting seeks a political understanding at the highest level among heads of State or Government so that this international economic co-operation effort can begin without in any way claiming to pre-judge or to replace our Organization as the natural forum for such negotiations.

204. This is the nature and the objective of the Cancún meeting: it represents an opportunity for informal talks of a political nature at the highest level in the search for understandings, also of an informal nature, which would clear the way for future negotiating efforts. These would be made easier because of a greater understanding of the

size, scope and modalities attendant upon the problems involved and would open new paths to action.

205. It can be argued and, indeed, it has been argued, that the difficult state of the world economy and the discouraging background of multilateral economic negotiating efforts do not augur well for this fresh endeavour. Perhaps we could have had a more propitious time, or perhaps we could have had more encouraging signs. The Government of Mexico nonetheless feels that the problems of co-operation and development call for urgent attention at the highest political level and that the present situation as well as the stalemate in multilateral economic negotiations and the limited progress made in international co-operation for development are powerful calls to action. So, once more, responsibilities will have to be assumed.

206. The international community as a whole will decide on how successful we are. But we are firmly convinced that, regardless of the results obtained, it will be recognized that no opportunity was lost for understanding and progress and that no efforts were spared in order to achieve that end.

207. The rather discouraging picture of the world today is for many a source of justifiable pessimism. The problems deriving from the worsening international economic crisis and the deterioration of the economic situation in many developing countries have been supplemented by the sharpness of the disagreements between the two major Powers based on attitudes which we thought were a thing of the past.

208. Despite the efforts of many countries, viable and appropriate solutions to problems facing the international

community seem to be fewer than ever. Hence, today more than at any time we must reaffirm our commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of this Organization and redouble our efforts to hold fast to common sense. Mexico will, for its part, continue with great realism along the only path it regards as reasonable: that of peace and negotiation.

209. This is how we acted in the forums dealing with disarmament and in the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea; thus we are proceeding at the Cancún meeting of 22 heads of State or Government, and thus we shall continue to behave in the case of El Salvador.

210. There is no problem without a solution. To find it depends on our will and our ability. Let us find the solution together.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See *Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea*, vol. XV, document A/CONF.62/L.78.

² See CD/228, Appendix II/Vol. I, document CD/160.

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1981*, document S/14664/Rev.2.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-sixth Year*, 2300th meeting.

⁵ Joint Declaration of 3 August 1980 of the Presidents of Mexico and Venezuela on the Energy Co-operation Program for Central American and Caribbean Countries.

⁶ Canada, Mexico, United States of America and Venezuela.

⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-sixth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1981*, document S/14659, annex.