



President: Mr. Imre HOLLAI (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 33

**Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa
(continued):***

- (a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*;
- (b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;
- (c) Reports of the Secretary-General

1. The PRESIDENT: Pursuant to the request by the Group of African States for the urgent consideration, under agenda item 33, of the application of South Africa for credit from IMF, the Assembly will now take up a draft resolution on the subject submitted by Guinea on behalf of the African States and circulated under the symbol A/37/L.5. As members will recall, the draft resolution was introduced at the 38th meeting.

2. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

3. Mr. LUCE (United States of America): First I should like to repeat what United States representatives have said so often in this chamber. We strongly oppose the South African system of *apartheid*; it is against our principles and deeply repugnant to our own political and social values. America's record of action, and not just words, against the *apartheid* system has been quite clear and consistent. We were, for example, the first major country to institute an arms embargo against South Africa. It is thus not that we question the motives of the draft resolution's sponsors; what makes us oppose this draft resolution is rather the manner of proceeding. The United States believes the demise of *apartheid* can best come from peaceful reform within South Africa itself rather than from further assaults on South African actions in the international arena.

4. We are most disturbed that, in attempting to oppose *apartheid*—a system which we all consider very objectionable—some Members of the United Nations have proposed a measure which would do grave injury to institutions which were established to serve all nations. In seeking improperly to influence IMF on a member country's request to draw on Fund resources, the Assembly would contribute not to an easing of the system of *apartheid* but to damaging international financial institutions. In this regard, many members of the Assembly are not even members of IMF.

* Resumed from the 38th meeting.

5. Worst of all, we see this draft resolution as a further assault on the fabric of international organizations themselves. No one in this Hall can be ignorant of the attack made on the integrity of such previously non-politicized institutions as IAEA and ITU in recent weeks. Here we can now add IMF to the list of those organizations under attack because of short-term political goals. It is most distressing that the international organizations which do the most good, which serve the people in a most beneficial and effective way, are those most under attack these days.

6. The draft resolution before us is inappropriate in several particular ways. First, it mistakes the relationship between the Assembly and IMF as a specialized agency of the United Nations. IMF has an elected board of member countries whose role it is to make the financial decisions. For the Assembly to interfere in that process would be a serious and crippling derogation of the functions of the IMF Board of Governors. Secondly, the draft resolution appears to proceed from the incorrect premise that drawing rights for IMF members are a privilege or a concession on the part of the Organization. This, of course, is untrue. IMF members are entitled to drawing rights by virtue of their membership in accordance with established statutes and procedures.

7. The third and most important objection to the draft resolution is the application of political rather than economic criteria to the IMF decision making, which is the draft resolution's intent. The apolitical nature of IMF is essential to its ability effectively to fulfil its important functions in the international monetary system and consequently its ability to serve the economic interests of the world community, just as the apolitical nature of IAEA, ITU, UNESCO and so on is essential for them to perform their noble functions.

8. Despite conflicts of a political, social and even military nature that have arisen among IMF members over the years, they have carefully respected the fact that it is an economic institution designed to pursue broad economic objectives shared by all members. Any introduction of political considerations into decisions on IMF financing could invite similar actions in other cases, ultimately undermining the credibility and effectiveness of the Fund.

9. It is well known to the members of the Assembly that, as has been made clear by President Reagan at the International Meeting on Co-operation and Development, which was held at Cancún in 1981, and since that time in all discussions on global negotiations, the United States is vitally interested in the preservation of the jurisdiction, functions, powers and integrity of the specialized agencies. This draft resolution is precisely the kind of inappropriate politicization of the specialized agencies which would do

irreparable damage to the international economic system if such a process were allowed to continue or even to spread. Such a debasement of IMF would continue and spread such a short-sighted course, to the serious detriment, if not permanent damage, of all the specialized financial and other international organizations whose correct functioning is so vital to so many members of the Assembly. The United States has defended the integrity of these institutions and has supported them to a degree matched by no other country, a policy posited on their functioning on economic grounds. We shall, as in the past, oppose any attempt to turn them into political agents and shall determine our future policies towards them accordingly.

10. Finally, separate from the overriding issues of the independence and effectiveness of the specialized international organizations, my Government is convinced that isolating and punishing the Government of South Africa, as this draft resolution seeks to do, is not the way to effect the change that we all desire for the people of that country. We believe that constructive change is taking place and we are determined to continue to encourage South Africa to hold to a firm course in that direction. The draft resolution would have exactly the opposite effect, strengthening the hand of those in South Africa who argue that, no matter what policies the South African Government pursues, the world will only criticize and continue to isolate and destroy it.

11. Because the means proposed by the draft resolution's sponsors can in no way be said to justify the presumed ends, my delegation is quite vigorously opposed to this draft resolution and will vote against it.

12. Mr. MONGUNO (Nigeria): The central issue in this draft resolution is the racist policy of the South African Government and not the policy of IMF. Let us be absolutely clear in our minds about that. This is not a campaign against, or even a criticism of, IMF. What we are debating is whether it would be morally legitimate and justifiable for IMF to lend the racist régime of South Africa money, and what the implications of doing that would be in terms of the need for internal changes and reforms in South Africa.

13. No current world issue elicits a more universal reaction of anger and condemnation than does the South African policy of *apartheid*. The revulsion of the international community for *apartheid* is complete. The Assembly, which in a way represents the conscience of mankind, has repeatedly pronounced itself on the abhorrence with which it regards the racist policies of the South African Government and the serious implications of *apartheid* for international peace and security. Every year, the Assembly has passed resolutions calling for practical action against the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. A policy of trade and financial sanctions against *apartheid* South Africa represents the most practical action and is considered to be one of the few remaining peaceful means by which the international community can simultaneously achieve two objectives: the imposition of economic pressure on the racist Government of South Africa and the expression of solidarity with all the people of South Africa and Namibia who continue to suffer under the obnoxious racist doctrines of the South African Government.

14. One critical feature in the successful development of the *apartheid* philosophy in South Africa in defiance of the clearly expressed will of the international community is the ready access and availability of overseas investments and loan capital for the South African Government. The *apartheid* régime still depends today on overseas lenders for the success of its programmes of trade and investment, as well as for its nuclear and military expenses. In the last decade alone, the value of foreign loans and credits to South Africa has been of the order of \$10 billion. This vast loan was secured at a time when the South African economy was considered buoyant and during a period of relatively high trade and balance of payments surpluses. These extensive borrowings were the result of three basic factors: a programme of expansion of infrastructural and strategic facilities so as to reduce South Africa's vulnerability to potential international sanctions; huge increases in defence expenditure and the growing cost of policing the *apartheid* State, as well as developing an indigenous arms industry; and a sharp rise in South Africa's oil import bills.

15. The proponents of the *apartheid* régime have argued that South Africa's application to IMF is a purely banking transaction, that it is non-political and that such banking transactions are ethically and politically neutral. We reject this obviously simplistic notion, which tends to ignore the consequences for the blacks in South Africa of strengthening the *apartheid* economy. This money will be used in a further massive build-up of the huge South African military machine, the sole purpose of which is to maintain its white minority régime at home and to destabilize its black neighbours, the front-line States.

16. The *apartheid* policy of South Africa has been universally condemned as morally and politically objectionable. Those who sincerely hold this view have a collective moral responsibility now to demonstrate their sincerity by declaring their opposition publicly to any granting of further credits by IMF to racist South Africa. It is deplorable enough for foreign banks and Governments to provide the *apartheid* régime with loan capital and quite intolerable for IMF, which is, after all, an international banking and finance agency in which we all have a collective interest, to aid and abet the racist régime by lending it money. This would be in clear defiance of resolutions adopted in the Assembly, and a slap in our face.

17. Nigeria will, of course, vote in favour of this draft resolution. It will do so because it believes it right.

18. Mr. HELGASON (Iceland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries: Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and Iceland.

19. The Nordic countries' condemnation of *apartheid* and all forms of racial discrimination is well known and has been voiced in the Assembly on many occasions. Our rejection is based on our traditional concept of justice, freedom and democracy and our belief in the equality and dignity of every human being.

20. The Nordic countries have, since 1976, introduced and sponsored a resolution in the General Assembly urging the Security Council to consider

taking effective steps to achieve the cessation of further foreign investments in and financial loans to South Africa. This appeal to the Council is reflected in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution before us, and we should like to reaffirm our support for that course of action.

21. However, other passages in the draft resolution seem to overlook the difficulties of a practical and constitutional nature which would face IMF in carrying out specific requests addressed to it by the General Assembly. We consider it important that the independent decision-making machinery of IMF, in accordance with its Articles of Agreement and its own established procedures and practices, be respected.

22. Because of the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, we must also generally reserve our opinion with regard to formulations which fail to take into account that only the Security Council can adopt decisions binding on Member States, including as regards their actions in accordance with other international agreements.

23. For these reasons, the Nordic countries will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution before us.

24. Mr. van WELL (Federal Republic of Germany): Before we vote on draft resolution A/37/L.5, I should like to make the following points.

25. The Federal Republic of Germany rejects South Africa's *apartheid* policy, it being an institutionalized system of racial discrimination. We are firmly convinced that everything necessary must be done to set in motion a process of peaceful change in favour of the oppressed majority and for the benefit of all sections of the population. With the present draft resolution, however, the Assembly is being asked formally to pronounce on a matter which seriously affects the integrity of a specialized agency.

26. My Government has consistently defended the independence and effectiveness of IMF as indispensable to the world economy as a whole and as in the interest of each individual member country. Decisions of IMF and loans to its members must continue to be governed by the principles and criteria laid down in its statute and must respect the rights established in its Articles of Agreement, which are accorded to every member of IMF without distinction.

27. This position of my Government is well known. For this reason, and for this reason alone, we shall vote against the draft resolution before us.

28. Mr. BLANCO (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Uruguay will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution, which is now before the Assembly for consideration.

29. My country condemns energetically the policy of *apartheid* and opposes energetically all forms of racial discrimination. With the entire international community, it has taken part in adopting resolutions and instruments which define the principles underlying that political attitude. Uruguay was among the first to ratify the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [*resolution 2106 A (XX), annex*] and has submitted all the reports called for in that connection, including the

optional declaration which allows for accusations against individuals of violations of those principles.

30. As Chairman of the Group of Latin American States during August, I had the opportunity of expressing full support for independence and self-determination for Namibia, as well as rejection of the illegal occupation of that Territory by South Africa and its discriminatory practices therein.

31. The position of my country on this issue can therefore leave no one in any doubt.

32. At the same time, an essential part of our policy is firm opposition to actions by the international machinery for economic co-operation being based on political criteria, without regard for technical considerations. Moreover, such a departure from the rule generally has a more adverse effect on people than on Governments. My country applies this position broadly to any kind of policy or ideology. Uruguayan representatives in all economic and financial bodies are given instructions to this effect. To act otherwise would mean empowering those countries with greater economic and financial sway to apply political criteria themselves in such bodies, where they customarily have considerable influence. My own country suffered from attempts of this kind. It would therefore be inadmissible for what we rejected when it was against our interest to be supported by us when it was in our interest. This would mean that we were applying a double standard.

33. The safeguard for small and medium-sized countries lies in scrupulous observance by everyone of the rules of international law. Once the competence of a given body is exceeded by its entering into what is the purview of another, a precedent has been created. Where do we stop? What is the limit?

34. My Government is prepared to take part, as it has so far, in every effort by the international community to put an end to *apartheid*, which, as the Minister for External Relations of my country said in the general debate [*12th meeting*], makes of iniquity a doctrine. In this regard, Uruguay will support every measure provided for in the Charter to that end.

35. Mr. LOUËT (France) (*interpretation from French*): As everyone knows, France unreservedly condemns the policy of *apartheid* pursued by the Government of South Africa. We have said this here most vigorously and we have proved it by our deeds. So my delegation fully understands the concerns of the African countries.

36. However, my Government believes that it is not the business of the General Assembly to intervene in the decision-making processes of IMF. Specialized agencies, juridically speaking, are entirely autonomous. Their independence must be respected. It is for IMF to deal with matters submitted to it in the light of all the facts and in accordance with its statutes and the criteria and procedures it has in full sovereignty established. It is in the interests of all of us for it to continue to be so.

37. In the circumstances, my delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution before us.

38. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): The decision by the South African régime to borrow the sum of \$1.1 billion from IMF, and any attempt by it to respect

that request, must be strenuously resisted, inasmuch as it undermines the Charter of the United Nations and its purposes and principles.

39. This body, whose fundamental purpose is the maintenance of international peace and security, is the parent body of IMF. By its very constitution IMF is obliged to report to the Organization, and we would assume that such reporting would have to be in accordance with the fundamental purposes and principles of the Organization.

40. As I have said, the fundamental purpose of the United Nations is the maintenance of international peace and security, and over the years the General Assembly and, in a less emphatic way, the Security Council have decided that the *apartheid* régime in South Africa and the policies and practices of that régime represent a veritable threat to international peace and security, and have called for the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. The minimum that can therefore be required and expected of IMF is not to bolster the régime but rather to heed the call of the parent body and conduct itself accordingly.

41. Of equal importance to the matter under consideration is the fact that the judicial organ of this system, namely, the International Court of Justice, has determined that South Africa is in illegal occupation of Namibia,¹ which is a United Nations Territory. However, South Africa has refused to comply with the Court's decision and has failed to withdraw from the Territory. Instead, it has extended the policies of *apartheid* to that Territory, which again constitutes a threat to international peace and security. Therefore, a body such as IMF cannot be seen to be flouting the authority of both the political and the judicial organs of the Organization. If anything, it should complement it and be supportive of it.

42. Sierra Leone, being a member of IMF and therefore having a vested interest in its viability, must state that it is not even in the interests of IMF to make such a loan to the Pretoria régime. A loan of \$1.1 billion would in a sense mortgage IMF to South Africa. IMF would be obliged to maintain considerable interest in the financial health and well-being of South Africa, and thus become a *de facto* partner in the *apartheid* policies of the régime. Not only would the proposed loan contribute to the economic strength of South Africa, but indirectly IMF would be supporting South Africa's military and political capability to promote and maintain the policy of *apartheid* and to continue to violate international peace and security.

43. For all the foregoing reasons, by delegation believes that IMF should be called upon by its parent body not to make the loan South Africa is asking for.

44. Mr. DORR (Ireland): This draft resolution raises matters of serious political concern to my Government. It also raises important and complex issues of a constitutional nature in regard to the relationship between the General Assembly and IMF.

45. Ireland has always taken a strong position on the *apartheid* policies of South Africa. We consider those policies both wrong and dangerous. We believe that they are a matter of legitimate concern to the international community and that the international community should join in considered and co-ordinated measures

designed to impose graduated pressure on South Africa to change its disastrous policies.

46. In pursuance of this approach we vote each year in the Assembly for a number of resolutions on the *apartheid* issue and we are a co-sponsor of some of those resolutions. In particular, we have in recent years sponsored resolutions calling for a range of measures, including a ban on new investments in and financial loans to South Africa. We envisage that these measures should be considered and adopted in proper form by the Security Council.

47. It will be clear therefore that we understand the feelings behind the present draft resolution under which the General Assembly would urge IMF not to grant the request for a loan to South Africa.

48. At the same time we see the present issue as a complex one and in deciding our position we have been conscious of the specific nature of each of the two institutions and of the terms of the agreement governing the relationship between them. Since we belong to both bodies, we believe we must uphold the provisions of this agreement and we believe that, taking due account of that agreement, resolutions adopted by the Assembly should respect the competence and independence of IMF.

49. However strongly we feel regarding South Africa's *apartheid* policies, we nevertheless feel obliged also to uphold the separate competence of IMF, which is a body with its own statute and its own rules. Under that statute and under those rules members of IMF which subscribe to it acquire certain rights in virtue of that membership and that subscription. In such a case, we believe that the body concerned should reach its own decisions in accordance with its own rules when an issue comes before it involving a request by a member to exercise rights granted to it under those rules.

50. Accordingly, and for the reasons I have mentioned, which are of a technical character and relate to questions of competence, Ireland will abstain on the draft resolution which is about to be voted on by the General Assembly.

51. Mr. ORTEZ COLINDRES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Honduras is a country which has very clear ideas and positions on the *apartheid* policy of South Africa. Furthermore, my country condemns and opposes any kind of racial discrimination, since this is completely outdated and inappropriate to the twentieth century in which we live.

52. My country has also expressed at the highest levels the importance of ensuring the independence of Namibia and seeing this become reality. But it feels that IMF, which has its own separate statute, should not be affected or involved in political issues which are brought to the General Assembly.

53. It would seem to be counter-productive for the Assembly to mix what is a political judgement with a technical assessment, since both bodies have separate statutes and rules of procedure. To our mind, the precedent would be a highly dangerous one, since it would give rise to a distortion in the delicate functions entrusted to IMF, which has specific goals.

54. We understand the issue in terms of the African countries. We stand side by side with them in the

struggle, in condemning this policy, which we emphasize is not appropriate to the twentieth century. In the interest of the economic health of the international community, however, we shall abstain from voting on this draft resolution on the ground that, to our mind, it might lead to mixing two different areas of competence.

55. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Canada): Quite frankly, my delegation finds itself torn on this issue. On the one hand, Canada's stand on the policy of *apartheid* is well known and requires no elaboration at this time. My Government unequivocally condemns that policy and its tragic consequences for the vast majority of South Africans. On the other hand, my Government is deeply concerned by this attempt to politicize the decision-making process of IMF, as implied by this draft resolution. As we have stated before, decisions of IMF and other specialized agencies should be based upon their technical and functional mandates, not upon political considerations.

56. While operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/37/L.5 seeks to initiate consultations between the Secretary-General and IMF, as allowed for in the Articles of Agreement, we are concerned that operative paragraph 1 may prejudge what might be the outcome of these consultations. Accordingly, Canada will abstain in the voting.

57. Mr. FLEMING (Saint Lucia): The draft resolution before us is of dual importance. First, it underscores the willingness of the States Members of the United Nations to take concrete measures, rather than engage in mere rhetoric, against the dehumanizing *apartheid* policies of South Africa. Secondly, this attempt by the international community to take measures against a régime which has consistently thumbed its nose at the accepted modes of international behaviour is an important first step on the long road to finding an effective means of sanctioning those States which continue to violate international law.

58. For these reasons, Saint Lucia will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

59. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Syrian Arab Republic is pleased to state that it supports fully and without any reservation draft resolution A/37/L.5. The Syrian Arab Republic's position of principle is that racist régimes—foremost among such régimes are those of the Governments of South Africa and Israel—which are guilty of the most invidious and murderous acts against the peoples under the yoke of occupation should never be helped.

60. We support the draft resolution, not only because of our solidarity with its sponsors from the Group of African States, but because we are fully convinced that the international organizations should desist from supporting practices that violate the Charter of the United Nations, especially practices involving racism, occupation, persecution, murder, detention and death sentences. We congratulate the African group on the draft resolution that they have sponsored. We agree with all the provisions of this draft resolution which are based on previous resolutions. This draft resolution is in harmony with principles and objectives that take into account the interests of oppressed peoples,

in particular with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

61. We fully support this draft resolution and expect the specialized agencies, whether or not they are concerned with monetary matters, to respect the resolutions of the General Assembly requesting specialized agencies never to work in co-operation with racist régimes, especially the South African and Israeli régimes.

62. Mr. SAHNOUN (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): We shall have an opportunity in subsequent debates to remind representatives of our well-known position on *apartheid* and the policy of repression of the Pretoria Government, a policy unanimously condemned by the international community. What I should like to say today is that we cannot accept the logic just developed before us by certain speakers who have suddenly discovered that the United Nations family is made up of totally independent agencies, while it is quite clear that all those agencies are based on the Charter and that the General Assembly is duty-bound to see to it that the Charter is respected by Member States and more especially by the international agencies.

63. It is clear to my delegation that the question raised in the draft resolution before us is that of making sure that our overall political attitude, *vis-à-vis* the policy of *apartheid*, is effective. It is a question of an act which is in keeping with all our decisions and which, in the case before us, has repercussions on the policy and action of IMF.

64. In our view, there can be no question of any discussion on the institutional functioning of IMF, but we cannot disregard the fact that that body, as a specialized agency and a member of the United Nations family, must see that its action is in keeping with the major decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. To say that the United Nations must avoid politicization of a specialized agency is in fact to use an argument which today can hardly conceal the true objectives of the South African application. We know only too well that the Pretoria régime, because of its policy of massive repression in South Africa itself, its large-scale aggression against neighbouring African States and its illegal occupation of Namibia, is now encountering considerable economic difficulties. This loan would serve not only to help it to deal with its internal difficulties, but directly to finance wars waged by that régime.

65. We must not delude ourselves. Such a loan would uncontestedly serve to encourage that policy and would nullify all our efforts, all the work of the United Nations, and be a breach of all our principles.

66. For these obvious reasons, the Algerian delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution. We cannot be blind to the fact that the vote will be a test for each of us of our true commitment to the common struggle against *apartheid*.

67. Miss DEVER (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Belgium wishes to express its understanding of the motivation of the initiative of the Group of African States. On all suitable occasions, and in all appropriate international bodies, such as the General Assembly, Belgium tries to exert pressure on South

Africa, to induce it to abandon the policy of *apartheid* and replace it by a true democratic system. We shall continue to do this.

68. My Government feels a revulsion for the South African Government's discriminatory policy of *apartheid* which is equal to that of the sponsors of the draft resolution before us. However, Belgium's unswerving policy has been to respect the statutes of IMF and those of the other specialized agencies. Hence, we are obliged to register very clear reservations on a procedure designed to politicize these institutions, which, under their statute, should take account only of technical factors.

69. We wish to stress the adverse consequences which the adoption of the proposal before us could have for the observance of the rules of international law. This would be, in our opinion, a dangerous precedent.

70. For those reasons, my delegation will be unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/37/L.5. However, as an exception, we shall not vote against the draft resolution, but shall abstain so as to express our repudiation of the continuing application of the policy of *apartheid* by the Government of South Africa.

71. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/37/L.5. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Honduras,

Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay.

The draft resolution was adopted by 121 votes to 3, with 23 abstentions (resolution 37/2).²

72. The PRESIDENT: I call now on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their votes after the voting.

73. Mr. MIGLIORINI (Italy): The position of my Government on the question of *apartheid* is well known. The fact is that Italy unequivocally condemns *apartheid* as an unacceptable system and as a fundamental denial of human rights.

74. However, it is my Government's point of view that it is within the exclusive competence of IMF, in applying its own rules and principles, to judge upon requests for credits by its members. For that reason my delegation abstained in the voting.

75. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Netherlands): The Netherlands Government has repeatedly and vigorously expressed its condemnation of the *apartheid* policies of the South African Government. Our rejection of that form of institutionalized racial discrimination is well known to all the members of the Assembly.

76. However, the Netherlands is opposed to any attempt to politicize IMF or other specialized agencies. In our view, the principle of universality and respect for the independence of the specialized agencies must be upheld. Criticism of these institutions or other forms of interference with their work are definitely outside the competence of the General Assembly. Therefore, the Netherlands abstained in the voting.

77. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): The draft resolution just voted upon has been introduced under agenda item 33, namely, "Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa".

78. The Government of the United Kingdom abhors *apartheid*. We want a peaceful change in South Africa and support international action which we believe will be effective in bringing about peaceful change. We well understand the strength of African opinion, but the draft resolution just voted upon deals with a different question: it deals with the relationship between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. As such, it gives us severe difficulties. Our views on the competence of IMF are well known, and strongly held.

79. The purpose of the resolution is clearly to exert political pressure on IMF. We find this inappropriate, and therefore voted against the draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM 134

Consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq (*continued*)

80. Mr. ULRICHSEN (Denmark): I speak on behalf of the ten States members of the European Community.

81. The members are greatly concerned at the continuation of the armed conflict between Iraq and Iran. This conflict, which is deeply destructive of both

countries, contains obvious potential dangers to the security and stability of the region. Indeed, a conflict of this magnitude between two such large and centrally-placed countries in the sensitive region of the Middle East must be regarded as a matter of grave concern to the whole international community.

82. The fact that the conflict has now entered its third year, with no solution in sight, is particularly worrying. The concern with which it is viewed by the international community cannot be relaxed, and indeed must increase the longer it goes on.

83. The members deplore this the more because they have long-standing, close links with each of the two belligerents as well as with the other countries in the region. They recall that since 23 September 1980 they have taken a position in support of an end to the fighting and of a negotiated settlement. The conflict has now lasted more than two years and claimed numerous victims. It has led to considerable material destruction, created grave suffering for the civilian populations and diverted significant resources which the two countries had wished to devote to economic and social progress.

84. The members have given their full support both to the present Secretary-General and to his predecessor in their persistent efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the dispute. We have also warmly welcomed the complementary efforts in the same direction which have been made by the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Non-Aligned Movement and individual countries. We commend the persistence and the aims of these efforts.

85. The members have welcomed in this context the visits of Mr. Palme, the Secretary-General's Special Representative, to the two countries in pursuit of the Secretary-General's efforts. We note that after Mr. Palme's visit there in February it was reported that both Governments had stated that they had no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of the other country, that they had no territorial ambitions, and that they wished to achieve a lasting peace. We welcome the fact that Mr. Palme has agreed to continue to serve in the capacity of Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

86. While reaffirming their commitment to the principle of respect for the independence and sovereignty of States and non-interference in their internal affairs, the members express their grave concern at the continuation of the fighting. The members call urgently for a peaceful solution in accordance with the principles recognized by the international community, such as those outlined by the Security Council. They firmly believe in the urgent necessity for a just and lasting political settlement, taking into consideration the positions of both parties and assuring the security of the two States, with respect for their sovereignty, their territorial integrity and their political and cultural identity. Such a settlement is a prerequisite for the economic and social development to which the peoples of the region aspire.

87. We regret that the various proposals which have been advanced so far have failed to attract the support of both parties. We believe that continued efforts must be made to win this support, and that there must be continued contact with both sides.

88. The members are willing to support every effort directed towards peace. They are ready to contribute at any time and in any way that seems likely to be helpful to the restoration of peace between the two countries, as well as to consider, when hostilities have ceased, the possibility of co-operating in the reconstruction of the two countries.

89. Mr. AL-QASIMI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly's decision to include on its agenda the item entitled "Consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq" provides ample evidence of the extent of the international community's concern about the need to end the war in a manner satisfactory to both parties and to put an end to the human and material losses of both the warring countries, and of its apprehension about the extension of the war, with the possible participation of other parties, in such a way as to endanger the security and safety of the Gulf area, the Middle East and the whole world.

90. Those considerations have led my country to support all initiatives by the General Assembly, as we have supported in the past the initiative of the Security Council in this respect, and the Secretary-General's initiative in the form of the mediation efforts carried out by his Special Representative, Mr. Olof Palme, Sweden's Prime Minister. This approach by my country is in line with what the Secretary-General said in his report on the work of the Organization [A/37/1] about the need to improve the capacity of the Organization to maintain peace and security and to serve as the forum for negotiations. My country considers that failure to accept United Nations participation in the settlement of disputes and resort to confrontation, violence and war, in contravention of the principles of the Charter, diminishes the role of the Organization as the centre for harmonizing the work of the nations of the world and their policies for achieving their common goals.

91. By virtue of its geographical location and its relationship with the two warring countries, my country is very conscious of the circumstances which led to hostilities between them, the widening of their scope, their escalation and the consequent damage and loss of the human, military and economic resources of both countries. We had hoped that the dispute would not worsen in such a way as to lead to the use of arms and destructive force. We have a firm belief in the Charter and in the principle of settling disputes by peaceful means, and especially in Article 33, which says that the parties to any dispute should seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement and so on. Our hope is based on our policy of consolidating friendly relations with neighbouring countries, on respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States, on the principle of the non-use of force or occupation to settle regional disputes and on the settlement of disputes by peaceful means.

92. My country has close relations with each of the countries involved, relations that grew and prospered by virtue of our bonds of religion, neighbourliness and human interaction. Therefore, we suffer bitterly because of the bloodshed and the waste of resources. We hope that the flames of war, which every day

devour more human and material resources, will be extinguished.

93. We are very sorry that this war began and is continuing, and we have done everything we could to support the good offices of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the non-aligned movement to establish a cease-fire and to settle the problems outstanding between the two brother countries by peaceful means.

94. The confused situation prevailing in the Gulf area, results, on the one hand, from the attempt made by the super-Powers to draw the region into their quarrels and, on the other hand, from the threat of foreign occupation. This is why it is more necessary than ever to end this war, lest it continue and furnish a pretext for direct or indirect intervention by those super-Powers in our region, which would have to suffer the consequences.

95. For all those reasons, we direct an appeal to both brother countries to halt this disastrous war and to open a new chapter of fraternal relations. We cannot fail, in this connection, to express our appreciation of the unilateral declaration made by Iraq of its readiness to halt the war and to withdraw its forces to the recognized international borders. We are hopeful that the Islamic Republic of Iran will take a similar step to avert new bloodshed and to establish peace in the region.

96. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): The item concerning the consequences of the prolongation of the Iran-Iraq war is for the first time on the agenda of the General Assembly. We do share the desire and hopes of the international community that this will also be the last time. The greatest efforts should be exerted to bring this war to an end as soon as possible and to replace the fire of guns by a peaceful settlement of the dispute.

97. From the very beginning of this armed conflict, Yugoslavia has called for its immediate cessation and for the settling of the issues outstanding between the two neighbouring countries—Iraq and Iran—through negotiations. I would like to quote here the statement made by Mr. Cvijetin Mijatović on 27 November 1980, when he was President of Yugoslavia. He said:

“Countries do not come out of such conflicts other than weakened and bled. Neither of the participants can be a winner. There is always a danger that the winner will be a third party. Speaking of Iraq and Iran, countries with which Yugoslavia maintains friendly relations, we do hope that they, in awareness of this, will halt the bloodshed and destruction and find ways and means of settling their disputes peacefully. This implies the cessation of hostilities under conditions acceptable to both parties, and it means withdrawal to initial positions and the launching of negotiations.”

98. We pointed out then, as we are doing now, the need for a peaceful solution based on the principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations and those of non-alignment and of justice, and based particularly on respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference. We have stressed the need for the cessation of hostilities, the withdrawal

from foreign territories and the launching of negotiations aimed at resolving the issues in conflict between the countries involved.

99. We have always emphasized that nothing—nothing whatsoever—can replace the process of the peaceful settlement of disputes. One of the basic principles of the policy of non-alignment is the obligation of States to use instruments of peace in resolving their disputes. We should build, by ourselves and for ourselves, and preserve for future generations, co-operation and friendship instead of hatred and destruction.

100. Every additional day of war takes additional human lives and prevents those countries from using their creative abilities and resources for their own development and well-being. Thousands of young lives are lost and the material destruction continues; and all this will go on until the political will is strengthened and prepared to approach these problems in a peaceful manner.

101. Coming after a long period of various forms of foreign presence, exploitation, domination and interference, this war has hampered the emancipation and the economic and social development of those two countries. It threatens the security and the non-aligned status of peoples and countries in the region.

102. In the name of peace, justice and human dignity we should like both countries to demonstrate political realism and thereby find a way to a peaceful settlement. It is indispensable that the two countries free themselves from the war and contribute fully to the strengthening of security and peace in the world in an atmosphere of friendship, co-operation and good-neighbourly relations.

103. Non-aligned countries are constantly trying to prevent the situation from worsening and to contribute to the termination of the conflict. The non-aligned countries have been doing so since the first days of the war. At the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held in February 1981 at New Delhi, they expressed their views, which are still of the greatest significance, with regard to seeking ways to halt the conflict and to launch negotiations. Those views embody the principles of the Charter and of the policy of non-alignment, principles that are important not only for Iran and Iraq, but for the whole international community as well.

104. These principles underline, *inter alia*, the fact that no State should acquire or occupy territories by the use of force, and that whatever territories have been acquired in that manner should be returned; that no State should try to intervene or interfere in the internal affairs of other States; and that all differences or claims that may exist between States should be settled by peaceful means, with a view to seeing peaceful relations prevail among the Member States.

105. Now, there is nothing more important than the creation of conditions which will enable peoples to strengthen their sovereignty, protect their territorial integrity and proceed undisturbed to develop according to their own choice and to live in peace, freedom and independence.

106. Nothing should be more sacred, in our opinion, than the right of every people to determine, without any external interference, the path of its development and its way of life. Disrespect for this principle will lead us to international anarchy at the very time when we should adhere most consistently to the principles of the Charter that we have adopted as a common code of conduct.

107. We believe that we should strive to create an atmosphere favourable to such solutions, based on the principles contained in the Charter and on the policy of non-alignment. Genuine efforts should be exerted to bring back peace to these two countries. Everyone should be aware of his place, and his role and his responsibility for achieving this goal and should contribute to a speedy and lasting peace between Iraq and Iran.

108. Mr. MRANI ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): For more than two years an unjust, sterile and fratricidal war has been waged between two countries with which we have strong age-old links of culture, creed and civilization. For more than two years we have witnessed aghast the murderous acts carried out against each other by two neighbouring countries which have made tremendous contributions to the building of a civilization which was the pride of mankind and whose creative genius must re-enter as soon as possible the path of peaceful, generous and tolerant construction.

109. It is our sincere conviction, however, that the dispute underlying this conflict can be naturally and definitively solved by quite different means—through the peaceful means of negotiation, by reference to the fundamental principles that regulate our international community, through respect for the rules of international law governing conflicts between neighbouring sovereign States.

110. Following the outbreak of this conflict the Security Council, faced with the serious risk of an extended conflagration which could engulf the whole region, unanimously adopted resolution 479 (1980), which called for a return to reason by the antagonists, who in an excess of rather hypersensitive national zeal, allowed the situation to become gradually worse, leading them into a sterile and bellicose rivalry, which brought the entire region to the brink of catastrophe.

111. In July 1982 the Security Council, at a meeting dominated by the emotion and concern of the international community, adopted resolution 514 (1982), which, in firm and pressing language, called urgently for an immediate cease fire, a withdrawal of forces to internationally recognized boundaries and greater co-operation with the mediation missions, which carried out their duties with great devotion deserving of our appreciation.

112. In this regard we must mention the mediation mission of the Secretary-General, led by the very talented and able Mr. Palme, the mission organized by the non-aligned movement and the mission of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, led by one of the elder statesmen of Africa most devoted to the cause of peace, the President of the Republic of Guinea, Mr. Ahmed Sékou Touré.

113. Nevertheless, regardless of the solemn appeals of the international community, the urgent resolutions of the Security Council and the determined and well-founded efforts of the mediation missions, the conflict lost none of its virulence, and the risk of general conflagration persists. However, here it is only fair to note with proper satisfaction that at least one of the parties, Iraq, constantly replied favourably to the peace initiatives undertaken within the United Nations as well as the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

114. Furthermore, Iraq has on more than one occasion declared a unilateral cease-fire and unilaterally withdrawn its troops to the international boundaries, as called for in the United Nations resolutions. The Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez last month, expressed satisfaction at the constructive attitude of Iraq, with which it again expressed solidarity in the unjustified ordeal that brother country continues to suffer. There was insistence at the Conference that both parties to the conflict should show a similar spirit of co-operation with the international organs and in particular the Security Council, whose resolutions 479 (1980) and 514 (1982) should be immediately and unreservedly implemented, in the interest of the peace and security of the region.

115. We have noted with satisfaction that, according to the report of the Secretary-General,³ the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq had said that his country was ready to co-operate in the implementation of resolution 514 (1982). We would add that the Iranian reply, reproduced in that same document, has caused only dismay and chagrin in the Organization.

116. Then came Security Council resolution 522 (1982), which confirmed the great importance attached by the international community to the re-establishment between the two countries of a just and equitable peace based on the principles of the Charter. Iraq then again confirmed its readiness to promote the restoration of peace and harmony throughout the region on the basis of international law, but a positive reply from Iran is cruelly lacking.

117. Therefore the Assembly must firmly and constantly remind the Member States that are in conflict in the region of the duties incumbent on them through their subscription to the Charter and through their voluntary participation in our community. It must also recall that a peace based on the purposes and principles of the Charter and brought about by joint effort and dialogue, with respect for tried and true human values including both tolerance and love, is the only peace that can be lasting.

118. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The issue under discussion in the Assembly this afternoon is a serious and important part of the sombre international situation reflected in the statements by heads of delegations during the general debate this year.

119. The ill-omened war between Iran and Iraq entered its third year in September without any prospect so far of an agreement that would end it and restore peace, harmony and tranquillity to those two brother Moslem neighbouring peoples, as well as to the peoples of the entire region, which badly needs such peace, harmony and tranquillity.

Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

120. We have followed, along with the international community, the developments of this bloody conflict with great pain, sorrow and sympathy, because the heavy losses suffered by the two countries in terms of human lives, the disabled, the wounded, and the displaced, as well as the tremendous material destruction, have impeded efforts for development and progress and will hold up reconstruction for years.

121. Our concern is not confined to the security of the people of this region; we also fear for the security and peace of the whole world if this war were to continue and worsen in this very strategically important region. The Sudan and the international community as a whole have not confined themselves to following the developments of this war with sympathy, sorrow and pain, but have taken the form of unilateral and collective calls and appeals for an immediate end to the fighting and for a peaceful settlement of the dispute. They have been directed towards the establishment of organized and intensive contacts and mediation between the two parties to the conflict in order to find the best way to stop the violence and encourage recourse to dialogue and peaceful settlement.

122. In the United Nations, for example, the Security Council, which is the organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, held three meetings, resulting in the unanimous adoption of three resolutions, the first of which is resolution 479 (1980) of 28 September 1980, the second is resolution 514 (1982) of 12 July 1982 and the third is resolution 522 (1982) of 4 October 1982. All those resolutions appeal to both the parties at war to heed the voice of reason and to have recourse to peaceful means and negotiations to settle their differences with a view to arriving at a just solution and an agreement that would preserve their sovereignty and territorial integrity. In those resolutions, a cease-fire was called for between the two countries and it was urged that they put an end to all military operations; the importance of the withdrawal of the forces of the two parties to the internationally recognized boundaries was also underlined. In the resolutions the importance of sending United Nations observers to monitor the cease-fire and the withdrawal of forces was also stressed.

123. To promote the efforts of the Security Council, the Secretary-General dispatched high-level representatives to exercise good offices and mediation efforts aimed at ending this conflict. Furthermore, within the framework of international good offices and mediation, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, of which the two countries at war are members, started in September 1980, immediately following the outbreak of armed hostilities between Iran and Iraq, to launch its initiatives and to exercise its good offices to contain this conflict and to put an end to the war by peaceful means.

124. These good offices are represented by the peace initiatives led by the President of Pakistan in his capacity as President of the Organization of the Islamic Conference at that time and also in the efforts made by the Goodwill Committee headed by the President of Guinea, Ahmed Sékou-Touré.

125. In addition to all these various appeals, another, the latest, was issued by the Thirteenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers which was held at Niamey in August 1982 [see A/37/567, annex I, resolution No. 10/13-P] and which called on the two Muslim countries to seek peace and an end to the hostilities between them. This was in addition to several mediation attempts and initiatives and painstaking efforts which had been taken within the framework of the non-aligned movement, as well as the League of Arab States and other groups.

126. There is no doubt that the three above-mentioned Security Council resolutions, as well as the good offices and the endeavours exerted by the Secretary-General and the Organization of the Islamic Conference as well as the non-aligned movement and other countries, can provide a sound basis and valid framework for a just and peaceful settlement of the conflict between Iran and Iraq.

127. We in the Sudan have followed with increasing concern the continuation of the Iran-Iraq war, which goes on despite all the ceaseless efforts which have been exerted for more than two years to bring it to an end. We wish from this rostrum to pay a tribute to all the efforts and initiatives made so far with the aim of resolving this conflict peacefully through dialogue and negotiations.

128. We also want to associate ourselves with what was said in Security Council resolution 522 (1982), adopted unanimously on 4 October 1982, which pays a tribute to the fraternal State of Iraq for the position it adopted and for all the efforts it made following the outbreak of hostilities through the Organization and other intermediaries to stop the bloodshed of the peoples of these two neighbouring Muslim countries. Iraq has since the beginning declared its acceptance of all the initiatives taken by the international community and confirmed its willingness to accept unreservedly an immediate cease-fire and to put an end to all military operations as well as to enter into direct negotiations with Iran in order to consider all the contentious issues between the two countries.

129. In compliance with the resolutions of the Security Council, Iraq withdrew its forces from Iranian territory to the internationally recognized boundaries. Iraq continues to seek a just and peaceful solution to this conflict in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council.

130. There is no doubt that the whole world, as is crystal-clear from the efforts made by the Secretary-General, the Security Council, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Non-Aligned Movement and other countries, agrees on the need to put an end to the war now raging between Iran and Iraq and to settle the dispute by peaceful means.

131. We regret that Iran, despite all these painstaking efforts, maintains its insistence on continuing this war despite the tremendous losses and despite the ominous dangers involved in this war, not only for the parties to the conflict, but to the States of the world as a whole. Iran must heed the whole world's appeals for an immediate end to the bloody conflict in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council. Iran must help to create a climate conducive to a

peaceful, just and comprehensive settlement of the current conflict.

132. We also add our voice to that of the Secretary-General in the appeal he made in the Security Council held on 4 October 1982⁴ for the implementation of the resolutions of the Council, which would require the will and co-operation with the United Nations of each of the parties concerned in order to enable the Organization to fulfill its tasks effectively. These resolutions would be dead letters if the two parties to the conflict did not show good will and a readiness to abide by these resolutions.

133. My delegation, speaking from this important international rostrum, reaffirms its call to Iran to respond immediately to the appeals issued by the international community to put an end now to this destructive war and to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council and implement them fully. Iran should resort to negotiations in order to save Moslem lives, property, resources and capacities for the benefit of the Islamic peoples and nation.

134. The only way to put an end to the conflict between Iraq and Iran is to have recourse to dialogue and objective negotiations within the framework of legitimacy and international customs. Experience has shown that there can be no lasting solution to disputes between States except a peaceful political solution based on right and justice. Any solution imposed by force or aggression can only be temporary.

135. The wisdom and logic of history and contemporary necessities clearly show that Iraq and Iran, both developing countries, need to direct all their resources towards reconstruction and progress; they must work in all seriousness and commitment to solve their dispute in a peaceful way and to create relations between them of good neighbourliness, mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and independence, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, and to build a new relationship of co-operation within the framework of the close historical, cultural and religious bonds that unite them.

136. Mr. AL-SABBAGH (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): As we all know, the war which broke out between Iran and Iraq in September 1980 is entering into its third year. The continuation of this war will seriously endanger the stability and security of the area.

137. It is clear that the two neighbouring countries have already entered into a grave war of attrition that is draining away their human and economic resources and destroying the infrastructures of both countries, with disastrous effects for the future of their societies.

138. Despite the failure of the peace efforts of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the non-aligned movement, as well as the unstinting endeavours of the United Nations, we appeal once more to the two neighbouring countries to stop this destructive bloodshed, to desist from the policy of the use of force, to solve their disputes and conflicts by peaceful means, to respect the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of another State, and to establish relations of good neighbourliness between them.

139. In this respect, we cannot fail to note with satisfaction the fact that Iraq adopted a positive and constructive attitude by withdrawing its forces to international borders, and has shown willingness to enter into negotiations and to resolve the outstanding disputes between the two countries through peaceful means.

140. Iran must heed the calls for international mediation to put an end to this bloody conflict. There is no doubt that the continuation of this conflict will lead to further polarization and pressure and will plunge the already extremely tormented Gulf area into an explosive situation which could extend to engulf other areas.

141. The peaceful solution to the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq has become the demand of the international community. The Security Council has unanimously adopted three resolutions on this matter, the last of which is resolution 522 (1982) of 4 October, which calls for an immediate cease-fire and an end to all military operations as well as a withdrawal of forces to internationally recognized boundaries.

142. We hope that in the near future these two neighbouring countries will be able to negotiate their disputes and find a just and lasting solution to all outstanding issues, in order to open a new chapter in their relations, a chapter which would be characterized by mutual understanding and respect for sovereignty, as well as non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

143. The Gulf region, which suffered from imperialism and underdevelopment for many years, now desperately needs to use its human, economic and natural resources for reconstruction and development instead of destruction and annihilation, and to establish a society of prosperity and wealth for the good of all the peoples of the area.

144. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): This is the first time that the General Assembly has before it the very urgent problem of the tragic armed conflict which has been raging for two years now in the region of the Persian Gulf. Item 134 on the agenda this year is entitled "Consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq". But in approaching this problem, we cannot just talk of the future; we are compelled to make a brief statement on the actual facts and an analysis of the primary causes of this conflict, as well as the grave consequences it has given rise to thus far. It is only now, two years after the beginning of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq, that a debate on the subject has been organized. But it is not only now that the sincere friends of the peoples of these two countries are beginning to be seriously concerned at the consequences of the fratricidal war in the Gulf region. From the very first moments of the conflict, freedom-loving peoples and progressive public opinion in many democratic States throughout the world have expressed bitter regret and have followed with deep concern the distressing development of events on the battlefield and the disastrous consequences which have so sorely afflicted the two parties to the conflict.

145. The Socialist People's Republic of Albania and the Albanian people were very distressed to learn of the outbreak of war between Iraq and Iran and have con-

tinued to follow with considerable distress the news of suffering, great loss of human life, devastation and material damage already caused by this war, and which it is still causing. It has always been painful for us to see two friendly and fraternal countries and peoples engaged in a devastating war at a time when the tense, explosive and dangerous situation now existing in the world, particularly in the region of the Middle East and Persian Gulf, requires more than ever before the unity of the Arab and Moslem countries in the face of the aggression and conspiracies of imperialism, social-imperialism and zionism.

146. The Socialist People's Republic of Albania, from the very first moments of hostilities between Iraq and Iran, publicly announced its views and position on the armed conflict, on its causes, and its probable consequences. Those views, and the position of Albania, were also clearly set forth before the Assembly even when there was no specific item on the subject on the agenda. This can be determined from the relevant documents of the United Nations. It is not our intention now, therefore, to go into all the aspects of the problem. However, we would like to make a statement of our analysis of the situation and the events which have occurred, in keeping with our well-known position, which from the very beginning has been based on our desire to see an end to the war between Iraq and Iran and the problems between the two countries solved justly and by means other than the use of armed force.

147. We think at the present time that the most important thing to remember is the situation which was created and the events which occurred in the Gulf area just before the conflict, in order to appreciate the whole extent of the interests and factors which led to the war between Iraq and Iran. The most striking event in the area in recent years was the victory of the anti-imperialist revolution of the Iranian people. That valiant people rose up in a determined struggle and swept away the reactionary and tyrannical régime of the Shah, driving out his American patrons and dealing a severe blow to imperialism. This great victory of the Iranian people was of great importance not only for them but for all freedom-loving peoples and particularly for Moslem peoples. The triumph of the revolution in Iran, the overthrow of the Shah, the *gendarme* of United States imperialism and the defender of Israel, had created a situation favourable to the strengthening of the anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist front in this area. This served as direct moral and material encouragement to the cause of the national liberation of the Palestinian people and the Arab peoples and was a very positive change in the balance of power in this part of the world. It does not seem at all surprising that the imperialists, the Zionists, and other reactionaries should have striven from the very beginning, by all possible means, to undermine and stifle the Iranian revolution, and to overthrow the power which had been established in that country after the creation of the Islamic republic.

148. It is well known that shortly before the outbreak of hostilities between Iraq and Iran American imperialism was feverishly engaged in an unbridled escalation of acts of aggression and intimidation against the people and revolution of Iran. The American imperialists cynically and arrogantly

resorted to pressure, blackmail, threats, undermining activities and subversion, and even attempted a naval blockade and direct military intervention in order to break the will of the Iranian people, to eliminate the Islamic republic, to restore the Shah's régime and their neo-colonialist privileges. It will also be recalled very clearly how the United States strove to unite its allies and reactionary forces and stir them up against Iran. One of the aims of American imperialism in all its manoeuvres and plots against the Iranian revolution was to divide Iran and the Arab countries, and to arouse in those countries a feeling of distrust about the cause of the revolution and the struggle of the Iranian people.

149. The Soviet socialist-imperialists have also always adopted a hostile attitude towards the Iranian revolution. They sought to profit from the situations which it created in order to carry out their own hegemonistic designs. They strove to score points in their rivalry with the United States in the Middle East, to establish influence over Iran and to replace the Americans who were driven out.

150. The American imperialists and the Soviet socialist-imperialists wove all kind of intrigues against the peoples and the countries of the area and against the Iranian revolution. Through their intelligence agents they encouraged discord in Iran and attempted to weaken unity in the face of the imperialist policy. They shrank from no pretext, from no means, in striving to realize their ambitions in the Gulf area, and above all an encouragement to destroy the Iranian revolution, and prevent it from becoming an example and an encouragement to other Moslem peoples.

151. All these intensive hostile activities against the revolution of the Iranian people was the background for the outbreak of the armed conflict between Iraq and Iran which has sown so much death and destruction. Now, two years after the beginning of the bloody fighting between Iraq and Iran, and in the light of all the tragic events which have occurred in the Middle East, everyone must now know more clearly than ever before that the war in the Gulf area was provoked and incited by the two imperialist super-Powers, and above all by American imperialism.-

152. The absurd war between Iraq and Iran broke out just at the time when there was an intensification of pressure and aggressive acts aimed at diverting the Iranian people from their path, at a time when American imperialism was attempting to put into effect its political and military doctrines of intervention and domination in the Middle East, when imperialist-Zionist conspiracies for a so-called settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict were broadening in scope. It was also at a time when Soviet occupation troops were striving by all possible means to drown in blood the resistance of the Afghan people.

153. American imperialism had an interest in provoking the armed conflict in order to advance its anti-Arab and anti-Palestinian plots. Soviet socialist-imperialism, for its part, had an interest in seeing this conflict expand, to profit from it, to divert the attention of world public opinion from its barbarous aggression in Afghanistan and to find pretexts for more advanced Soviet intervention within the framework of its rivalry with the United States. But the Iranian

people remained brave and determined in spite of the tremendous difficulties they were encountering internally and externally. They persisted in their just struggle and outfaced all the manoeuvres and imperialist plots.

154. From the very beginning we have always thought that the motives advanced to justify the outbreak of the conflict did not hold water. It may well be that history has bequeathed these two neighbouring countries some unsolved problems, or that political and other controversies may have arisen between them, but these were not serious enough to lead inexorably to a military confrontation, a development that came about because of the intervention of the super-Powers in the case of the conflict between Iraq and Iran. The only effect of that military conflict was to inflict great suffering on the countries involved and serve as grist to the mill of imperialism and socialist-imperialism. The war has benefited neither Iraq nor Iran, nor the other countries of the Middle East. On the contrary, great damage has been done to them, and the consequences that may yet ensue could be very serious.

155. As we have stressed on other occasions, the Israeli Zionists were rubbing their hands and gloated openly at seeing their enemies slaughtering each other, and the Palestinian problem and the liberation of occupied Arab lands taking second or even third place. They have always welcomed the armed conflict because it reduced the opportunities created by the triumph of the Iranian revolution for the strengthening of the anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist front in this area, weakened the anti-Zionist unity of the Arab countries, and gave Israel excellent opportunities for increasing its aggressive acts. Israel did not hesitate or delay in profiting from the circumstances and acting to realize its ambitions. Suffice it to recall the bombing by the Israeli Zionists of the atomic power station in Iraq, and the war of aggression and extermination by the Israeli Zionists against Palestinians in Lebanon, to mention only two examples which demonstrate how correct were the warnings from the sincere friends of the Arab and Moslem peoples that the Zionists were going to profit from the armed conflict in the Gulf area.

156. In the light of all these adverse consequences, the complications and implications of the conflict between Iraq and Iran, we have stated from the beginning that from all standpoints the continuance of the conflict can only harm the brother peoples of Iraq and Iran and other neighbouring countries, and therefore all the forces involved in the fighting should be withdrawn without delay inside the frontiers of their own countries and all outstanding quarrels and disagreements should be resolved in a spirit of understanding and good-neighbourliness, without permitting any interference from imperialist Powers.

157. In expressing these hopes, it was our view that this was entirely possible if account was taken of the fact that the principal enemies of the peoples of Iraq and Iran were and remain American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, the international monopolistic bourgeoisie and their agents. From the first days of the conflict we said that if the Iraqis and the Iranians, two brother countries which have suffered the domination of the same imperialists and have been threatened by the same great Powers, were to put

an end to the fighting and settle their disagreements in a peaceful way it would serve their interests and the entire cause of the national liberation of peoples.

158. But, to our regret, we are faced with another situation two years later. The war is continuing. In the Gulf area the situation remains grave and may get even worse. In spite of the ignominious defeat it has sustained in Iran, the United States has not given up its efforts to regain the position and privileges which it has lost, while the Soviet Union continues its efforts aimed at profiting from the situation. But the valiant people of Iran, which has so successfully stood up to all the difficulties created for it after the victory of the anti-imperialist revolution, has been reinforcing the defence of its liberty and the independence of its homeland.

159. As our delegation stated in the course of the general debate [*15th meeting*], the Albanian Government believes that it is in the interests of Iraq and Iran to put an end to their conflict, to settle their differences by negotiation and for the two peoples to live in peace and friendship. Today we express the same hope, because our people is bound by ties of friendship to the two peoples of the countries in conflict, and very much hopes that they will be able to put an end to hostilities and live in peace. It would also be to the advantage of the other peoples of the area and would deal a severe blow to the policy of the super-Powers, which want to see different countries fighting among themselves and are doing everything possible to encourage them to do this.

160. When the armed conflict between Iraq and Iran broke out, the two imperialist super-Powers hastened to declare a false neutrality, but they did everything possible to envenom the situation and exacerbate the differences that have contributed to the continuance of the war. In the meantime, they have striven to present themselves as arbiters and, on the pretext of attempts to bring about a settlement, to impose their will. That was the objective of their manoeuvres in the United Nations, particularly to the Security Council. There are many examples of this and in particular the most recent, unhappy example of Lebanon, which shows that the two imperialist super-Powers are provoking armed conflict, aggravating it by their many interventions, and then in order to profit to the maximum at the expense of their victims, attempt to take charge of the so-called process of settlement.

161. In concluding, the Albanian delegation would also like to make it known that it believes that the United Nations has not done its duty in the case of the conflict between Iraq and Iran, or indeed, in other cases. It is our feeling that certain isolated actions on the part of the Security Council have not really been serious.

162. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The armed conflict between Iraq and Iran has lasted for more than two years, without a glimmer of hope, especially at the present time, that this tragedy nears its end and that the reasons for the conflict have disappeared which would mean that it could be ended and that the historic and legitimate rights of each party could be preserved. No impartial observer can underestimate the extremely high price that has

been paid by each of those countries during those two years, at the expense of economic development and improvement of the standard of living of the Iranian and Iraqi peoples. But the effects of the war are not confined to the destruction of economic wealth; they extend to the human resources which continue to fuel the battle.

163. To give a realistic picture of the extent of the ferocity of this war, suffice it to say that more than 200,000 soldiers have been killed or wounded on both sides, while the prisoners of war number 70,000. These are only estimates and the reality may be worse.

164. The absence of any hopeful sign of a settlement of the Iran-Iraqi conflict does not mean that the international community should resign itself to this painful reality and abandon any mediation efforts aimed at stopping this bloody conflict immediately or give up on efforts to end by peaceful means the disputes that sparked the outbreak of hostilities.

165. Despite the failure of all the international efforts in this respect, whether on the part of the United Nations, the non-aligned movement or the Organization of the Islamic Conference, it is only fair to pay a tribute to all the mediation efforts undertaken up till now and which have not been weakened by the absence of positive reaction by one of the parties to the conflict, which has led to the present dead end in spite of the readiness of the other to co-operate in implementing the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. However, we sincerely hope that international efforts will succeed in bringing about a cease-fire in order to lessen the tensions, tensions that indicate the continuance of this bloody battle and reflect the tendency of the two adversaries to make their positions more and more rigid about conditions for the ending of hostilities.

166. The Iran-Iraqi war is not the only conflict in the region which is plagued by a chronic conflict; the Israeli-Arab conflict, which has so far led to five ferocious wars imposed by Israel on the region, makes it one of the most serious hotbeds of tension in the world and which is liable at any time to lead to a confrontation between the two super-Powers. This region is very important from an economic and strategic point of view, and hence this war represents an increased danger for confrontation between the great Powers; it is like a fire that threatens to swallow the entire Gulf area.

167. I need not emphasize the extreme concern of the Government of Qatar at the continuance of the Iran-Iraqi conflict and its implications for the tension in the Gulf area in particular, in addition to the threat it poses to international peace and security.

168. I wish to put on record Qatar's support for the initiative of Iraq to withdraw its forces to its international boundaries and its desire to negotiate in order to settle the conflict between the two countries by peaceful means.

169. My delegation, furthermore, supports all the international mediation efforts, foremost among which is that of the Goodwill Committee of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, aimed at bringing about a just and honourable settlement of the conflict in accordance with the principles of justice and inter-

national law. Those efforts, however, will not bear fruit unless the two parties first of all agree on an immediate cease-fire and on the withdrawal of the military forces to the internationally recognized boundaries, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 479 (1980), 514 (1982) and 522 (1982), which were all adopted unanimously.

170. The State of Qatar, which is located in the Gulf area and is a member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, looks forward eagerly to the success of all the mediation efforts aimed at a peaceful settlement of the conflict between Iran and Iraq, so that peace may be restored to the area. The peoples of the Gulf area desire peace, a peace which will guarantee friendly and normal relations between two countries which are bound by the same faith, the tolerant Moslem faith, thanks to which the common good, peace and security can be ensured in the Gulf area.

171. Mr. SAIGNAVONGS (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Having itself endured more than 30 years of the war of aggression imposed on it by colonialism and imperialism, the Lao people is well acquainted with the aftermath of devastation and destruction. It is therefore with grave concern that the Lao delegation is taking part in this debate.

172. When this regrettable conflict broke out between Iran and Iraq, two neighbouring countries which are members of the non-aligned movement, and with which my country maintains friendly relations, the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic at once declared itself in favour of an immediate cessation of hostilities and of a settlement of the matters in dispute through negotiations between the two parties, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and with the principles and objectives of the policy of non-alignment.

173. Therefore the Lao People's Democratic Republic supported and welcomed the efforts made by President Fidel Castro in his capacity as current President of the non-aligned movement with a view to finding a just, peaceful and honourable settlement of this conflict. More specifically, it endorsed the efforts of the Non-Aligned Ministerial Committee designated by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in February 1981. Similarly, my country welcomed the Secretary-General's attempts at mediation and his appeals, as well as the initiatives taken by the leaders of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

174. However, this regrettable and tragic conflict, which has lasted for two years, continues to cause human and material losses—which are already considerable—on both sides: thousands of human lives have been lost, economic activities have been seriously affected, and infrastructures have been damaged or destroyed by the flames of war. All the resources and wealth swallowed up by the war could have been devoted to the economic and social development of the two countries or to assisting the poorest countries.

175. Furthermore, this conflict poses a threat to the future development of the two countries and is in the interests neither of Iraq nor of Iran. On the contrary, it can only benefit the imperialists and enable them to

increase their interference in that region. Furthermore, they have already found pretexts for, *inter alia*, strengthening their naval presence in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, acquiring bases and "logistical facilities" in certain coastal States and establishing so-called "rapid deployment forces", ready to intervene in the region to defend their alleged "vital interests"—in other words, to strengthen their grip on the vast oil and other resources.

176. With this in view, it is not only the peace and security of the region but international peace and security that are in jeopardy. Consequently, my delegation hopes that both parties, showing their wisdom and good will, will succeed in rapidly putting an end to their armed hostilities and entering into a dialogue for a lasting, just and honourable settlement of their dispute on the basis of the fundamental principles of the Charter and the principles and objectives of the Non-Aligned Movement.

177. The fact that one of the parties has stated its readiness to co-operate with the international community in finding a settlement to the conflict is already a positive sign. In the meantime, however, it is important for all other States to refrain from any action liable to worsen or prolong the conflict.

178. Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): As the statements in the general debate during this session of the Assembly clearly demonstrated, there is universal concern over the increasing resort to force to settle disputes between States. This is perhaps one of the most striking indications of the alarming deterioration of the international situation. The difficulties in finding peaceful solutions to conflicts are underscored by the lack of progress in the efforts of various international bodies to bring about negotiated settlements of the many problems that continue to plague the world.

179. It is a matter of profound regret to my delegation that one of the conflicts which continue to elude peaceful solution is the war between two brother nations, Iran and Iraq. As the conflict enters its third year, the efforts exerted through the Secretary-General's good offices and the mediation efforts of the non-aligned movement and the Goodwill Committee of the Organization of the Islamic Conference have yet to yield any encouraging results. As noted in the final communiqué of the Meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries held in New York earlier this month, this was due primarily to the lack of appropriate conditions for third-party efforts [see A/37/540/annex, appendix II].

180. This situation persists even with the great human and material losses incurred by both sides, which underscores the truism that the costs of armed conflict obliterate any distinction between victory and defeat, between the victor and the vanquished.

181. Another aspect of the conflict which is no less disconcerting is that it can only be exploited by the common enemy in the region. Failure to end the conflict will only lead to greater tragedies, as has been fully demonstrated by Israel's invasion of Lebanon and the horrible massacres in Beirut. It has also inevitably distracted attention from the pressing task of achieving a just solution to the Middle East ques-

tion, and has tended to create discord among the States in the region.

182. Unless there is an expeditious end to the hostilities, there is a potential danger of further escalation, including the possible involvement of extraregional Powers in the conflict. Such a development would have very serious ramifications indeed, since the Gulf region is of strategic importance to many States and would therefore pose a grave threat to international peace and security. It would also prolong the conflict and thereby retard the development efforts under way in those States and increase the suffering of the people in the area.

183. Since the outbreak of hostilities, over two years ago, my Government has followed the events with grave concern, particularly as they involve two brother nations from the non-aligned movement and the Organization of the Islamic Conference. Indonesia has traditionally maintained brotherly, cordial relations with both Iraq and Iran, and therefore views these hostilities with profound sorrow. We deeply regret the massive loss of life and extensive destruction that the conflict has brought to both countries.

184. We sincerely believe that it is still possible, and indeed imperative, to settle this dispute peacefully in the context of Islamic solidarity and good neighbourliness. This hope was clearly reflected in President Suharto's appeal on behalf of the Indonesian people, when, at the very beginning of the armed conflict, he voiced a sincere call to both Iran and Iraq to resolve their differences peacefully and honourably, in the true Islamic spirit, as between brothers within the same family. These should, indeed, constitute the conditions in which meaningful and substantive negotiations could take place to achieve a peaceful solution.

185. I wish to emphasize that our motivation for speaking on this item is solely our concern for peace and the well-being of our two brother nations. We urge the conflicting parties to allow the mediation efforts a chance to achieve success and a disengagement of all forces under conditions acceptable to both States. Ultimately, a solution has to be based on the principles of the Charter, particularly those provisions related to the peaceful settlement of disputes. Therefore my delegation would like to reiterate the appeal of the Indonesian people to our two brother nations to refrain from any action which would further aggravate the situation and to intensify efforts towards a negotiated settlement.

186. Mr. ALI (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Oman views with concern and sorrow the armed hostilities between the neighbouring and Moslem countries of Iran and Iraq. The continuance of the war and the resulting devastation and waste of the human and material resources of those two developing countries is a cause of grief for every Moslem and every person who is concerned about peace and relations of friendship and good-neighbourliness.

187. Faithful to its position of principle and its absolute belief in the need to seek a peaceful settlement of the conflict in accordance with the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, especially Article 33, Oman has welcomed the initiative taken and the efforts made within the framework

of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the non-aligned movement with the aim of finding a peaceful solution acceptable to both parties.

188. Oman has also followed closely all the sincere attempts by the Secretary-General, through his Special Representative, to persuade the two parties to the conflict to accept and implement the unanimously adopted resolutions of the Security Council calling for an immediate cease-fire, an end to all hostilities and the withdrawal of forces to internationally recognized boundaries. Among those resolutions are Security Council resolutions 479 (1980), 514 (1982) and 522 (1982). It grieves us that they remain unimplemented and that the war still rages, jeopardizing the situation of all the Gulf countries as well as endangering international peace and security, which leads to all sorts of perils. In addition, the resources of the two countries are being wasted instead of being directed to their economic and social development.

189. As has been said, war is a fire that devours both the victor and the vanquished. The victory that we seek is a victory over war, a victory in agreement with the principles of the true Islamic religion, which lays down the righteous path for Moslems to follow in dealing with others, calls for co-operation, sympathy and interdependence and forbids them to commit acts of aggression against anyone, except where it is a matter of the defence of Islam and the Moslems. We seek victory for those principles, represented by the Government of Iraq's declaration about the withdrawal of its forces from Iranian territory to international boundaries, its readiness to take part in negotiations aimed at putting an end to the hostilities and to co-operate in implementing the Security Council's resolutions, as set out in the Secretary-General's report of 8 October.⁵ At the Arab Summit Conference held at Fez, Oman welcomed that responsible declaration by Iraq and appealed to Iran to follow suit, in order to ensure the peace and stability of the area as well as the achievement of a peace which would safeguard the legitimate rights of all peoples. Today we once more call on Iran to end the war and choose peace, so that cordial relations between neighbours may be restored, replacing enmity and hostility, and so that understanding and negotiations may replace bombardment and bloodshed.

190. One of the principal elements of the draft resolution [A/37/Rev.1] and which we must affirm concerns the necessity of achieving an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of forces to internationally recognized boundaries as a preliminary step towards the settlement of the dispute by peaceful means. We do not think that anyone in the Assembly would oppose the call for peace and respect for the principles of the Charter, in particular the principle of refraining from the use of force in international relations, in the interest of the preservation of security in the Gulf as well as international peace and security.

191. Mr. SALLAM (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the consistent policy of the Yemen Arab Republic, which believes in the principles of peaceful coexistence and regional co-operation to solve the problems of neighbouring countries by peaceful means, the delegation of my country is taking part in this debate designed, I hope, to

demonstrate a sincere determination to work for peace between two fraternal Islamic neighbouring countries, Iraq and Iran.

192. My country believes that peace is a noble goal towards the attainment of which the international community must devote its full efforts in order to ensure the establishment of peace throughout the world.

193. With that noble principle in mind, the delegation of my country listened to the statement by the representative of Iraq [38th meeting], in which he said that his country had accepted the implementation of the Security Council resolutions on the Iran-Iraqi conflict and was prepared to co-operate with all the mediation efforts of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the non-aligned movement. He also said that his country was responsive to the efforts made by the Secretary-General and he called for the establishment of a commission of inquiry to determine which party had begun the aggression. Finally, Iraq accepted the arbitration of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the non-aligned movement, as well as that of the Security Council, to study the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from all Iranian territories to the international boundaries.

194. After all that, what arguments can Iran use to justify its repeated aggression against its peaceful Moslem neighbour and brother? Is Iran pursuing expansionist aims in its war with Iraq? If the answer to that question is "No," my country's delegation calls on Iran to adopt an attitude favourable to peace, since Iraq, for its part, has demonstrated its goodwill and its willingness to accept registration on the dispute and has accepted the arbitration of a third party.

195. My country, which has ties with both Iraq and Iran created by our common religion and our common heritage, affirms its sincere desire to see the establishment of a just peace between two brother neighbouring countries, since the potential and advantages of such a solution are clear to everyone. At the same time, we reaffirm that should Iranian aggressions against the territory of another Arab country continue, the Yemen Arab Republic will find itself obliged to side staunchly with a fraternal country, Iraq, or any other Arab country, to assist it in defending its territorial integrity, in accordance with the decision adopted at the Arab Summit Conference, stipulating that any aggression committed against an Arab territory is considered to be an aggression against the territory of all the Arab countries [*see A/37/696, annex, sect. III*].

196. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): For nearly two years now, the tragic conflict between Iran and Iraq has continued to inflict human and material losses of colossal proportions on these two neighbouring Islamic States while deeply wounding the sentiments of their well-wishers and the fabric of Islamic unity. This fratricidal war has also aggravated the climate of insecurity in a highly sensitive region of the world. The spectre of its escalation and of the involvement of great Powers in it looms darkly on the horizon of our region.

197. As a neighbour traditionally bound to both Iran and Iraq by indissoluble ties of friendship and solidarity, we have viewed this conflict with deep

anguish and concern, and we have made every effort to bring about its early termination in the best interests of all peoples of the area. The President of Pakistan has been engaged in ceaseless efforts, both personally and in conjunction with other Islamic heads of State under the auspices of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, to bring about the resolution of this tragic conflict. In this context, we should like to pay a special tribute to President Sékou Touré of Guinea, Chairman of the Goodwill Committee of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, and to Mr. Habib Chatti, Secretary General of that organization, for their vigorous leadership of the peace initiative.

198. It is a matter of profound regret and a cause of deep concern that these efforts and similar efforts undertaken by the United Nations and the non-aligned movement have so far remained devoid of success. Yet these efforts must continue, in the hope that our brothers in Iran and Iraq will be able to live once again in peace and that the shadow the conflict casts over the region can be lifted. The President of Pakistan is personally committed to undertake any further effort required to help to fulfil this hope.

199. The efforts undertaken in this direction by world leaders, the United Nations, the non-aligned movement and the Organization of the Islamic Conference are complementary and must be pursued vigorously and, as far as possible, in a co-ordinated manner. Accordingly, we have always sought to remain in close touch with all those who are actively engaged in the pursuit of the common objective of bringing the conflict to an end.

200. We hope that the deliberations of the General Assembly will contribute to the creation of an atmosphere in which the brother countries of Iran and Iraq will be able to exercise self-restraint and tolerance and refrain from any action which may cause the prolongation and escalation of the conflict. We also call upon outside Powers to desist from any steps which would amount to interference in the region and further aggravate the situation.

201. The time has arrived for the guns to be silenced and wounds to be healed. We believe that after so much bloodshed and suffering the time is ripe for building bridges and re-establishing communications between these two neighbours, thereby enabling them to resolve the issues outstanding between them in an atmosphere of trust, confidence and security. The United Nations has an important role to play in generating the momentum necessary for the realization of this objective, which must remain uppermost in our minds when adopting any measures in this forum.

202. We hope that peaceful conditions can soon be restored in the region, safeguarding the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States there and ensuring respect for the principles of inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force, non-interference in internal affairs and peaceful settlement of disputes.

203. Mr. LESSIR (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Over two years after it began, the war between Iraq and Iran is continuing with greater intensity, causing unprecedented death, desolation and suffering to two neighbouring peoples that should in

every way be predestined to understanding and co-operation.

204. Iran and Iraq, both Members of the Organization, belong to the Islamic world and to the large family of the non-aligned countries. Therefore they share the same faith and are guided by the same principles. Their importance politically, economically and militarily dictates that their duty to promote peace and understanding in their region is all the greater since they are situated in a coveted strategic zone rich in mineral resources.

205. Tunisia was concerned from the outset at the way events developed between those two brotherly neighbouring countries and made an urgent appeal to the Iranian and Iraqi Presidents to halt the hostilities and to resolve the conflict by peaceful means in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the Organization. Our main concern arose from the aforementioned considerations and particularly from the fact that the persistence of the conflict could have very serious repercussions throughout the region, opening the way to foreign intervention and a further destabilization of the Middle East and the Gulf region. Although we were inclined to doubt that the parties to the conflict had anything of the sort in mind, it is in any case imperative to put an end to this murderous war, which has caused considerable human and material losses and has drained the economies of the two countries to the detriment of the well-being of their people and of our common cause.

206. Since September 1980 we have witnessed several mediation efforts and peace initiatives in the region. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General went five times to Iran and Iraq to reconcile the points of view of the parties to the conflict. The Organization of the Islamic Conference established a Goodwill Committee under the leadership of President Sékou Touré. That Committee went to the leaders of the two countries at war with the firm resolve of arriving at a much-needed peaceful settlement, in conformity with the decisions of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and with the principles of law and justice.

207. The non-aligned countries established their own committee, which worked to bring peace to the two parties to the conflict and to find a just and honourable settlement of the dispute.

208. The Security Council has since adopted three resolutions, proposing a peace process based on a cease-fire, the withdrawal of troops to international boundaries and the stationing of observers.

209. While we welcome all these initiatives, which show the determination of the Organization and other forums to arrive at a settlement of the conflict, we are constrained to note, unfortunately, that these initiatives have remained without effect, in spite of the persistence and self-sacrifice with which they were undertaken. Nevertheless, my country hopes that any initiative conducive to the halting of hostilities will be carried on with the same spirit of dedication and keeping the higher interests of the international community in mind.

210. However, it must be noted that the parties to the conflict have reacted differently to the mediation

efforts and to the resolutions of the Organization. This has now resulted in a pointless prolongation of the war and consequently an unfortunate sense of frustration among all those who have directly or indirectly taken part in the various attempts to end the conflict.

211. We express the hope that Iran will respond positively to the peace efforts in the same manner as Iraq, which has clearly shown good faith by withdrawing from Iranian territory and showing its willingness to accept all the peace initiatives. Consequently Tunisia reiterates its appeal to both these brotherly countries to put an end to the hostilities and settle their dispute by peaceful means.

212. Tunisia remains convinced that the settlement of any conflict, regardless of its seriousness, cannot be beyond the means of conventional diplomacy. In implementing the resolutions of the Security Council, Iraq and Iran will have contributed to the peace and stability of their region, spared their peoples the horrors of war and undoubtedly strengthened the role

of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and security in the world.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.*

² The delegations of the Islamic Republic of Iran and Samoa subsequently informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

³ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1982, document S/15293.*

⁴ *Ibid., Thirty-seventh Year, 2399th meeting.*

⁵ *Ibid., Supplement for October, November and December 1982, document S/15449.*