

*Nations Unies*  
**ASSEMBLÉE  
GÉNÉRALE**



**QUARANTE-DEUXIÈME SESSION**

*Documents officiels\**

**FIRST COMMITTEE  
53rd meeting  
held on  
Monday, 23 November 1987  
at 3 p.m.  
New York**

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 53rd MEETING**

**Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)**

**CONTENTS**

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

---

\*Le présent compte rendu est sujet à rectifications. Celles-ci doivent porter la signature d'un membre de la délégation intéressée et être adressées, dans un délai d'une semaine à compter de la date de publication, au Chef de la Section d'édition des documents officiels, bureau DC2.750/2 United Nations Plaza, et également être portées sur un exemplaire du compte rendu.

Les rectifications seront publiées après la clôture de la session, dans le fascicule d'insertion de chaque commission.

**Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/42/PV.53  
9 December 1987  
ENGLISH**

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 71, 72 AND 73 (continued)

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

Mr. BORG OLIVIER (Malta): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time Malta has spoken in this Committee at the current session, I should like to convey to you my delegation's warm congratulations on your unanimous election as Chairman of the First Committee. We extend congratulations also to the other officers of the Committee and we assure you of our full co-operation and support in your endeavours to ensure that the work of the Committee is carried out smoothly and successfully. Under your able guidance, Mr. Chairman, we are most confident that this will be so.

When the First Committee considers international security issues, this important forum grants us an opportunity each year to review the situation in the Mediterranean region and to assess the relevant developments between sessions of the General Assembly. In this way we are able to share our thoughts and views on a subject of particular importance to us, and in the light of our deliberations we, the Mediterranean countries, are in a position to work with other countries to consolidate achievements and to further enhance peace, security and co-operation in the Mediterranean.

In a magnificent book entitled Mediterranean, Portrait of a Sea by Earnle Bradford, we are reminded that:

"The Mediterranean, though small when compared to the great oceans of the world, contains a greater range of peoples, cultures and meteorological and geographical differences than any other comparable area."

It is in fact a region where two worlds meet, the East and the West, the Arabic and the Latin.

The Mediterranean States realize that they have a crucial role to play in the development of their region. While there are serious problems such as those of

Dr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

Cyprus, Palestine and Lebanon which yearn for a lasting solution and which continue to create division and tension in our region, there are also many common interests which could unite us, and it is in this context that we are witnessing more understanding, dialogue and better co-operation among the Mediterranean States. This trend is to be encouraged. It will undoubtedly help us to bring more stability to the Mediterranean region.

The special geopolitical characteristics of the Mediterranean were underlined within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) by the adoption in August 1975 of the Helsinki Final Act when, for the first time, relevant provisions on questions relating to Security and Co-operation in the Mediterranean were agreed to by 35 participating States. Indeed, the adoption of the Final Act in Helsinki is regarded as one of the historic achievements in the post-war era affecting relations among participating States in Europe, the United States and Canada, and contributing significantly to international peace and security.

Malta is proud to be part of that agreement and is particularly proud to have promoted the question of the Mediterranean within the CSCE framework. Twelve years have passed since that time and today we are witnessing increased co-operation, not only among the participating States of the CSCE, but also among and between the European participating States and other non-European States bordering the Mediterranean Sea.

Malta, with a new government at its helm, intends to consolidate its role in promoting peace, security and co-operation in the Mediterranean. As stated on various occasions by our Prime Minister and by our Minister for Foreign Affairs, Malta intends to utilize its status of neutrality, adhering to a policy of non-alignment in order to contribute actively and constructively to regional peace and security and to the economic and social welfare of the Mediterranean

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

countries. The new Government of Malta is committed to following a foreign policy that is clear and predictable. In the words used by my Prime Minister during a recent official visit to Rome:

"We are walking forward with a firm step along straight paths, without swaying this way and that way - led by convictions of principle and old cultural traditions."

During the past year my Government has continued to play an active role in a number of forums in order to show its strong commitment to the peaceful resolution of conflicts in the Mediterranean, to the lessening of tension and to the expansion of co-operation in the political, economic and social spheres. Malta's new government has found it necessary on various occasions in recent months to emphasize, among other things, that Malta will strengthen its relationship with all Mediterranean countries, especially those closest to us in southern Europe and northern Africa. These relations will be inspired not only by considerations of good-neighbourliness but also by our shared responsibilities to work for peace and co-operation in the region.

Conscious also of its European heritage and trade relationships, Malta intends to seek closer links with and, under the right conditions, membership in the European Economic Community. These policies should fortify the framework of relationships on the basis of which Malta emerges as a bridge between Europe and North Africa. In an area such as the Mediterranean where tensions persist, bridges of this kind are of crucial importance. It may be of interest for me to recall at this stage that the Mediterranean falls geographically into two main sections, the Western and Eastern Basins. The Western Mediterranean, the area from Gibraltar to Malta and Sicily, is separated from the Eastern by a submerged ridge, on which the Maltese Island stands. This now submerged and hidden land once joined Europe and North Africa.

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

Time and time again it has been recognized that the security of the Mediterranean is closely linked with European security and with international peace and security. Various incidents have proven that events in our region have had and continue to have a strong impact on the European region as a whole and also beyond.

It is Malta's intention to continue projecting the Mediterranean dimension in every forum and at every opportunity available, including the CSCE process, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Commonwealth, and above all, of course, here at the United Nations.

Along with other non-aligned Mediterranean States, Malta looks upon the successful meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned Mediterranean States held at Brioni, Yugoslavia, last June, as concrete evidence of the potential that clearly exists for the non-aligned States of the Mediterranean to work together with a view to contributing to security, peace and co-operation, not only in their region, but also within the broader European context.

Four important documents adopted at Brioni have once again identified the complex and diverse nature of the problems in the Mediterranean region. At the same time, the Brioni meeting has underlined the seriousness and willingness with which the non-aligned Mediterranean States intend to dedicate their energies and their efforts to stabilize the Mediterranean. In this context the Brioni conclusions emphasize once again the importance of continuing and strengthening the dialogue between Mediterranean members of the Movement and European countries, particularly those bordering the Mediterranean.

The need to enhance stability in the Mediterranean will also continue to be given attention in the CSCE process where, together with the neutral and non-aligned countries, Malta will make every effort to obtain appropriate guarantees and assurances for the benefit of the Mediterranean region.

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

At the Vienna meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, the Maltese delegation, together with the delegations of Cyprus and Yugoslavia, earlier this year submitted a proposal for the convening of a meeting to consider the possibilities and means of strengthening security and intensifying co-operation in the Mediterranean region within the framework of the Mediterranean chapter of the Helsinki Final Act.

One of the main reasons for submitting this proposal is the need to maintain and to amplify the dialogue and co-operation initiated by the CSCE with the non-participating Mediterranean States, and to develop good-neighbourly relations with all of them, with due regard to reciprocity, and in the spirit of the principles contained in the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States of the Helsinki Final Act.

It is relevant to recall that a number of important suggestions were discussed and formulated at the meeting of experts held at Valletta, Malta, in 1979 on the subject of economic, scientific and cultural co-operation within the framework of the Mediterranean chapter of the Final Act of the CSCE and also at the follow-up seminar held at Venice in 1984.

Malta, as a member of the Commonwealth, is also working within the framework of the Commonwealth to promote greater understanding and co-operation in the Mediterranean and to seek support for the related endeavours being undertaken in our region. It is appropriate to refer to the meeting of the Commonwealth Heads of Government held at Vancouver, Canada, a month ago, which the Prime Minister of Malta attended. The Commonwealth Heads of Government, in the final communiqué, expressed concern at the persistence of unresolved conflicts in the Mediterranean region. They renewed their call for restraint and stressed that a just and durable settlement of the problems of the region, in accordance with United Nations resolutions, would make a significant contribution towards the easing of tension

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

and the improvement of international security. They also took account of the close interrelationship between security and co-operation in the Mediterranean and Europe as a whole.

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

It would be appropriate at this stage for my delegation to welcome the encouraging developments in the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on nuclear and conventional disarmament in Europe. Malta, like all other countries, is following these negotiations with the greatest attention. As a small Mediterranean country, convinced that the security of the Mediterranean is closely linked with European security, Malta sincerely hopes that the negotiations on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles in Europe will be successful and that any agreements reached will include also the Mediterranean region within their scope.

I have attempted to review the initiatives being undertaken with regard to the Mediterranean at the international level. I should now like to turn very briefly to what my own country is doing at home, besides actively participating in the forums I have mentioned, with a view to contributing to the expanding and strengthening of co-operation among all States in our region. Malta has taken the lead in organizing a number of activities which bring together not only representatives of Governments but also representatives of scientific, educational, cultural and other institutions.

A project organized jointly by the Ministry of Education, the Foundation of International Studies and the United World College, two Malta-based non-governmental organizations, was held earlier this year, in June. This project included a course on the problems and common interests of the Mediterranean region such as marine development, regional political issues and prospects for the future. Special meetings, organized under the chairmanship of leading figures from the telecommunications world, and the reading of reports and papers by international specialists were among the highlights of the meeting of the Committee for the General Plan for the Development of the Regional Network in Europe and the Mediterranean Basin organized by the International Telecommunications Union.



(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

I should like to mention also a meeting held in Malta last July, sponsored by the Euro-Arab University. This meeting brought together eminent personalities from diverse countries in order to provide an opportunity for them to work together, to strengthen friendship and to promote understanding and co-operation.

The initiatives I have just mentioned underscore Malta's objective of contributing towards peace and security, with special and particular emphasis on the Mediterranean region. These contributions are in line with Malta's tradition of generating an international conscience on issues of interest to the international community. Indeed, 20 years ago this month Malta launched a historic initiative in this very Committee which culminated in the adoption in 1982 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, which deals comprehensively with all matters relating to the sea-bed and its resources.

Malta's involvement in issues of Mediterranean co-operation is embodied in other initiatives which it has undertaken in the course of these past two decades, including the establishment in Malta of the International Ocean Institute, which has been generating further interest in the protection of the marine environment, and of the Regional Oil-Combating Centre for the Mediterranean, which was set up to combat pollution by oil and other harmful substances in the Mediterranean Sea. Other important institutes which have been placed at the service of the international community are the Mediterranean Institute and the International Environment Institute.

Malta's contribution to peace, security and co-operation has been further enhanced by the setting up in Malta of a European Centre for Training and Research in the field of natural and technology pollution of the Mediterranean. The decision to set up this European Centre was taken a few weeks ago at a meeting, held in Athens, of the Ministers of the Environment of the Council of Europe. Yet another important initiative in the social field which Malta has pursued has now

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

resulted in the setting up in Malta of the International Institute on Aging. This Institute is to be inaugurated early in 1988.

Before concluding my statement I wish to express my delegation's appreciation and gratitude to the Secretary-General for the useful information provided in his report on this item contained in document A/42/570.

My delegation has worked closely with the delegations of the Mediterranean States within the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with a view to submitting a draft resolution on peace, security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region for consideration and action by the First Committee. We have consulted also with several other interested delegations and we wish to express our appreciation for the co-operation and understanding we have received from all concerned. It is our sincere hope that the consensus achieved on this subject in previous sessions will again be achieved at the current session.

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt): I have asked to speak today to comment on item 73 of our agenda, entitled "Comprehensive system of international peace and security", which is before us pursuant to resolution 41/92 adopted by the General Assembly on 4 December last year.

At this stage I shall not dwell on the particular language of resolution 41/92 or on that of whatever draft resolution or resolutions may have been circulated informally this year. The wording and language of draft resolutions are no doubt important, for they convey solemn obligations to which my delegation accords great importance and commitment. I feel compelled however to address what we believe to be the basic premise of the proposal as it has been brought before us by its proponents.

My delegation's analysis of the proposal - and we stand to be corrected - is that the proponents of this agenda item believe that the challenges of the present day and age, with their added dimensions of nuclear and space armaments and growing

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

interdependence, compel the international community to develop a comprehensive system of international peace and security, which, while based on the United Nations Charter and international law, should go beyond them. We conclude from this that they remain committed to the United Nations Charter and the existing legal norms governing relations between States but that they also believe that the realities of the present century and the direction of the future cannot be ignored, and thus that the international community, as represented by the United Nations, must evolve a new, more comprehensive system of international peace and security without prejudice to the United Nations Charter. Such a system would evolve new international norms and practices. It is also our conclusion that this would mean that the United Nations would remain the centre of gravity and the international focal point round which that system would revolve, besides being the mechanism for its interpretation and expression. A final point in the proposal is that political dialogue should be the basic method of resolving international disputes or promoting international co-operation.

Given the complexity and multifaceted dimensions of the idea suggested, it is quite natural that it has been received with hesitation on the part of some, concern on the part of others, and even outright opposition in some quarters. Egypt, as I stated last year when this issue was first introduced, remains open-minded in every respect.

As we all know, faced by death and devastation unparalleled at the time, the world community in the aftermath of the last world war developed the Charter of the United Nations which, while not exclusive or all-encompassing, has served both in war and in peace as the corner-stone of the contemporary international order. We are called upon today to reflect on the challenges that face us and to develop a new, comprehensive system of international peace and security.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

While the saying goes that history has a way of repeating itself, we cannot but admit to not being over-confident that if the state of international relations became equivalent to that during the last world war we would have the opportunity, in the aftermath, to reassess the consequences or once again lay down new foundations for a new international system. If anything is obvious in the present day it is that we no longer have the luxury of making mistakes. That in itself is sufficient reason to give constructive consideration to the questions that this proposal raises. We would be failing in our duties and responsibilities, particularly towards future generations, were we to reject outright this proposal, for while we may not agree with it in its entirety it should be assessed for any and every constructive element it may include.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

The past 40 years have witnessed concerted action in developing international norms specific to particular issues while remaining consistent with the United Nations Charter. These issues have encompassed a diverse field, ranging from the rules governing actions of States in time of war to human rights, economic and social development and co-operation and so on. Those years have also witnessed consolidated action by the United Nations and its specialized agencies which, while consistent with the Charter, was not specifically stipulated in it.

Many valuable international achievements could be recalled. However, I should like to limit myself to one, the peace-keeping techniques and operations, which we believe to be among the most successful innovations of the United Nations. To paraphrase the words of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, nowhere has the gulf between theory and practice been so evident as in the primary function of the United Nations, the maintenance of international peace and security. Being unable to exercise the magisterial but relatively simple powers prescribed in the Charter, the Security Council has had, time and again, to fall back on less well-defined measures - good offices, conciliation, mediation, and delegation of responsibility to the Secretary-General. Of those less well defined measures, the form of conflict control that is now known as peace-keeping is perhaps the most original and most ambitious. Peace-keeping is a technique not mentioned, let alone described, in the Charter. In fact it is in many ways a reversal of the use of military personnel foreseen in the Charter. In spite of this, it may seem strange that the United Nations has turned to various forms of this technique no less than 13 times.

The Secretary-General went on to state that in a time of nuclear armament, it was more than ever important that regional conflicts in sensitive areas should be kept out of the sphere of possible great-Power nuclear confrontation. He further

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

expressed the belief that peace-keeping was a novel but still fragile creation and an important addition to the armoury of peace in the nuclear age.

Egypt can concur fully with the assessments of the Secretary-General in this regard and has witnessed the invaluable role of the peace-keeping technique, with all it entails in the recurrent circumstances that have led to the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East during the past four decades.

We should also admit that certain elements of the Charter have not been interpreted to their full potential. Foremost among them is the collective security system, to which we remain very strongly committed. We have all here reaffirmed our commitment to the Charter and at the same time admitted that certain of its provisions have not been faithfully respected or fully interpreted. How sincere could our commitment be were we to be satisfied with expressions of regret and occasional admonitions without attempting to tackle our problems and redress our mistakes? Can we honestly reaffirm our commitment and shy away from addressing our most glaring failure, the lack of full interpretation of the collective security system envisaged by the Charter to enable the world community to maintain international peace and security? Egypt remains very strongly committed to ensuring the full realization of this collective security system and will continue to pursue it with vehemence and determination. We call upon the international community, which has reaffirmed its commitment to the United Nations Charter, to avail itself of the opportunity now before us to give serious consideration to the development of ways and means to ensure the full realization of the most worthy element of the Charter.

Another constructive aspect of the proposal is that it recognizes that further development of our present international system is necessary. We remain resolute in our commitment to the Charter but adamant in our belief that we cannot rest on our laurels, oblivious to events or developments. It would be useful to review

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

both our achievements and our failures, to consider whether and how they could best be directed towards international peace and security and the betterment of mankind. We shall continue to base all our actions on the United Nations Charter. They will remain consistent with international law, but we shall also pursue concurrent efforts to ensure that the international system by which we are governed, in which the United Nations is the corner-stone, is further enhanced, but we cannot ignore the developments, whether positive, negative or novel, that have already occurred since the Charter was drafted.

Our commitment to a just and equitable international system is unwavering. We shall pursue our efforts in this regard in conjunction with the many like-minded peace-loving States. We shall not shy away from new proposals or imaginative ideas but at the same time we shall be cautious and pragmatic in our approach, for we strive, not for novelty, but to enhance and build upon what has already been achieved.

We must pursue our endeavours in this regard with calculated steps, seeking to utilize to the utmost the vast potential of the United Nations Charter and consolidating our achievements as we go along. Where complementary efforts are possible they should be undertaken in a manner consistent with the Charter. The areas in which new concepts or approaches have emerged should be clearly defined to ensure that the international efforts in this regard are not to the detriment or at the expense of existing norms and practices.

To summarize our position, we believe that international efforts towards a comprehensive security system should attempt the following.

First, a concerted analysis should be made of the provisions of the United Nations Charter with a view to determining which provisions have not been utilized to their fullest potential.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Secondly, on the basis of this analysis, remedial measures by the international community should be suggested to ensure the full utilization of the provisions of the Charter and realization in particular of the full potential of the collective security system embodied therein.

Thirdly, new developments in international relations not covered by the provisions of the United Nations Charter that have emerged because of changing circumstances or as a result of international practice should be defined.

Fourthly, endeavours should be made to have whatever new developments or trends are defined covered by the United Nations Charter by consolidating and enhancing it.

Fifthly, some of these steps could be undertaken concurrently. They should constitute the basis of the international security system that will lead us into the twenty-first century, and it is on the basis of these steps, and only subsequent to them, that a decision on the need for the establishment of a new comprehensive system of international peace and security should be taken.

In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm our strong commitment to the United Nations and its Charter and to express the view that the very important ideas and issues which agenda item 73 raises should be fully assessed and decided upon within the context of the United Nations and through the modalities it provides for such consideration.



Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): Our consideration of the international security items in the Committee this year is taking place in an atmosphere of revived hope and optimism engendered by some encouraging developments. We are also meeting at a time of growing awareness of the need to re-think the basic problems of international peace and security in the light of commonly shared values and interests.

Since the historic Reykjavik meeting between the leaders of the United States and the USSR, the two super-Powers have shown a greater disposition to engage in substantive dialogue and negotiations on a range of issues of critical importance to their bilateral relationship as well as to the interests of the world at large. In the field of disarmament there now appears to be a real prospect for agreement on the elimination of intermediate and shorter-range missiles before the end of the year. We look forward to the forthcoming summit meeting in Washington D.C., at which such an accord is to be signed. This first step involving the actual dismantling of specific categories of nuclear weapons will be of timely significance, not only for Europe but also for Asia and beyond, thereby contributing to enhanced security and stability. We hope it will lead to further agreements on the more complex issues of space and strategic arms and provide added impetus to the multilateral disarmament negotiations in Geneva where, notably, the early conclusion of a chemical weapons convention is becoming a distinct possibility.

Concurrently, there has also been a perceptible evolution in the views, especially of the leaders of the major power blocs, regarding questions of international security and disarmament, an assertion of new concepts and approaches, signalling, it is to be hoped, a gradual abandonment of earlier rigidly ideological responses and stereotyped reflexes.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

While these are promising signs, we should also remind ourselves that expectations should not be confused with realities and that a wide gap still separates declared intent from actual accomplishment, for the international security environment continues to be characterized by a preponderant reliance on armaments and military strength, by the use and threat of force, aggression, foreign occupation, economic coercion and exploitation. Consequently, there has been no surcease in tensions and mutual mistrust among nations and, despite the enormous sums expended on arms, a paradoxical drift into greater insecurity at ever increasing cost.

Mankind's vision of a new world order in which the United Nations, through the collective security system as embodied in its Charter, would be the guarantor of peace and the protector of nations has not materialized. This is not because of any conceptual flaws in that system, but because, in the absence of mutual trust and political will, States have continued to seek security through the accumulation of arms. Thus, in our search for greater security for all, there is a need for an objective assessment and common appraisal of the basic trends and realities of our rapidly changing world and, hence, for ensuring that the concepts and mechanisms of the security system of the United Nations can be made to apply while taking these trends and realities fully into account.

First, there is the chilling reality of the arms race which, through the constant development of new weapons and weapons systems, both nuclear and conventional, and the refinement of existing ones, continues in its inexorable upward spiral and now threatens to expand into outer space as well. To say that the destructive potential of the global nuclear arsenals is a threat to the very survival of mankind is only stating the obvious. The dynamics of the arms race, however, involve more than the proliferation of ever deadlier and costlier weapons,

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

more than ever burgeoning military budgets. As our debates over the years and numerous United Nations studies and reports have established, the arms race, in its various manifestations and implications, is adversely affecting global options in all other spheres of human endeavour as well. It promotes a pattern of military alliances and bloc policies and reinforces tendencies towards confrontation rather than co-operation. The human and material resources consumed by world-wide military activities are severely narrowing our socio-economic options, at both the national and the international levels. Moreover, the arms race not only drains resources away from development purposes but also impinges negatively on the scope and content of inter-State relations. In an environment dominated by the arms race, political and economic relations between States tend to be increasingly subordinated to military-strategic considerations, with all the distorting consequences attendant on it.

For all these reasons, to persist in a colossally wasteful arms race that is completely disproportionate to the requirements of self-defence or to the degree of national security obtained amounts to an irrational and wholly counter-productive option.

In this nuclear age, the objective of seeking unilateral security through armaments has proved to be a dangerous illusion. Neither quantitative additions nor qualitative improvements to weapons arsenals can substantially reduce a State's vulnerability or lead to absolute security. There can therefore be only one rational option, and that is to seek common security for all through total nuclear disarmament and balanced reductions to progressively lower levels of conventional armaments.

Another basic phenomenon in contemporary international relations is the growing interdependence among nations and the interrelatedness of global problems.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

At the present time, no nation or group of nations, no matter how rich or powerful, can hope to solve the major problems affecting world peace, development and security on their own, or unilaterally impose their concepts for a solution. Neither can they afford to ignore or dissociate themselves from the collective aspirations and efforts of the international community in this respect.

In a world of increasing interdependence, global geo-political factors converge in such a way as to make it impossible to define security in military terms alone. We have all become acutely aware of the array of non-military threats to national and international security in such forms as under-development and sharply curtailed prospects for economic growth, impending resource scarcity, threats to food security, population pressures and severe environmental degradation.

Interdependence also implies that no nation can be secure so long as other nations are insecure. Interdependence necessarily presupposes the mutuality of interests among nations in each other's stability and security. Genuine and lasting security, therefore, cannot but be universal and comprehensive in nature, that is, operating on an equal basis for all States and encompassing all spheres of international relations.

Concurrent with the phenomenon of interdependence, there has also been renewed interest and emphasis on regional approaches to security and disarmament as an important constituent part of our globalized efforts. Within this approach, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in various regions of the world offer a particularly valuable option, to which, as is known, Indonesia and its other partners in the Association of South-East Asian Nations fully subscribe.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

The establishment of such zones implies the complete absence of nuclear weapons in certain designated areas of the world, as well as specific guarantees on their non-use or threat of use against the zonal States. In the case of zones of peace, it likewise places greater restraints on the policies and actions of extra-zonal Powers, particularly in the deployment of forces, including nuclear forces, within the zone. Nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace are particularly desirable in regions with a long history of endemic instability and conflict, as their establishment would relieve tensions and facilitate co-operation on other, wider issues. Besides, we believe that through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, non-nuclear-weapon States would be making a real contribution to nuclear disarmament by at least progressively reducing the geographical confines within which nuclear weapons could operate, thereby also strengthening non-proliferation.

At the same time, however, owing to different circumstances pertaining in different regions, the modalities and provisions in each case should be left to the regional States involved and any agreements or arrangements should be freely arrived at among those States.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

It is equally important to strengthen the role of regional and subregional organizations in addressing and resolving their particular security concerns, inter alia, through more widely gauged forms and modalities of regional co-operation. Indeed, in many regions of the world regional co-operation encompassing the economic, social and cultural fields have for quite some time taken root and have shown their effectiveness in the peaceful settlement of disputes and in the adoption of certain arms limitation measures, thus preventing or moderating regional arms competition and bolstering regional security.

Our collective efforts to strengthen international peace and security and to meet the challenges of the future can hardly succeed while unresolved tensions and conflicts continue to rage in many parts of the world. It is a most distressing reality that practically all the wars of the past 40 years have been fought or are being fought in the regions of Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. These flashpoints of strife and turmoil, which are exacting a heavy toll in human and material resources, have their primary source in the continued violation of the fundamental rights of nations and peoples and of the basic tenets and principles enshrined in the Charter. The struggle for self-determination and true independence, justice and racial equality, economic progress and social emancipation still has to contend with outmoded structures of domination and exploitation and neocolonialist forms of coercion, subversion and intervention. More often than not, regional conflicts have been further exacerbated by the superimposition of East-West rivalry and contention or by the distortion or recasting of issues into that mould.

If we are to move progressively towards a more viable world order of common security and common prosperity, it is of the utmost importance for the leaders of nations to concert their efforts and co-operate in bringing these conflicts to an

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

early solution. In so doing, there can be no alternative to fostering renewed recognition of and strict adherence to the basic precepts of the Charter, the universally accepted norms and principles of international law and the fundamental values and human rights of nations and peoples. On a more practical level, we should also heed the particularly pertinent admonition of our Secretary-General, who in one of his recent addresses stated:

" ... war brings no victories and the threat of force serves only to aggravate problems. We have seen that withdrawal from dialogue makes solutions more difficult to achieve. We have had proof that stalemates bring no lasting advantages to either side. We witness every day that mere re-statements of positions, already well known, lead only to blind alleys. Whatever be the rights or wrongs of international disputes or differences, their continuance imposes a heavy toll on the peoples on both sides - in lives lost, in hopes defeated, in confidence shaken and morale impaired."

Finally, the world has undergone a fundamental change in one vibrant aspect. The emergence of newly independent nations from colonialism and the establishment of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have led to a radical transformation of the political map of the world. Henceforth, the unique concerns and interests of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, notably on the issues of war and peace and security and development, have assumed their rightful place on the international landscape and in the processes of international decision-making.

In the face of these diverse realities, acute problems and emerging trends in world developments, efforts to strengthen international peace and security need to take some basic guidelines for action into account. First, in a world of growing interdependence, multilateralism and the democratization of inter-State relations are no longer options but are a vital necessity. Secondly, recognition of

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

the fundamental rights and legitimate interests of nations and peoples is a prerequisite for lasting peace. Thirdly, intensified efforts to achieve genuine disarmament and arms reductions, especially in the nuclear field, remain the priority task. Fourthly, the eradication of poverty and underdevelopment afflicting vast segments of humanity and the removal of inequitable structures and modalities in the present system of international economic relations can no longer be regarded as long-term goals but are of urgent relevance to national and international security. Fifthly, the comprehensive and just resolution of conflicts and disputes in the various regions is an indispensable ingredient for stable peace and viable security in the world.

If these guidelines are to be followed, then clearly it is to the revitalization of the multilateral institutions, in particular the United Nations, that we should turn. Indonesia shares in the conviction that a truly comprehensive approach to international peace and security needs to be adopted: comprehensive, not only in the sense of encompassing and involving all nations and all regions but equally in the sense of embracing all aspects and dimensions of international relations.

In this context the proposal of the socialist countries on the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security, presented last year and further elaborated upon during this session, is of considerable relevance and interest. We welcome the explanations furnished by the representative of the USSR, Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovsky, in his statement last week, and the reassurances that such a proposed system is to operate on the basis of the Charter and within the framework of the United Nations. In fact, as last year's resolution on this subject has already reaffirmed:



(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

" ... the collective security system embodied in the Charter of the United Nations continues to be a fundamental and irreplaceable instrument for the preservation of international peace and security". (resolution 41/92, para. 1)

My delegation is firm in its belief that the United Nations Charter must remain the centrepiece in any efforts towards a comprehensive security system, indeed, it is itself the system and what needs to be done is to ensure the faithful implementation of its collective security provisions and to develop, as required, the complementary mechanisms and modalities in order to make the system more effective and more operationally relevant to the contemporary realities and exigencies of a rapidly changing world. In this context, the strengthening of the functions of the Security Council and of the Secretary-General in the fields of conflict prevention and conflict resolution is of particular importance.

We note that the sponsors of the concept of comprehensive security themselves believe that further discussions and exchanges of views are needed to give more concrete shape and content to their ideas. Indonesia stands ready to contribute constructively to such an exercise. We have an open mind as to the format and manner in which these continuing discussions could be held. We do see the need for carefully considering the various possibilities that are available in order to proceed in the most effective and productive manner.

In the final analysis, what is of paramount importance to Indonesia is that through renewed faith and reinforced commitment to the Charter, all Member States join in ensuring that the United Nations fully assumes the role for which it was created: the principal, universal instrument for the resolution of the fundamental global issues confronting humanity.

Mr. BUI XUAN NHAT (Viet Nam): In the nuclear and space age, world peace and security become fragile and unreliable if they are based only on sophisticated technologies, power politics and the use of force or the threat of force in international relations, particularly in the face of the threat of nuclear self-destruction.

Debate on the item concerning comprehensive security began at the forty-first session of the General Assembly. It is important to continue it now, keeping it as concrete and as geared to practical actions as possible.

At present there are two dramatically opposed trends in world politics. On the one hand, there are factors which increase mankind's fear for its future: the unabating arms race now even threatens to move into space; focal points of tension still exist; growing poverty is the lot of many areas of the world; and blatant violations of human rights continue to be perpetrated on a massive scale. On the other hand, people are increasingly realizing that this kind of situation is intolerable and that the international community must work together to set things right.

The new concept of a comprehensive system of international peace and security coincides with that of the efforts of the six States from four continents that have repeatedly urged elaboration of "a new concept of universal security, free from nuclear weapons". The shaping of comprehensive security is a historical process associated with the creation of reliable non-military and non-violent guarantees of the security of all States on an equal basis and in all spheres of international relations. We are well aware that a comprehensive system of international peace and security cannot take on an immediate, ready-made form, as a kind of artificial structure. It is not a static, but a dynamic system. Its dynamism depends on purposeful activities by the entire international community. This is an international matter which takes joint efforts and time. Public opinion has been

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

making a stronger impact on this process. Political realism has put less and less trust in those shunning equal dialogue and has made a serious search for ways to end the arms race and lessen the nuclear threat. We are of the view that a comprehensive system of international peace and security should be both horizontal, covering all countries and regions, and vertical, taking into account all factors behind international relations - military, political, economic, ecological and humanitarian; in building an edifice of security, it is necessary to demonstrate equal concern for each story and each section.

The idea of a comprehensive system of international security is a philosophy and a plan of concrete action to eliminate the use of force and intimidation from international relations. Its establishment would be in keeping with the provisions of the Charter and would help to implement its goals and principles in the current nuclear and space age. Each nation would begin on its own to carry out a readjustment of its policies and actions in order to bring them into line with the objectives of the United Nations, abandoning its own approaches, making a fresh analysis of all the emerging problems, and giving up selfish interests. A comprehensive system of international security does not simply mean the absence of war. Its aim must be to use the entire system of international co-operation to make war impossible, thus creating conditions favourable for development. There must be a system of material, political, military, economic, ecological, humanitarian, legal and psychological guarantees of security.

Needless to say, a comprehensive system of international security cannot automatically remove all existing problems and contradictions. International relations will continue to evolve out of a blend of competition and co-operation. A system of security, however, would further co-operation, so that all emerging problems could be solved by peaceful, not military, means.

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

The arms race and the improvement of military technology cannot ensure security either on the national or the international level, because technology - even the most sophisticated on earth or in space - cannot provide defence against nuclear weapons. Therefore, security is virtually a political rather than a technical issue that may be solved only by political means. In today's interdependent world, where all mankind is faced with a threat of nuclear catastrophe, the reduction of the security of any nation of the international community would inevitably entail negative implications for international security in general. The world is whole and its security is indivisible: therefore the highest wisdom is not to care only about oneself, let alone to the detriment of the other party.

The ways to a genuinely secure world lie through practical steps towards building confidence and trust among nations on the basis of democratization; the development of ideas of life in peace and of the inadmissibility of war and violence in human consciousness; the renunciation of stereotyped thinking by categories of hostility; the overcoming of confrontational approaches; the strengthening of rules of civilized conduct; and an atmosphere of openness in international relations.

Historically, mistrust in international affairs was no doubt a reaction to the emergence of States with a new social system or a differing political order. However, it became a factor of tension and even the cause of wars when transformed into a policy of intervention and aggression. This is true now more than ever before. Infringement of independence and encroachment on the right of nations to an independent choice and an original way of development are the source of mistrust, with all its perilous consequences for all humankind in our complicated times.

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

With reference to the issue of trust and confidence among nations, one cannot fail to recall the achievements recorded in September 1986 at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. The Final Document of the Stockholm Conference includes not only practical confirmation and implementation of the principle of the non-use of force, but also confidence- and security-building measures in the military sphere. On the practical level, it is a detailed, well-thought-out set of political and military measures which will help to lessen the danger of military confrontation in Europe, the most heavily armed continent on our planet.

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

In adopting these confidence-building measures in the military sphere, the Stockholm Conference was laying important foundations for the building of a climate of confidence and security in Europe. Without it, it will be impossible to preserve what has been achieved.

The results of the Stockholm Conference are a practical development of the Helsinki Final Act, which takes into account existing political and military realities in Europe. In fact, this is the first agreement to be reached in the context of the large-scale programme of peace, disarmament and security made on 15 January 1986 by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is necessary to emphasize that the Stockholm agreements were made possible by the consistent efforts of the socialist countries, the neutral and non-aligned States and all the participants in the Conference. The political realism and sense of responsibility shown by them made it possible for the Conference to overcome the many hurdles and difficulties in the way of reaching a compromise based on a mutually acceptable balance of the security interests of all participating countries. Therefore the most important task now is to set about effectively implementing those measures.

The recent Soviet-American agreement achieved in principle on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles and the forthcoming third summit meeting between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan in December constitute an important step forward on the road leading to the reduction of nuclear disaster and improvement of the international political climate.

The growing interdependence of States gives rise to a most serious task, that of developing international humanitarian interaction as one of the important aspects of bringing about comprehensive security, confidence and co-operation among nations. The elimination of genocide, racial discrimination and apartheid would

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

contribute to the overcoming of the serious social evils that are undermining security all over the world.

The establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security involves not only the elimination of foci of tension and conflicts, but also the prevention of new focal points of military danger.

Regional peace and security are inseparable from international peace and security. The essential problem confronting mankind today, that of survival, is equally acute and urgent for Europe, Africa, the Americas, and Asia and the Pacific. The consolidation and strengthening of peace and co-operation in any region would constitute a concrete contribution to the preservation of peace and security throughout the world.

In Central America, the Guatemala agreement on a procedure for establishing firm and lasting peace in Central America signed this August by Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica demonstrates the willingness and determination of the Central American peoples to "make dialogue prevail over violence and reason over hatred" (A/42/521, annex, p. 3) and to forge a peaceful future for Central America.

In the Middle East, the promising trend towards a just solution to the long-standing regional crisis is burgeoning. To this end, an international conference on the Middle East will have to be held without delay with the participation, on an equal footing, of all the parties concerned, including the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Our region, Asia and the Pacific, remains one of the most turbulent regions of the world. There, for the past 40 years, the peoples have never really known peace. At present, although Asia and the Pacific on the whole have not as yet been

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

militarized to the extent that Europe has, the potentialities of its militarization are truly immense, and the consequences extremely dangerous. Therefore Viet Nam firmly supports the Vladivostock initiative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning the establishment of a system of peace and security in Asia and the Pacific with a view to the consolidation of peace, security and co-operation on the basis of equality and mutual benefit among States in the region. Viet Nam also joins many countries in supporting the initiative of the People's Republic of Mongolia on the conclusion of a treaty on the non-use of force or of the threat of force between the States of the region. We support every effort to convert the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and South-East Asia, the South Pacific region and the Korean peninsula into nuclear-weapon-free zones, and the recent proposal of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea on the phased reduction of armed forces.

In South-East Asia, having suffered too much from war, the three Indo-Chinese countries more than any others treasure peace and desire friendship and co-operation with other countries all over the world, first of all with their neighbours. While resolutely struggling for the preservation of their independence and sovereignty, the three Indo-Chinese countries have spared no efforts to make South-East Asia a zone of peace, stability, friendship and co-operation. We are eager to seek, through dialogue in good faith, political solutions to the problems of this region, including the question of Kampuchea, on the basis of equality, respect for each other's sovereignty, and mutual understanding.

At the moment, while healthy and encouraging signs are evident in world politics, tension-breeding factors still prevail. Let us hope that with the tireless efforts of all peace-loving forces and with the co-operation of all Member States, the healthy and constructive trend in international affairs will move



(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

steadily ahead, and that lasting peace and security will be firmly cemented and promoted at the international as well as the regional and national levels, adding practical bricks to the building of a real system of universal security.

Mr. IN SOPHEAP (Democratic Kampuchea): Despite the announcement of the forthcoming conclusion of a treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear missiles, and despite all our utmost efforts with a view to disarmament, the present international situation remains disturbing. Fraught with dangers resulting from policies of domination and power, from the arms race and from the pauperization of developing countries, this situation is becoming even more tense as regional conflicts triggered by acts of aggression and occupation by expansionist Powers against other countries continue unabated. Considering that since the end of the Second World War there have already been more than 150 regional wars waged with conventional weapons, causing more than 20 million deaths, it is more than ever necessary to put an end to these local conflicts, which are an many potential sources of a possible generalized conflagration.

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic  
Kampuchea)

These regional conflicts are the result of the violation of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter; they are a constant threat to international peace, security and stability. The United Nations has always been striving to do away with these hotbeds of wars, and has adopted resolutions in accordance with its Charter, presenting the necessary framework for solving the problems in a just and lasting manner, in the interest of the parties concerned and of the international community as well. To mention only a few examples, if the General Assembly resolutions on Kampuchea that have been adopted by overwhelming majorities over the past nine years were implemented by the aggressors who had created the conflict, Kampuchea would recover its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, South-East Asia and the Asia-Pacific region would again enjoy an era of peace, security, stability and co-operation. Similarly, if the eight General Assembly resolutions on Afghanistan were implemented by the aggressors who had created the conflict, Afghanistan would be restored in its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, and peace, security, stability and co-operation would be re-established in South-West Asia.

Last year, in this very room, our Committee adopted a draft resolution entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", which was later approved by the General Assembly as resolution 41/90. Operative paragraph 2 of that resolution stipulated:

"Urges once again all States to abide strictly, in their international relations, by their commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and, to this end:

"(a) To refrain from the use or threat of use of force, intervention, interference, aggression, foreign occupation and colonial domination or measures of political and economic coercion which violate the sovereignty,

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic  
Kampuchea)

territorial integrity, independence and security of other States, as well as the permanent sovereignty of peoples over their natural resources;

"(b) To refrain from supporting or encouraging any such act for any reason whatsoever and to reject and refuse recognition of situations brought about by any such acts;".

It is worth noting that the aggressors of Kampuchea and Afghanistan, who voted for that resolution, still continue to violate it with cynicism.

If the resolutions adopted by our Organization were implemented in good faith, especially by those who adopted or even initiated them, our world would be much more peaceful and safer than it is today, and many obstacles impeding international relations would be removed, thus paving the way for better economic co-operation and development, as well as for disarmament. Unfortunately that is not the case.

In consideration of changes occurring in today's world and the interrelationship of the major issues, any well-intentioned idea and proposal aimed at tackling the shortcomings objectively discovered and at increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations should naturally be examined within appropriate frameworks and in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. Far from being obsolete, our Organization continues to contribute and could undoubtedly contribute even more effectively to the strengthening of international security, if no one violated the spirit of its Charter and more particularly if no one indulged in practices that undermine its efforts to maintain international peace and security. To give you an instance of such destructive work, I would like briefly to recount some practices that have prevented the settlement of a very serious problem, that of the war of aggression and occupation of a country - Kampuchea as it was.

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic  
Kampuchea)

First, in January 1979, while Democratic Kampuchea was being invaded and about a quarter of a million troops of aggression were carrying out their successive annihilation drives, here, at the Security Council, the super-Power which initiated the "Comprehensive system of international peace and security", with a view to allowing its client State to complete its conquest, twice vetoed the Council's resolutions demanding the withdrawal of the invaders. These vetoes prevented the Security Council from bringing about at a most appropriate stage a solution to a very grave situation, which has since developed and continues to threaten the stability and security of the whole region.

In the meantime, diplomatic manoeuvres were being frenziedly carried out in order to have the fait accompli of the aggression accepted. At the summit conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in Havana, another regional lieutenant of the super-Power did not hesitate to take advantage of his capacity as host country to arbitrarily block Democratic Kampuchea's participation. In doing so, he defended the aggressor and condemned the victim of the aggression. Moreover, in collusion with the aggressor, he splits and disparages the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which Kampuchea is a founding member

Secondly, since the invasion of Kampuchea, the General Assembly has considered this problem in depth every year. On the basis of the sacred principles of the Charter, it adopts resolutions demanding the total withdrawal of foreign troops, respect for the right of the people of Kampuchea freely to decide their own future, and the restoration of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kampuchea. Its recent resolution of 14 October was supported by 117 Member States, that is three quarters of the United Nations, representing régimes of every tendency, neutral and non-aligned, liberal, democratic or socialist.

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic  
Kampuchea)

In 1981, the International Conference on Kampuchea was convened under the auspices of the United Nations. It laid down the fundamental principles, in line with the Charter, for a comprehensive political settlement and adopted a declaration reiterating the same, just demand as that contained in the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. The super-Power, the financial backer of the aggression, and the occupying Power, which had created the problem and thus held the key to the settlement, have arrogantly rejected the United Nations resolutions and the Declaration adopted by the International Conference on Kampuchea. Moreover, they boycotted them and repudiated the role of these bodies in the settlement of the problem of Kampuchea. The irony of it is that a few days ago in this very Committee, an avatar of the super-Power in question, with touching innocence, upheld that resolutions are adopted in order to be implemented and stressed the necessity of implementing the General Assembly resolutions on disarmament.

Instead of complying with the resolutions of the over-whelming majority of the international community represented in our Organization, the aggressors of Kampuchea with the backing of their big protector and in collusion with it, have been carrying on activities outside the United Nations with a view to imposing their fait accompli in Kampuchea.

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic  
Kampuchea)

Their proposals for a regional conference between the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the self-styled Indo-Chinese States, including the puppet Phnom Penh régime, for a conference of the type of the 1962 Geneva Conference on Laos, or for negotiations between Kampuchians, to disguise their aggression as a civil war in Kampuchea, are but delaying manoeuvres and traps that reveal their contempt for the United Nations Charter and the international law governing relations between States.

Now that they are bogged down in their expansionist venture and are faced with inextricable difficulties at home and unrelenting world condemnation, the aggressors try to display flexibility and pretend that now is the time for dialogue and not for confrontation. They do their utmost to conceal the fact that they are precisely the ones who, through their invasion of Kampuchea, triggered the confrontation and through their continued occupation of that country are actually continuing to feed confrontation. All their propaganda is aimed at diverting the international community from the reality of their crimes and their expansionist strategy. To achieve that purpose they do not hesitate cynically to speak of so-called national reconciliation within the framework of the puppet régime installed and maintained by their occupation forces. All their propaganda and their disinformation machine are aimed at that one and sole goal: acceptance of the fait accompli of their policy of aggression and of global or regional expansion.

Those are some concrete facts illustrating the manner in which the super-Power in question and its regional lieutenant: disregard the United Nations when it does not fit in with their interests of expansion and domination, and how they use diplomacy not as a peaceful means to settle differences but as a subtle stratagem to back acts of aggression on the ground. That is why, regarding the establishment

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic  
Kampuchea)

of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, conceived by the super-Power in question, my delegation shares the objections and serious reservations already expressed here and the general concern to preserve the Charter of the United Nations and to prevent the creation of a system that might better serve the initiator and its clients, who are past-masters at manipulating propaganda and diplomacy, to achieve their goals of conquest and expansion; a system competitive with the United Nations, which could give them pretexts for continuously displaying cynicism and perfidy and evading their obligations to comply with the United Nations Charter and the recognized norms and principles of international law.

Our apprehension is certainly not without foundation when we recall what happened eight years ago. On 14 December 1979 the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session adopted by an overwhelming majority a draft resolution introduced by the Soviet Union under the title "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations". The draft, which became resolution 34/103, clearly defined the policy of hegemonism as follows:

"... hegemonism is a manifestation of the policy of a State, or a group of States, to control, dominate and subjugate, politically, economically, ideologically or militarily, other States, peoples or regions of the world.

...

"[It] manifests itself in the use or threat of use of force, foreign domination and intervention.

...

"hegemonism, global and regional, in all its different forms, leads to a serious threat to international peace and security".

By that resolution the General Assembly unequivocally

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic  
Kampuchea)

"[condemned] hegemonism in all its manifestations" (resolution 34/105, para. 1)  
and

"[called] for the withdrawal of all occupation forces back to their own territories, so as to enable the peoples of all States to determine and administer their own affairs". (resolution 34/103, para. 7)

Eleven days later, Afghanistan was invaded and what followed is well known to everyone.

For several dozen years now we have heard fine rhetoric while the authors of it have been firing cannons and guns in many places throughout our planet. We have learned to our detriment that those fascinating words of peace and disarmament actually conceal preparations for war and a frenzied arms race. Now they assure us that today is the era of glasnost, the era when, according to the assertion of Mr. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

"... the Party now firmly adheres to the principle that words should be followed up by deeds".

He said that in an interview with Time magazine of 9 September 1985. Such a statement deserves applause. The new glasnost rhetoric is just as fine as, if not finer than, that of the past. For instance, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has lectured us on "Reality and safeguards for a secure world". It was so well said and written that I cannot help quoting some passages from it:

"A prerequisite for universal security is unconditional respect for the Charter of the United Nations and the right of peoples to exercise the sovereign choice of the ways and forms of their development, revolutionary or evolutionary. This applies also to the right to the social status quo, for this too is an exclusively internal affair. Any attempts, whether direct or



(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic  
Kampuchea)

indirect, to influence the development of 'other people's' countries and interfere with it must be excluded. Equally impermissible, too, are attempts to destabilize existing Governments from outside." (A/42/574, p. 6)

"...

"The permanent members of the Security Council could act as guarantors of regional security, and would for their part assume the obligation to refrain from the use or threat of the use of force and from conspicuous displays of military strength, for this practice is one of the factors in sparking regional conflicts." (A/42/574, p. 7)

"...

"A decisive increase is required in the authority and role of the United Nations ..." (A/42/574, p. 10)

Those words, so wise and so enthralling, would definitely convince the most recalcitrant, if in Kampuchea and Afghanistan the Soviet weapons ceased massacring the population and destroying those countries; if the foreign aggression and occupation forces were withdrawn; if the relevant United Nations resolutions were implemented; if instead of trying to mislead the international community in the search for a so-called comprehensive system of international peace and security they purely and simply implemented the United Nations Charter. That is the most effective way of strengthening international security. We call upon the adepts of the policy of power and domination, and more particularly those who ignite the hotbeds of regional tension in Kampuchea and Afghanistan, to act in accordance with their own rhetoric - and the earlier the better, for people are beginning to see that glasnost as it actually is differs totally from the glasnost that one would hope for.

Mr. RAKOTONDRAMBOA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): The announcement that there will be a United States-Soviet summit meeting on 7 December to sign a treaty on the elimination of medium-range and short-range missiles is an event that my delegation welcomes, especially since for the first time there is the prospect of massive reductions in strategic nuclear weapons, a comprehensive test ban and strategic nuclear disarmament.

International peace and security can be ensured only by general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, under effective international control. The time has come for those two countries which are militarily the most powerful to set an example by overcoming their mutual distrust and rivalry and committing themselves to serious negotiations in a spirit of good will, taking into consideration the interests of all mankind.\*

The time has come also to realize that East-West confrontation, which spreads to and aggravates local and regional conflicts, makes it more difficult to resolve them and threatens world peace. This confrontation has maintained most of the sources of tension in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Central America. It stands in the way of the achievement of the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and is incompatible with the principles set forth in the Charter.

It is against this background that the odious and warlike apartheid régime manages with impunity to defy the international community and treat with scorn the most solemn resolutions of the General Assembly, notwithstanding the genocide committed against the people of South Africa, notwithstanding the illegal occupation of Namibia and State terrorism practised against independent neighbouring countries. The many and varied forms of support that the advocates of institutionalized racism are receiving prevent the Security Council from adopting

---

\*Mr. Nashashibi (Jordan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Rakotondramboa, Madagascar)

comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa and, in addition, make it easier for South Africa to acquire nuclear capability.

Furthermore, because of the same East-West confrontation, the Indian Ocean is becoming the theatre of growing escalation of the military presence of the great Powers. The coastal countries and the hinterland countries note with great concern the expansion and upgrading of existing bases, the attempts to establish new bases and the installation of new structures of military command. All these activities jeopardize the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and peaceful development of the States of the region.

And yet it has been 16 years since the Indian Ocean was declared a zone of peace in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI). My delegation fervently hopes that by 1990 the Conference on the Indian Ocean will be held at Colombo, with the full and active participation of all the countries concerned, all the permanent members of the Security Council and the principal maritime countries, in order to ensure its success.

Acting on the principle that it is vain to try to ensure international security without a stable and equitable world economic environment, which is an essential basis for world peace, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar fully supports the strengthening of international co-operation for the purpose of development and supports efforts to establish a new international economic order. Here we welcome the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 41/128 on 4 December 1986, containing the Declaration on the Right to Development and referring to the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held at New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987. The Final Document of that Conference clearly stresses the relationship between disarmament and development, which are elements that in themselves can be sources of security.

(Mr. Rakotondramboa, Madagascar)

It should be recalled that as far back as 1970, in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the General Assembly affirmed its conviction

"that there is a close connection between the strengthening of international security, disarmament and the economic development of countries, so that any progress made towards any of these objectives will constitute progress towards all of them" (resolution 2734 (XXV), para. 19).

We hope that in the near future the necessary international financial machinery will be established to facilitate the transfer of resources released by disarmament measures into economic and social development. Development would make it possible to end the scourges afflicting many countries of the third world: poverty, unemployment, hunger, malnutrition, epidemics and health problems, exploitation, aggression and social inequality. In our interdependent world, it is in everybody's interest to eradicate these scourges, which create unacceptable risks for the international community as a whole.

Madagascar, a product of the decolonization process to which the United Nations gave such irresistible momentum, reaffirms its dedication to the purposes and principles of the Charter. Our Organization is the most appropriate international body to play the central role which it plays as well in the maintenance of international peace and security and the peaceful settlement of international disputes as in the promotion of progress towards international co-operation in all fields on the basis of the sovereign equality of States and in the establishment of equitable and just economic relations. The capacity of the United Nations to define and resolve potential and new problems in the political, economic, social and humanitarian fields must be developed systematically.

(Mr. Rakotondramboa, Madagascar)

In this connection, the Secretary-General notes in his most recent report on the work of the Organization (A/42/1) that, in the tasks it has set itself, the United Nations has so far kept pace with global change, when it has not itself set the pace for such change.

(Mr. Rakotondramboa, Madagascar)

It notes that, without considering their political orientation or their economic systems, countries aware of the dangers of immobilism have begun to attack with new pragmatism the problems that exist in this interdependent world. The report stresses that the Organization must remain attentive to evolving needs in our constantly changing world, and that it must try to derive benefit from the ideas and counsels that can be offered by the most enlightened minds in the entire world.

Finally, the conviction is expressed that the United Nations must learn to become more closely associated with prominent statesmen from all countries as it carries out its world mission. When applied, with respect for the Charter, to international peace and security, as these ideas have already been so fruitfully in other areas, these ideas and proposals most definitely command the support of our delegation.

Mr. NCWORYTA (Poland): Last year the socialist countries, including Poland, proposed the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. The evolution of the international situation since the last session of the General Assembly corroborates the validity and the topical nature of our proposal.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the unity and harmonious development of the world is possible only with the acceptance of the truth that the interests of particular States and regions are part and parcel of the global interests of all nations. The world can make headway, nationally and regionally, only with acknowledgement of the political, economic and cultural diversity of States and regions, which makes it necessary to seek a balance between the various contradictory but real interests and mutual co-operation, understanding and respect.

Recent decades have created truly promising perspectives for such headway. For the first time in its history mankind has developed technologies and has mastered resources capable of securing a prosperous future for all. At the same

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

time, however, mankind has found itself on the verge of nuclear annihilation. The accumulation of huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons, far from contributing to overall security, has become a factor threatening the human race. The proliferation of threats and challenges to the survival and development of mankind has given rise to the need for a reappraisal of conventional thinking and a fresh look at the problems of international security.

In presenting the joint initiative on the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security, the socialist countries proceeded from the following assumptions.

Given the current stage of the arms race, particularly in the nuclear sphere, and the level of military technology achieved, it has been generally acknowledged that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

Security cannot be attained by military means; it calls for political solutions.

Traditional concepts of security, relying on the supremacy of one State or group of States at the expense of others, have lost their validity. It has become necessary to accommodate one's own security to that of others. Security can only be universal and must apply equally to all.

The pressing global problems and challenges facing mankind, including not only military, but also economic, social, environmental and health hazards, have given rise to the interdependence of nations and call for common solutions.

All States, be they big, small or medium-sized, bear a common responsibility for the peaceful and secure future of the world and should contribute to that future.

The interests of mankind's stable and long-term security require the evolution of new political means and rules of conduct applicable to the nuclear and space age. The concept of security presented by the socialist countries in their joint

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

initiative is comprehensive in nature and universal in scope. It is comprehensive, because it is not confined to the political and military fields, but also covers the economic, ecological, human rights and humanitarian spheres. It is universal in scope, as any attempt to arrive at a truly secure world must be made on a global scale. It does not diminish the importance of regional approaches to the solution of conflicts and disputes among States, taking into account the complex historical and geopolitical factors as well as the security interests of States in various regions of the world.

The comprehensive system of international security, as we see it, is to be based on the United Nations Charter, applied to the new conditions prevailing in the international situation, and should embrace all the positive experience accumulated by the international community in the ensuring of international security, including experience gained from regional endeavours.

Under this scheme, priority should be given to values common to all mankind. In terms of those values, peace must have top priority, while peaceful coexistence should be recognized as a universal principle of international relations and a basis for co-operation between States. Therefore the solutions to the global problems of mankind call for the elaboration and application of modalities for a more active practice of peaceful coexistence among States as a basis for their co-operation.

As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland, Mr. Marian Orzechowski, noted in an address to the international symposium held on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the Polish Institute for Foreign Affairs:

"The essence of this concept is an endeavour to put security on a non-military and co-operative basis. The limitation of military factors is bound to be linked to the promotion of confidence and mutual guarantees as to the non-threatening character of military activities, to the limitation of



(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

armaments, and to disarmament with particular reference to weapons of the greatest destructive power which could be employed in offensive operations.

"Such restructuring should favour a specific 'demilitarization' of political thinking, reorientation of political and military doctrines."

The Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs amplified this subject in his statement in the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly.

Progress in disarmament is the conditio sine qua non of a peaceful and secure world. The inseparable link between disarmament and security has been confirmed in numerous United Nations documents, including the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly.

While a system of comprehensive security can become a reality if all means of mass annihilation are destroyed, progress towards a nuclear-free world can be achieved stage by stage in terms both of participation and of the armaments to be covered.

In the process of disarmament negotiations a special role devolves on the great Powers. The international community is following with close interest the Soviet-American disarmament negotiations, expecting them to achieve concrete agreements. Poland welcomes the agreement in principle reached between the USSR and the United States of America concerning intermediate and shorter-range missiles as an important step towards the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. We hope that it will be followed by an agreement to make radical reductions in long-range strategic weapons, while at the same time adhering to the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems.

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

Poland has been concentrating its attention on the creation of conditions for durable security in Europe, especially Central Europe, which is Poland's immediate security environment. The Government of the Polish People's Republic is of the opinion that the improving political, economic and cultural conditions in Europe and the level of enhanced mutual confidence already achieved do not warrant the present high level of military preparedness in Europe.

Proceeding from the conviction that the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of thinned-out arms concentration serves all European States well, hence also Poland, the Polish Government launched a series of initiatives covered by the Rałicki and Gomułka plans and, most recently, by the Jaruzelski plan. The basic premises of the Jaruzelski plan have been specified in the Memorandum of the Polish Government on decreasing armaments and increasing confidence in Central Europe, dated 17 July 1987.

The plan seeks to ensure for the region a military stability on the lowest possible level of armaments and armed forces in conditions of equal security of States. It proposes, inter alia, the gradual reduction and withdrawal of specific, mutually agreed-on types and quantities of nuclear and conventional weapons and an agreement on the elimination of disproportions and asymmetries in a variety of weapons and armed forces, providing for possible reductions in areas where one side enjoys superiority over the other. The plan also addresses the transformation of the present military doctrines into strictly defensive ones and the consideration of the possibility of applying specific confidence-building measures, commensurate with the military and political situation obtaining in Central Europe.

We read with interest that the plan has been welcomed as an expression of converging expectations and the starting-point of positive transformation in Europe. Taking into account the geostrategic and functional ramifications of Central Europe and its impact on global security, we are of the opinion that it

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

could bring a positive influence to bear on the situation throughout Europe and all over the world.

Poland attaches great importance to the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) as a means of furthering confidence and security in Europe. We have submitted a proposal to expand the terms of reference of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe to embrace problems of conventional disarmament and we are looking forward to an agreement on more far-reaching arms reduction measures at the ongoing meeting in Vienna, taking into account the proposals contained in the Budapest Communiqué of June 1986 and the Communiqué of States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty of May 1987.

We note with satisfaction that at the current session the General Assembly has adopted the Declaration on the Enhancement of the Effectiveness of the Principle of Refraining from the Threat or Use of Force in International Relations, which testifies to the desire of States to promote peaceful relations and to achieve enhanced security by non-military means.

One of the basic components of the initiative concerning a comprehensive system of international peace and security is the concept of international economic security reflecting the growing interdependence of all countries and the global nature of world economic problems. The essence of the concept is the need to ensure the predictability of world economic processes and the stability of international economic co-operation, free from restrictions and limitations. The problem of debt is also inseparably linked to the question of economic security. The debt crisis stands out today as one of the most dangerous economic phenomena in the world because it inhibits the economic growth of States and destabilizes international trade and financial relations.

Poland has time and time again underscored the necessity of resolving the debt problem through the co-operation of creditor and debtor States and has sought to

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

make a contribution to its solution. Towards that end, at the fortieth session of the United Nations General Assembly Poland proposed that an international debt and development centre be established under the auspices of the Secretary-General. Since the end of 1986 a national centre dealing with those problems has been operational in Cracow. We hope that shortly the centre will be associated with the programmes carried out within the framework of the United Nations system.

Efforts with a view to the promotion of a safe world should be accompanied by expanded co-operation in human rights and other humanitarian areas and, above all, by facilitating contacts between peoples, communities and individuals. It has been recognized that international co-operation for the promotion of human rights is an important factor in the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security. We subscribe to the view that respect for, and promotion of, human rights and fundamental freedoms in their civil, political, economic, social and cultural aspects, on the one hand, and the strengthening of international peace and security on the other, mutually reinforce each other. While contributing to greater understanding and tolerance among people, international co-operation in those areas can provide the psychological and moral prerequisites for the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. Education for life in peace could play an important role in achieving those objectives.

The new comprehensive approach to the question of international peace and security, as proposed by the socialist countries, is by no means intended to be a substitute for the security system provided for in the United Nations Charter. In presenting their joint initiative, the socialist countries have been guided by a desire to continue and to develop an open political dialogue, making full use of the potential inherent in the United Nations and with a view to implementing the purposes and the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter in an effective

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

way. In fact, the elaborate and comprehensive proposals submitted by the sponsors of the initiative in the current debate could constitute an agenda for the United Nations for years to come. Coming to grips with challenges facing the international community calls for the strengthening and the enhancement of the role of the United Nations as a forum for dialogue and multilateral co-operation, which would bring closer the vision of the United Nations as a centre for harmonizing the interests of Member States.

As the Secretary-General of the United Nations noted in his report on the work of the Organization,

"convergence [of interests] now exists on important issues confronting the world". (A/42/1, p. 18)

The question is, how to transform this convergence into practical agreements. We concur with his conclusion that sustained dialogue and negotiations need to be pursued and expanded in undertakings

"that bring together the capacities of nations for the common benefit of humanity." (A/42/1, p. 18)

The current debate has shown the existence of premises for a constructive dialogue. We have also spotted them, notwithstanding diverse differences, in the statement by the Permanent Representative of Denmark, Ambassador Ole Bierring, on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Community. We share his assessment of the CSCE process as a positive example of what can be achieved through multilateral co-operation within a regional context. We share his assessment and assurances that

"the Twelve are ready to collaborate on ways and means of implementing the security system provided for in the Charter." (A/C.1/42/PV.49, p. 48)

and that they

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

"remain prepared to strengthen international peace and security effectively within the framework of the Charter". (A/C.1/42/PV.49, p. 52)

(Ms. Noworyta, Poland)

As is stated in the communiqué of the Prague meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty parties (A/42/708), the system of universal security is to function on the basis of the United Nations Charter and within the United Nations framework. Such a statement of our position should dispel any doubts as to our intentions. It is not our goal to create some new structure, but - quite to the contrary - fully to use the United Nations machinery as provided for in the Charter to strengthen international peace and security. The point is that, within the existing structure, different policies can be pursued, and if actual practice is not always satisfactory, as is generally recognized, it is the very purpose of our proposal to establish a new practice consistently based on co-operation and common responsibility.

Some delegations have voiced their reservations about the group of experts proposed in our draft resolution, asserting that by convening it we would set out upon a road leading to the creation of a system parallel to that of the United Nations. What in fact we are proposing is to request the Secretary-General to prepare a report with the assistance of a group of experts. We are, of course, open to all constructive proposals. This device, like commissions composed of eminent persons, is a method frequently used - not to say one preferred by some States - for approaching diverse complex problems within the United Nations framework.

A number of such bodies - to mention just the newest example, the World Commission on Environment and Development, chaired by Mrs. Gro Harlem Brundtland - have achieved unquestionably positive results. It is to be noted that the members of that Commission considered it appropriate to title the report "Our Common Future". This title speaks even more emphatically about the character of contemporary problems than our formula of a comprehensive system does.

(Mr. Noworvta, Poland)

For the last few days the representative of the United Kingdom has been making painstaking efforts to detect divergences in statements made by the representatives of the socialist States. On 20 November, he presented the results of his efforts. His conclusion was that new solutions proposed by us were difficult to reconcile with assurances of respect for the Charter and for the system of peace and security provided for in it.

Conversely, it is precisely our wish to strengthen this very system so that it can meet the challenges of the present time. Hence we do not want anybody to buy a pig in a poke, as was suggested. It was, rather, the representative of the United Kingdom, my dear colleague, who was finding quarrel in a straw.

The concepts of security currently practised do not preclude wars, proliferation of regional and local conflicts, limitations on international co-operation or the imposition of unequal relations. The concept of security as proposed by us should preclude the unleashing of a war and should make possible a turn-about from policies relying on deterrence to security policies based on co-operation and confidence. In it we put our hopes of improving the mechanisms of conflict-prevention and settlement and of fostering international relations in the political and trade spheres, as well as contacts in the fields of culture, the arts, science and human relations.

A real possibility has arisen for a genuine get-together of nations, with full respect for their identity and sovereignty. This is a matter deserving our common reflection.

On behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Cameroon, the Congo, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mongolia, Panama, Peru, the Syrian Arab Republic,



(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

Tunisia, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and my own delegation, I now have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.91, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace.

In the preambular part the draft resolution would have the General Assembly recall its resolution 33/73 of 15 December 1978, by which it adopted the Declaration, and its 1981 and 1984 reviews of the implementation of the Declaration, which confirmed the important role of the Declaration in alerting public opinion in all countries and in mobilizing consciences, both individually and collectively, in the cause of peace. It would also have the General Assembly take note of the achievements of the International Year of Peace in respect to the preparation of societies for life in peace, and take into account the growing timeliness of the Declaration as well as the valuable experience gained in the course of the implementation of its principles and objectives.

In the operative part, the draft resolution would have the General Assembly solemnly reaffirm the lasting validity of the purposes and principles enshrined in the Declaration, and urge all States to continue their sustained efforts towards the fullest implementation of the Declaration at the national and international levels.

The draft resolution would also have the General Assembly recommend to all Governments and appropriate institutions that they keep in mind the principles contained in the Declaration while elaborating their policies, in particular their education programmes and school curricula, and also recommend to the appropriate United Nations bodies and other international organizations concerned that they be guided by the principles and objectives of the Declaration while preparing their programmes of work.

(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

The draft resolution also provides for a report of the Secretary-General on the progress made in implementation of the Declaration to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session.

We have consulted numerous delegations, especially sponsors of the previous resolutions on the review of the implementation of the Declaration, with regard to the content of the draft resolution.

On behalf of the sponsors, I express the hope that the draft will receive the unanimous support of the First Committee and that it will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The crisis today in human affairs is caused not by the incapacity to deal with it, but by failure to recognize its root cause and by an inclination to ignore it.

The international community has to face certain realities that cannot be ignored.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The Powers which conduct the arms race are, by their position, at the same time those that dominate the disarmament effort. The arms race is a galloping reality, the disarmament negotiations are a stagnant pretence.

Both phenomena are due to one and the same cause and have a common characteristic, the flagrant violation of the Charter in the primary purpose of the United Nations for international peace and security, depriving the Security Council of the means of enforcement action to give effect to its decisions - thereby rendering the Security Council inoperative - while the arms race escalates.

The disarmament effort, thus denuded of the security system of the Charter, was forced onto a wrong course, namely, the obsolete United Nations concept of balance of power. But in our present-day polarized world, attempts to achieve a parity of weapons engender and escalate the arms race.

The imperative need today for a system of international security is twofold. Without it, nations will necessarily continue to seek their security only through competitive armaments, ultimately leading to a nuclear holocaust. On the other hand, the lack of United Nations security and world order is in itself the cause of increasing international criminality, anarchy and terrorism, with equally disastrous consequences.

A closely interdependent world of numerous sovereign nations cannot function towards peace and survival without an effective international organization. We have as an international organization the United Nations, but it should be restored to its effectiveness by making available to the Council the necessary means of enforcement action. That is the great thing: if we have enforcement action, then we can deal with the situation accordingly; if we have no enforcement action, then those are mere words and not realities. The function of the United Nations for the

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

maintenance of international security and peace is the corner-stone of the whole structure of the Organization and constitutes its primary purpose. The preamble to the Charter declares the determination of the peoples:

"to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, ..." and to this end "to unite" their "strength" in collective action for the maintenance of "international peace and security."

The concept of collective international security runs all through the Charter and is intended to ensure through enforcement action the validity and effect of the decisions of the Security Council.

A transitional stage for a world clustered with arms to a system of international security, gradually eliminating nuclear weapons, is most significant. This, however, can succeed only by establishing the authority of the United Nations as an instrument of international peace and security.

The practice so far of proceeding straight to disarmament negotiations without reference to concurrent measures to implement the Charter system of international security is an exercise in futility. This has been amply shown in the decades of unproductive bilateral and multilateral negotiations, and despite persistent efforts in the Conference on Disarmament. Negotiated disarmament agreements should proceed with due regard to the concomitant requirements for effective international security. The two things are interrelated and have to go together: disarmament and international security; the one cannot be achieved without the other.

Pretending dedication to Charter principles while showing in actual practice a great disregard for principle, with only the specific interests of the Power concerned being dominant, is a policy that has to be abandoned. It is most heartening that Mr. Gorbachev proposed that the Security Council should take on an

(Mr. ROSSIDES, Cyprus)

enhanced importance in preserving military stability. I want to take this opportunity for warmly congratulating Mr. Gorbachev on his initiative and on really getting into the spirit of the United Nations, as I suggested some years ago that the Soviet Union should do. I am very glad to see that now Mr. Gorbachev is really entering into the spirit of the United Nations. The Soviet leader praised the United Nations for its efforts to maintain peace around the world by sending military forces to supervise truces, or to keep antagonistic forces apart, and expressed the wish that the Organization should increase such peace-keeping activities in the future. This attitude of the Soviet Union is a very important feature in the affairs of the United Nations because it brings a new spirit and a step forward towards the ideas which we advocated some years ago and which we still hold.

In conclusion, it has to be fully recognized that a closely interdependent world of numerous sovereign nations cannot function towards peace and survival without an effective international organization. The United Nations has to become effective by being enabled to answer its primary purpose. The first step in this direction is for the Security Council, particularly its permanent members, to rectify their original error by proceeding to implement the provisions of Chapter VII, Article 43, of the Charter. I repeat: it is most important that Chapter VII, Article 43, should be promoted and followed.

Positive developments in this respect would in themselves create a climate of confidence in the United Nations as an instrument for world order, security and peace, opening the way to better trust between its Member States. Such developments would also facilitate the peaceful settlement of disputes by limiting the possibilities of negotiating from positions of strength. More significantly, the emerging pattern of a common security system would be conducive to improved

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

co-operation between the major Powers on global issues for peace and security, irrespective of their socio-political differences.

In the last analysis, the problem is one of adjustment to the demands of a radically changed world. We have to take this into account, that we are in a radically changed world. The breakthrough in technology calls for comparable ethical standards in the approach to world problems. Beyond the achievements of the human intellect, it is the human spirit that will determine the fate of man on this planet. On this I insist emphatically, that it is the human spirit that will determine the fate of man on this planet. When it is awakened, it leads man to the right decisions.

Mr. MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): The situation in the Mediterranean region has been unstable for many years now. It is still characterized by tension, crises and conflicts. The major cause of the tension is the policy of interference in the internal affairs of non-aligned States of the region, aggression, occupation, denial of the legitimate rights of the States and peoples of the region to self-determination and to the economic and social development of their choice, and other policies of political and economic pressure carried out by the imperialist forces and by those foreign racists who are trying to expand their spheres of influence and to implement their colonial designs and impose hegemony on this vital region of the world.

In the course of the past three years, the Mediterranean region has indeed experienced a serious escalation of tension because of the concentration of imperialist forces and weapons, including nuclear weapons, which represent a serious threat to the peoples of the region and to neighbouring regions, and because of the large-scale military activities in which various military bases and navies engage, in particular the Sixth Fleet, and which take the form of provocation and military manoeuvres near the borders and territorial waters of the coastal States of the Mediterranean. They have also engaged in such acts as shooting down an Egyptian plane over the Mediterranean, an act which also involved violation of the airspace and territorial waters of non-aligned countries of the region. The Jamahiriya has been the victim of a series of threats and acts of aggression, both direct and indirect, on the part of the American administration. Those acts have taken the form of specific steps in the political and economic area, and in the area of cultural information as well.

(Mr. Muntasser, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

In fact, on 15 and 16 April 1986, the United States of America made ferocious attacks on residential areas and civilian airports in the cities of Tripoli and Benghazi, and on the residence of the Head of the Revolution, using the most sophisticated kinds of weapons, military planes and dozens of F-11 planes. The attack resulted in the death of several innocent residents and caused considerable material damage to civilian sites.

The international community has, on numerous occasions, strongly condemned these brutal acts of aggression.

Thus at their Eighth Summit Conference, held at Harare from 1 to 6 September 1986, the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries adopted a Declaration in which they vigorously condemned those unjustified acts of aggression, which are acts of State terrorism and violations of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations. They requested the United States to put an immediate end to such acts of aggression, including the military manoeuvres in the Gulf, which were a violation of the sovereignty of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and of its territorial integrity, and which threatened international peace and security in the Mediterranean region. The Council of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Islamic countries, held in New York on 2 October 1986, vigorously condemned the military attack on the part of the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in April 1986, and demanded that the United States refrain from any acts likely to threaten the independence and sovereignty of the Jamahiriya or its territorial integrity.

The Council of Arab Ministers of Foreign Affairs, which met in March and October 1986, condemned the American acts of aggression against the Jamahiriya. They expressed the belief that it was a flagrant violation of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Libya and that the pursuit of such acts



(Mr. Muntasser, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

of aggression was a threat to the peace and security of Arab States and to international peace and security. They considered that the United States was responsible for the consequences of that aggression.

In its resolution 41/38 of 1986, the General Assembly condemned the American military aggression against the Jamahiriya. In paragraph 1 of that resolution it:

"Condemns the military attack perpetrated against the Socialist People's Libyan Jamahiriya on 15 April 1986, which constitutes a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law".

In paragraph 2, it:

"Calls upon the Government of the United States in this regard to refrain from the threat or use of force in the settlement of disputes and differences with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and to resort to peaceful means in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations".

In paragraph 3 it also calls upon

"... all States to refrain from extending any assistance or facilities for perpetrating acts of aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya".

The Declaration adopted by the meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Non-Aligned Countries, held in New York, from 5 to 7 October 1987, stated:

"The Ministers and heads of delegation reiterated that the United States attack endangered peace and security in the Mediterranean region and hindered the efforts designed to make that region a zone of peace, security and co-operation." (A/42/681, para. 109)

The acts of aggression, of which the Jamahiriya has been a victim, are an example of the dangers to which neighbouring countries in the region and other non-aligned countries are exposed and are a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, in particular of

(Mr. Muntasser, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

those principles which require international co-operation and the peaceful settlement of disputes, non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and the non-use of force or the threat of the use of force in international relations. My country believes that the establishment of certain areas of the world as zones of peace is a significant contribution to the reduction of tension in that region and to the strengthening of international peace and security in general. It is therefore following with interest the question of the strengthening of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean and attaches great importance to the establishment of an area of peace and co-operation in that region, so that the sea may remain free from tensions and conflicts.

These are fundamental objectives for which we are working with the countries of the region. They are important not only for the countries of the region, but also for the security of the world. In that context the efforts undertaken by the non-aligned countries in the Mediterranean region are an effective contribution to the transformation of that zone into a zone of peace. Those objectives were emphasized in the two Declarations which emerged from the meetings of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement of the Mediterranean, held at Valleta, Malta, in 1984, and at Brioni, Yugoslavia, in June of this year.

(Mr. Muntasser, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

They affirmed that it was in the joint interest of co-operation of the countries of the region in the economic, social and scientific spheres, to strengthen efforts aimed at promoting peace and security in the Mediterranean region, based on respect for independence, non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries and territorial integrity.

The Jamahiriya supported the Soviet President's initiative of 26 March 1986, in which he requested the withdrawal of Soviet and American fleets from the region.

The General Assembly, aware of the aspirations of the countries of the region to reduce tensions and eliminate them, in order to establish conditions for co-operation and security in the region, has requested in its numerous resolutions that all States should co-operate with the States of the Mediterranean region in their efforts to carry out those objectives, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Here we can only note with great concern that that request continues to run into numerous obstacles, including the fact that conflicts remain unresolved, that the policies of imperialist and racist forces are continuing their attempts to thwart the aspirations of the States of the region to independence and self-determination. The preservation of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region requires concerted efforts to eliminate the sources of tension in the region by finding solutions to the problems of today. A just and lasting solution must be found to the problem of the Palestinian people, to enable it to return to its territory, exercise its right to self-determination and establish its own State.

Four decades have elapsed since the beginning of the racist occupation of Palestine and the expulsion of its people. The international community has up to

(Mr. Muntasser, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

now been unable to take measures enabling that people to exercise its rights and to return to its territory, in spite of the hundreds of resolutions condemning the racist occupying régime and demanding that it should respect United Nations resolutions and international legitimacy.

The imperialist forces are responsible for the deterioration of the situation, since they give unlimited support to the racist régime to consecrate the occupation of Palestine, acts of aggression against an Arab nation and the continuation of the occupation of that nation.

The advancement of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region also requires scrupulous respect for those principles of the Charter dealing with respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-intervention in their internal affairs, the non-use of force in international relations, and a ban on military manoeuvres and manifestations of force near the territorial waters of coastal States. In addition, military facilities should not be given for purposes of intervention, nor should military bases whose presence threatens the security of the region be established. In addition, military and economic pressures, which attempt to subject peoples to domination and imperialist hegemony, should be rejected.

My country believes that implementation of those objectives would strengthen co-operation and stability in the Mediterranean region. To that end, it has requested the convening of a conference of non-aligned countries and the coastal States of the Mediterranean in order to take collective measures to protect and maintain the security of the Mediterranean region by prohibiting the military manoeuvres of foreign fleets and making that region an exclusive economic zone for the coastal States of the region.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

I once again remind members of the Committee that we shall follow the procedure set forth in my previous statement on this subject.

Mr. THAYER (United States of America): We find it curious that Libya chooses to attack the United States, in its recent speech, when it is itself one of the major causes of regional insecurity. Is there any country with which Libya shares a boundary which has not suffered, over the past 16 years, from Libyan threats or actual aggressions? It is not the United States which has staged or directed attacks against civilians and airports in London, Vienna and Rome, which has bombed nightclubs in Berlin and which supplies arms used to blow up civilians in Ireland. There is no question as to which country, the United States or Libya, the countries in the Mediterranean region consider to be the greater threat to their regional security.

Mr. MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of the United States has made allegations at all meetings of the General Assembly and in the various Main Committees. We have denied those allegations, and we have challenged the United States of America, which practises terrorist policies, to go to the International Court of Justice or to the General Assembly and the Security Council, and have these questions considered. Libya has challenged the United States to go to those bodies, where the true situation as regards these allegations should be considered. The United States practises terrorism against peoples and it should be the last to speak on this subject.

Mr. THAYER (United States of America): I believe that, under the rules of procedure, mine will in fact be the last word on this subject. It is not necessary to go to the Security Council or the International Court of Justice to

(Mr. Thayer, United States)

discuss those subjects. They have been tried in courts of law in various countries, and in each of the cases the linkage between the Libyan State and the acts of terrorism which I have described has been very clearly established.

Mr. MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic):

That allegation is quite false. There is no connection between the Jamahiriya and the two incidents referred to by the representative of the United States. The Austrian and Italian Governments have confirmed that fact in official statements.

#### PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I should like to remind members of the Committee of the programme that we decided upon at the beginning of our work. We promised that we would complete our work on 25 November, the deadline set by the President of the General Assembly.

I hope that the present consultations and discussions on draft resolutions already introduced, reproduced and distributed to all delegations, will be completed fairly soon. We intend to ask the Committee on Wednesday morning, after all the speakers on the list have spoken, to take decisions, if possible, on all the draft resolutions under agenda items 71, 72 and 73 that will have been presented to the Committee by then.

I have no more speakers listed for the right of reply, and I should like to inform the Committee that the following delegations are scheduled to speak at tomorrow morning's meeting: Mongolia, Albania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.