

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY  
FORTY-THIRD SESSION  
Official Records\*



FIRST COMMITTEE  
51<sup>st</sup> meeting  
held on  
Monday, 28 November 1988  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 51st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ROCHE (Canada)

CONTENTS

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

---

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-730, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/43/PV.51  
13 December 1988  
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 71, 72 and 73 (continued)

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

Mrs. MARICO (Mali) (interpretation from French): After forty-three years our trust in the future that inspired the creation of our Organization, whose Charter calls upon all nations to rise above their national egoism and undertake the joint task of peaceful co-operation, remains as strong as ever.

Indeed, notwithstanding differences or polemics, the discussions held during the consideration of disarmament questions have shown that we all share the political will to act jointly to attain the objectives of peace, security and prosperity for all mankind.

We must attain those objectives. That is why the political and security Committee is once again examining questions of international security. We are becoming ever more aware that the search for peace and security for all is a political task, and States are becoming increasingly aware that there is a pressing need for them to abandon their dangerous goal of unilateral security based upon armaments and to choose, instead, common security through disarmament.

The States members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), meeting at Addis Ababa, and those of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at Cyprus, reaffirming their faith in the United Nations as the most appropriate forum for the role of maintaining international peace and security, stated their conviction that the establishment of a climate of security and peace propitious to the development and progress of all countries can be achieved only through political means and the joint efforts of all States.

In addition, we are increasingly convinced that peace and security cannot be safeguarded by military force alone, but that dialogue, joint action and

(Mrs. Mariko, Mali)

negotiation are also necessary. My delegation is convinced that it is both necessary and possible for States with different political and social systems to achieve concrete agreements consonant with the interests of all.

Thus, most of the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted by the General Assembly nearly two decades ago, and which is still valid today, have not been implemented. In southern Africa the racist and warlike régime of apartheid continues to prevail, despite numerous appeals by the international community. That is why the African States, their allies and their friends continue to condemn the nuclear capability of South Africa, which, in addition to running counter to the spirit of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, poses a constant threat to the countries and peoples of that continent.

This is an opportune moment to pay a tribute to the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, whose media have launched a world campaign against apartheid. The seminar held in that connection at Lima, Peru, and the mission of the United Nations Council for Namibia in Latin America have made valuable contributions to the struggle of Latin American and Caribbean peoples and Governments against the abhorrent apartheid régime.

My delegation also wishes to welcome the important measures adopted by many countries and international organizations to assist the peoples of southern Africa by adopting sanctions against the apartheid régime. The people of Mali, the Mali People's Democratic Union and the Government of Mali have just devoted the week of 7 to 13 November 1988 to a Week of Solidarity with the Peoples of Southern Africa. All the best elements in our country and all democratic organizations took part in the Week's various political, artistic, sporting and cultural events, which

(Mrs. Marico, Mali)

were summed up in the Bamako Declaration, a veritable act of faith in the establishment of a climate of peace and security in our sub-continent.

The situation in the Middle East continues to cause concern, for there, as in South Africa, the most basic human rights continue to be trampled underfoot, notwithstanding the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, and especially the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The Palestinian people, seeking a decent existence in their ancestral homeland, continue to struggle for their right to exist as a free and sovereign State. The declaration of the State of Palestine on 15 November 1988 at Algiers was greeted with satisfaction by the many countries that recognized it.

In resolution 42/92 on the review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the General Assembly once again urged all States to abide strictly by their commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and to refrain from the use or threat of use of measures of economic coercion which violate the sovereignty, independence and security of other States.

(Mrs. Mariam, Mali)

The world economic situation continues to deteriorate. The imbalance is so great that it could pose a threat to international peace and security if urgent measures are not taken. With the added effects of natural disasters, trade imbalances, the burden of external debt, consequences of structural adjustment, and the international economic crisis, the situation in the developing countries is unbearable and requires an urgent comprehensive solution by the international community. That is why we welcome the consensus adoption by the General Assembly of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole on the mid-term evaluation of the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990. My delegation has no doubt that by 1990 the commitments of Africa's development partners will be fully honoured and that in the end the United Nations will have won another victory in its effort to establish equitable and just economic relations.

With respect to agenda item 73, "Comprehensive system of international peace and security", my delegation remains faithful to the ideals of the United Nations Charter and considers that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74, far from questioning the system outlined by the Charter, lays out the specific elements of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. For us, the Charter remains a basic instrument for protecting international peace and security. During last year's debate on this item my delegation said that improving the international situation was the duty of all States - but especially the permanent members of the Security Council. They must take all measures necessary to prevent the further deterioration of the international situation, inter alia, by making effective use of the means prescribed by the Charter. In our view, one of the underlying causes of the present crisis and threats to peace is a certain turning away from the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Marico, Mali)

My delegation will support draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74 because my country favours anything that reaffirms the basic principles of international law, especially respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States, the self-determination of peoples, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Moreover, paragraph 1 calls on Member States to continue and intensify the international dialogue within the framework of the United Nations; that is fully in keeping with the views of my delegation.

Indeed, when he addressed the General Assembly on 4 October last, the Head of State of Mali and current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), General Moussa Traoré, said that

"The United Nations is the embodiment of our common will to unite our forces and harmonize our efforts to fulfil man's profound aspiration to peace, freedom and well-being. The Charter contains the rules of conduct that should enable us to achieve those ideals, namely: the non-use of force, good-neighbourliness, the peaceful settlement of disputes, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, respect for fundamental human rights and solidarity and mutual assistance among peoples". (A/43/PV.16, p. 6)

My delegation takes this opportunity to reaffirm Mali's commitment to the principles and purposes of the Charter. My country will continue to work to strengthen the role of the United Nations in preserving peace and guaranteeing international security. Under the Charter, a system of international security must be built on the following foundations: the indivisible nature of peace, protection of the political independence and territorial integrity of States, non-use of force, the peaceful settlement of disputes, general and complete disarmament, the sovereign equality of States, respect for the right of self-determination, decolonization, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and respect for human rights.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): The representative of Greece, speaking here as Chairman of the 12 members of the European Community, has twice stated the common view of the Twelve on international security, a view to which France entirely subscribes.

In my statement on this subject during the forty-second session, I stressed international awareness of the need to strengthen the conditions for international peace and security. I spoke of the encouraging prospects emerging at the time, while reaffirming clearly that in our view it was in the framework of the Charter, by respecting its principles and by implementing its procedures that we could find the most effective ways of settling crises.

I shall turn in due course to the agenda item entitled "Comprehensive system of international peace and security", but I should like now to say that we appreciate as a sign of openness the efforts of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74 to meet the concerns expressed last year, even if, in my delegation's view, a number of problems remain unresolved.

That brings me to my first point. I shall begin with the encouraging observation that there is a strong trend towards strengthening international security both at the bilateral and at the regional and multilateral levels. None the less, we must avoid excessive optimism and spare no effort to ensure that this continues. In many respects, the main issues are before us.

First, at the bilateral level, the conclusion of the Treaty on Soviet and United States intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear forces indisputably marked a turning point. I shall not speak of it in detail, but we can all agree - and this is particularly important for the future - that the agreed provisions for

(Mr. Blanc, France)

elimination and verification constitute an entirely new and very significant phase in the process of nuclear disarmament of the two States concerned and of disarmament in general. But we must note that the negotiations on a strategic agreement still face major difficulties. While the universally supported goal of an agreement on a 50 per cent cut in nuclear arsenals remains, the time-table is being set back - Our expectations remain high; it is for the two Powers concerned to meet them.

At the regional level, since the breakthrough at Stockholm two years ago on conventional disarmament in Europe, new arrangements have come about, arousing hope for genuine progress in this field. But if that is to happen we must, first of all, reach an agreement at Vienna on the resumption of negotiations on confidence-building measures and on new negotiations on conventional weapons and armed forces. Both these negotiations should take place in the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE).

(Mr. Blanc, France)

We also require an affirmation in the near future of real will on the part of all parties concerned, and primarily the Soviet Union, to move ahead in a sector in which declarations of intent have not always been followed up by concrete actions.

In that regard, as the President of the French Republic has pointed out a number of times, the two or three years ahead will be pivotal. The absence of concrete results and the disappointment of international public opinion that would follow could not fail to have negative consequences for the atmosphere of East-West relations.

Lastly, as regards the multilateral level, my delegation is very pleased to note that there is now a much stronger awareness than in the past of the fact that security and disarmament questions are of concern to the entire international community. From that point of view, the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was of undoubted usefulness. In substance, even if it did not conclude its business positively, it represents a net gain from which the First Committee has already been able to profit this autumn by taking a certain number of decisions in sectors of great promise for the future. We are pleased with the welcome given to our proposal to hold in Paris, from 7 to 11 January 1989, a conference of the States Parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol and other interested States. That welcome is additional proof that the international community does consider itself directly involved in certain important disarmament questions. We very much hope that the conference will achieve its goal by making it possible solemnly to reaffirm its condemnation of the use of chemical weapons and to impart a new momentum to the Geneva negotiations.

I should like now to take up a matter which, in our debate on international security, is the central issue in our thinking, namely, the need for scrupulous compliance with the Charter and its procedures.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

Last year, my delegation emphasized at length the number and gravity of the unresolved regional conflicts whose continuation seriously endangered international peace and security: the Iran-Iraq conflict, the question of the Middle East, southern Africa, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Cyprus, Western Sahara.

Today, it is possible, without being unrealistic, to be more optimistic, because a certain number of regional crises are moving towards a solution, thanks in part to the efforts of the United Nations. Whether we consider the Iran-Iraq conflict, Afghanistan, the Sahara or Cyprus, it is through action taken by our Organization that conflicts unresolved for years now seem to have some prospect of settlement. Undoubtedly, without the improvement of the climate in international relations, particularly that of the two major Powers, such results would not have been possible. It remains true nevertheless that it is the organs of the United Nations that have been, are and will be the instruments of such progress - I particularly have in mind the conflict between Iraq and Iran - the channel through which peace efforts must be steered and the focal point and the conclusion of all initiatives. Better co-operation among the Members of the Security Council and active collaboration between the Security Council and the Secretary-General contribute greatly to the solution of such crises. It is our Organization which, through its organs, has been honoured this year, and my delegation welcomes that fact.

It is only natural, therefore, that having always defended the principle of absolute compliance with the Charter and its principles, France should feel vindicated in its stand. The organs of the United Nations are now required to demonstrate their efficacy and they have in fact achieved very encouraging results. The policy to be followed is clear: we must apply the Charter, use its resources most effectively, mobilize the organs and men that serve it and secure

(Mr. Blanc, France)

compliance by Member States with the obligations to which they subscribed in joining the Organization.

I come now to the final point of my statement, concerning the draft resolution introduced by the Soviet Union and other countries in document A/C.1/43/L.74, entitled "Comprehensive approach to strengthening international peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". That text elicits certain positive remarks, but also certain reservations.

First, we note the removal from the title of the draft resolution introduced this year of the reference to a "system of security". We have already had occasion to say that such a concept was dangerous. The system of security with which we are familiar - the one towards which we have obligations - is that of the Charter, the central pivot of which is the Security Council. The idea of adding through a draft resolution what might seem to be another type of machinery, far from improving that which already exists, would only weaken it. We welcome the abandonment of the concept of such a system. We also note, and rightly so, that in paragraph 1 of the operative section, where the concept of a security system appears, the system in question is clearly that of the Charter as we know it.

My delegation also noted with interest the numerous references to the principles of the United Nations or to the competence of its organs, the Security Council and the General Assembly.

My delegation none the less continues to hold certain reservations or harbour certain doubts.

The present draft resolution has a history behind it, and my delegation has in the past placed on record its opposition to concepts that appeared in past versions. Yet, not all the links between the current and earlier or parallel texts have been done away with.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

Furthermore, we find that the proposed draft resolution co-exists with a memorandum on the same subject that has not been discussed, that does not have the same legal standing and on which my delegation would have a great deal to say. We are therefore inclined to fear that we may eventually find ourselves engaging in two contradictory readings of the draft resolution, depending on whether or not it is interpreted in the light of the memorandum.

By way of example, the draft resolution, in operative paragraph 1, refers explicitly to the Security Council and the General Assembly - which is only normal - in the implementation of the system of security provided for by the Charter.

However, the memorandum proposes a considerable modification of the binding value of resolutions: are we within the Charter system - as the draft resolution appears to suggest - or is an attempt being made to establish a new system or at least to modify the current balance and institutional rules - which is what the implementation of many of the provisions of the memorandum would entail?

A third comment applies to the extension of the concept of security to spheres outside the prevention and settlement of disputes, particularly the idea of linking it with concepts of economic or ecological security. While not denying the existence of links between those concepts, we consider that the Charter distinguishes among them, that they belong within the purview of the Organization's specialized agencies and that they are subject to special treatment. Consequently, we cannot fail to voice our reservations at the idea of merging those notions and the attempt to establish an institutionalized link between them through a consideration in the First Committee of all aspects of security, which would precede or guide the work of other United Nations committees or organs.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

Were we to proceed along those lines, we would stray dangerously far from the institutional balance provided for in the Charter. Such a process which would be perpetuated year after year could cast a wholly unnecessary discredit on the competence and efficiency of the other bodies of the United Nations. It could even lead to the thwarting of their decisions altogether on the pretext that a link - which remains to be defined - with the general problems of security dealt with by our Committee, needed further consideration.

However, as the Chairman of the European Community has emphasized, we are all in favour of considering, within the framework of the appropriate committees or bodies of the United Nations, any concrete proposal designed to strengthen its efficiency.

My last comment relates to the ambiguity which still persists in regard to the concept of "comprehensive approach", which we find in the title of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74. It is without any doubt a reference to the security system instituted by the Charter and also a reference to the organs of the United Nations, which is reassuring. But one wonders whether the "comprehensive approach" proposed here has the same meaning as the "system of security embodied in the Charter" or whether it is different. And if it is, what are the differences? The draft resolution is not clear on this fundamental point.

I shall conclude on an optimistic note. My delegation has always favoured a multilateral dialogue aimed at maintaining international peace and security within the framework which we chose freely more than 40 years ago, the framework of the United Nations Charter.

Accordingly, we can only be gratified at the spirit of understanding and openness which is developing within the United Nations. Above all, we very much hope that this dialogue will take the form, at the earliest possible time, of real and effective actual progress in all fields in the resolution of disputes.

Mr. STRESOV (Bulgaria): Two years ago, when a draft resolution entitled "Comprehensive system of international peace and security" was introduced for the first time, the United Nations was perceived by many as a forum which could contribute only modestly to the solution of the issues paramount for the survival of mankind. As a result of the overall improvement of the international situation, this year's general debate and also the deliberations in the Main Committees have been encouraging. They have indicated that the world community is more acutely aware of the global risks facing our world and there is an understanding that concerted efforts are required on the part of all of us if we are to overcome these risks. As representatives of our respective Governments, we have a lofty objective - to highlight and elaborate the ways of managing the challenges confronting our civilization.

That is the rationale underlying the proposal to approach international peace and security on a comprehensive basis. It is a product of the new political thinking which is shaping the foreign policy of the socialist countries.

The idea is the result of a thorough review of the stage reached in international relations. It has two main points of departure. One is the re-assessment of the gravity of the threat which nuclear weapons pose for mankind. The second is the concept of the changing world, in which the number of participants in international relations has not only increased but has created a new multipolar political environment. The forceful pursuit of one's own interests in disregard of the interests of other countries is destabilizing and dangerous in view of the existing huge stockpiles of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction as well as conventional weapons and the threat of transferring the arms race into outer space. The idea is therefore based on the understanding that the

(Mr. Stresov, Bulgaria)

security of a country cannot be strengthened in isolation from the security of the international community as a whole, neither can it be based on the diminished security of another country. The world today is interrelated and interdependent as never before, and its security requires a comprehensive approach.

In the post-war period, more often than not, the history of the United Nations bears witness to the fact that the confrontation, the unbridled arms race, the lack of political will, and the selfish approach to national security have for many years blocked the world Organization from achieving the main objectives of the Charter: the maintenance of international peace and security. The concept of deterrence suggested by some States as a model for ensuring international security is, to say the least, debatable. It is making the world unstable, all the more so as technology advances.

The world has changed in another way too. Besides the conflicts dividing nations, the new international realities have brought to the forefront new problems which are common to all countries and which, if ignored, would jeopardize the very survival of mankind. The present session of the General Assembly has again highlighted these problems: the threat of war, and in particular, nuclear war, the continuing arms race, underdevelopment and deprivation, hunger and malnutrition, external debt, environmental pollution, disregard for human rights and fundamental freedoms. To overcome them would require a common and comprehensive approach. Unless we realize that we are all in the same boat, we will not be in a position to find mutually acceptable solutions. It is only through concerted efforts based on the realities and challenges of the present-day world that we will be able to do so. And we consider the United Nations to be the most appropriate forum for this purpose.

(Mr. Stresov, Bulgaria)

Some members of the United Nations have interpreted our proposal as having some sinister objectives or as aiming at the revision of the United Nations Charter. Such interpretations are due either to misunderstanding or to a lack of political will to adopt a new approach. What we are actually aiming at is enhancing the efficiency of the United Nations in solving common problems and at creating the prerequisites for the fuller implementation of the purposes and principles laid down in its Charter. We believe that the concept of a comprehensive approach to international security is inherent in the Charter. The practical implementation of this approach would therefore be in accordance with the requirements of the present-day world. It would also require the rejection of the confrontational and propagandistic attitude towards the work of the United Nations which has lessened the efficiency of the Organization in previous years.

The practical advantages of the proposed approach are becoming apparent to an increasing number of Member States. In the draft resolution submitted to the Committee in document A/C.1/43/L.74, the sponsors suggest that the dialogue on this important issue should continue, with a view to achieving universal acceptance. We do not delude ourselves into thinking that we know all the answers. Neither do we insist on imposing our solutions on the other members of the international community. The draft resolution is the result of in-depth consultations, in the conduct of which the sponsors have displayed a high degree of flexibility.

(Mr. Stresov, Bulgaria)

My delegation welcomes the practical ideas about a comprehensive approach towards international peace or security put forward in the Committee by the Soviet delegation.

We noted with interest that in his statement on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community the representative of Greece referred to several aspects of international security in a way which demonstrates that there is an emerging convergence of views on the matter. The positions of the Twelve on the issues of mutual confidence in international relations, the strengthening of multilateral co-operation in all fields, the importance of enhancing the authority and role of the Security Council, peace-keeping operations and the need to manage non-military threats to security are indications of the fact that there is an ample basis to start a wide-ranging international dialogue.

We share the view that closer interaction for crisis-prevention within the Security Council, and especially among its permanent members, is needed. In particular, the Security Council should use its prerogatives for early detection of emerging crises and should take appropriate action to prevent their spilling over into hot conflicts.

The award of the 1988 Nobel Peace Prize to the United Nations peace-keeping forces has underscored the role they have played in restraining international hostilities. They should be used on a wider basis, not only in existing conflicts, but also in emerging ones, as a means to give substance to the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

Noting that a number of Member States have reiterated the need to increase the efficiency of the work of the General Assembly and its main organs, we believe it seems advisable to search for a consensus on specific items of its agenda which concern the whole international community.

(Mr. Stresov, Bulgaria)

In our view, the role of the Secretary-General in the prevention and solution of international crises could also be further enhanced, in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

The primacy of law in international relations requires, inter alia, a wider use of all available international legal means for conflict-resolution. The General Assembly and the Security Council should more often seek the advice of the International Court of Justice in cases of international disputes or in the interpretation of international agreements. The possibility of recognizing the jurisdiction of the International Court on a mutually acceptable basis should be discussed among Member States.

The developments of the last year demonstrate that it is possible to enhance the participation of the United Nations in solving regional conflicts; the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, the cease-fire in the Gulf war, the progress towards the independence of Namibia, the inter-Cyprus dialogue and so on are all indications of the increased role of the world Organization in the peaceful settlement of disputes. This growing role of the United Nations gives us grounds to expect that it may deal successfully with the global problems facing mankind in the spheres of disarmament, international economic co-operation and development, protection of the environment, human rights and fundamental freedoms. This can be made possible provided the relevant political will exists on all sides.

It is with this purpose in mind that we appeal to all Member States to support the proposed resolution and to continue the wide and unprejudiced dialogue on a comprehensive approach to strengthening international peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

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

Libya's 2,000 kms coastline is the most important part of the southern Mediterranean coast. Added to this, there are other strategic, security, economic and environmental considerations which make the issue before us a matter of special importance to the Jamahiriya.

The Mediterranean links the three continents of Asia, Africa and Europe. Its coasts have been the cradle of major cultures, civilizations and religions. The Mediterranean continues to be an important artery of peaceful maritime activities, such as international navigation and trade, tourism and prospecting. In view of its strategic location and the factors I have mentioned, the region has fallen prey to rivalries, instability and mounting tension. Indeed, the situation in the area is fraught with danger.

Among the reasons for the worsening situation we wish to cite the following: First, there are the policies of provocation pursued by outside imperialist and racist forces, the reliance on the use of force, aggression, occupation and expansion. The Zionist entity, which is supported politically, materially and militarily by imperialism, persists in its repressive and expansionist practices and deprives the Palestinian people of their right to self-determination.

Secondly, there is the intensive presence of foreign fleets in the region.

Thirdly, there is the existence of military bases in certain littoral Mediterranean countries, the deployment of nuclear and non-nuclear missiles in those bases with all the resultant threats to the other Mediterranean countries.

Fourthly, there is the intentional provocation inherent in military manoeuvres and exercises near the coasts of certain countries in the area.

Fifthly, there is the problem of Cyprus.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

The intensive presence of foreign fleets in the area, especially the Sixth American Fleet, the repeated manoeuvres, the pursuit of policies of provocation and the acquisition of bases are sources of tension and instability. That situation has culminated in acts of aggression such as the overt American act of aggression against the Gulf of Sidra in August 1981 and March 1986 and the air raid on Tripoli and Benghazi in April 1986. The raid was a brutal onslaught aimed at the destruction of civilian residential areas, the murdering of innocent civilians and the liquidation of the leader of the revolution in the Jamahiriya on flimsy pretexts that proved to be fallacious. The real aim was to prevent the Jamahiriya from continuing to pursue its free, independent and non-aligned policy which has always been supportive of liberation movements and the struggle against racism and exploitation.

The intensive military presence and the continuing manoeuvres have not only worsened tension and increased the threat to peace and security in the area, but have also obstructed normal civilian activities, such as civil aviation, prospecting, and sea fishing, led to the jamming of communications and impeded international trade and tourism in that part of the world.

Because of the crucial importance of the issue, the Jamahiriya has welcomed all regional and international efforts to promote security and co-operation in the Mediterranean and ease tensions with a view to safeguarding the independence and territorial integrity of the littoral Mediterranean States and ensure non-intervention in their affairs.

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

We have, therefore, supported the initiative of the non-aligned States in the region, including the Final Document adopted at Valletta on 11 September 1984, which urged all States not to use their armaments, forces, bases and other military facilities against non-aligned Mediterranean States. We also support the initiatives taken by the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the declarations issued at New Delhi in April 1986 and Harare in September of the same year condemning military manoeuvres in the region and deplored the show of military might in areas adjacent to the region's territorial waters and airspace of the non-aligned countries of the region.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya also participated in the meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held at Brioni, Yugoslavia, on 3 and 4 June 1987 and supported the proposals that issued from that meeting, relating, inter alia, to promoting economic, scientific and cultural co-operation in the region and the protection of its environment.

In 1986, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya called for convening a conference of the countries members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and European-Mediterranean and other European countries to formulate an international agreement on collective measures to protect and safeguard the Mediterranean, to promote peace, security and co-operation in the region by prohibiting military manoeuvres by foreign fleets and ridding the Mediterranean region of foreign naval bases, to turn the region into an economic zone for its littoral States, to promote all forms of co-operation among those States and to declare the Mediterranean region a nuclear-weapon-free zone of peace.

Out of our desire to ensure co-operation and promote peace and security in the Mediterranean region, we have co-operated with the Government of Malta and

(Mr. Burwin, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

supported its desire to rid itself of foreign bases. Malta and Libya have concluded agreements that guarantee the neutrality and independence of Malta. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has also made an effective contribution to meetings held with a view to eradicating pollution in the region and preserving its environment. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya enjoys excellent relations with the northern littoral Mediterranean States.

The States of the Arab Maghreb, which make up an important part of the Mediterranean's southern coast, are pursuing a policy of integration, and many important steps have been taken toward the unity of the Arab Maghreb, which will be an important contribution to peace, stability and co-operation in the region.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya supported the General Assembly resolutions on this question adopted in its previous sessions. We also support the Soviet proposals aimed at creating a zone of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean through the reduction of military confrontation and the withdrawal of the forces of the two super-Powers from the area or at least, as a first step, a reciprocal freeze on the number of vessels and military naval capability, along with agreement on a force ceiling.

In conclusion, we would express the hope that the efforts made will achieve the lofty and cherished goals of turning the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation free from tension and provocation.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): My delegation is speaking at this final stage of the Committee's deliberations to address agenda items 71, 72 and 73 concerning international peace and security. Our reasoned perception of those items is that they are of particular importance, an importance deriving from a constructive treatment of some of the practical aspects of issues of grave international concern.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Statements made at this forty-third session of the General Assembly would suggest that we are celebrating a kind of political Pentecost graced by a refreshing revival of faith in the United Nations. If such is the current consensus, it would seem imperative that we clearly understand the thrust and morality of the universal conscience that sustains our hopes and that such understanding be seen to guide every endeavour undertaken by this generation in its purported pursuit.

We are called upon to give practical and concrete form to an expressed collective will, to assume obligations under the Charter, to co-operate in achieving broadly shared aspirations for conditions of life loftier than mere survival on this planet, to research ideas and methodology for mobilizing resources and human genius in a conscious effort to construct and subsequently to maintain international peace and security. The First Committee must not, directly or indirectly, dodge the responsibility for fostering, through productive dialogue, the quest for ways and means of enhancing the hopes and dissipating the fears of the international public.

Perhaps the most pertinent aspect is that these items have a direct bearing on the United Nations Charter, which is the documented framework of the constitutional consensus that we, the Member States, have undertaken to observe in its full scope and context.

Part of the human dilemma at this crossroads in history is the burden of having to make important choices and critical decisions in a technological age. Isolationism - from others and from the brutal realities of the times - is dangerously impracticable and provides no shelter. No nation, great or small, can afford the luxury of permitting knowledge to which most now have access to be drowned by ignorance of its significance. Yet, overwhelmed by primitive, animal-like instincts to subdue the weak and lured by emotions of arrogance and by

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

miscalculations based on illusions of fleeting power, man seems attracted to ambitions for conquest and domination that ultimately prove too costly and sometimes too ghastly to maintain.

The Charter of the United Nations was born of the quest for sustainable peace, security and progress for all mankind. It was a war-weary generation's guide to the way of truth. It is a gift to us and to future generations, in whose mind, to quote the preamble to the Constitution of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO),

"the defences of peace must be constructed. We must collectively design the conditions of peace."

We can do that only if the leaders of States conform their thoughts and policy decisions with the norms and principles of the Charter. It is now an indisputable phenomenon that the international climate takes its rhythm from the extent to which the conduct of States undermines or respects those norms and principles.

If advancements in science and technology have brought home any lesson at all, it is the fact of our diminished geography and the explosion in the dimensions of interdependence among peoples, States and regions across the globe. Co-operation must replace confrontation because it is more productive of organized, rather than imposed, peace. Pacific settlement of disputes must, as a process, reinforce the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Interdependence is a healthy component of the values that compel collective endeavours and foster notions of common good.

Multilateralism has, inevitably, rendered isolationism and sectionalism obsolete in a nuclear age in which the threat is to human existence, irrespective of the location, size or level of development of any State. In the absence of a more appropriate and effective forum, the United Nations provides a universal centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of those common ends. It is the accredited home in which multilateralism must, and does, thrive.

It is in that frame of mind that Cameroon continues to give full support to all efforts within the framework of the United Nations aimed at safeguarding international peace and security.

The inspired purposes of the Organization are spelt out in the opening Article of its Charter. That pragmatic document opts for

"effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace".

The role of the Organization in the peace process is not academic. Recent events have demonstrated that the United Nations can perform its functions effectively if given the collective political will of the membership to use it as a genuine instrument of organized peace. It is regrettable that for far too long this Organization has remained hostage to ideological conflicts, to narrow sectional interests and to excessive and retrograde nationalism.

Our delegation believes that there can be no genuine peace without real progress in arms limitation and disarmament, whether conventional or nuclear. While it is important to note that security is a legitimate concern of all States, it is also of fundamental importance to embrace security in its broader context involving the provisions of the Charter relating to non-military aspects of

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

security, which are an integral element of enduring international peace and security. The United Nations has long supported the search for the peaceful settlement of disputes and for the attainment of security at the lowest possible level of armaments and armed forces.

Arms-limitation and disarmament agreements will not, it must be admitted, eliminate the causes of conflict, but they can contribute to reducing tension and to creating a climate conducive to the settlement of conflicts by political means. It is incumbent upon Member States therefore to utilize the provisions of the Charter to resolve their differences at all levels.

Indeed, one of the causes of the arms race is the inadequate application of the collective security provisions envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations. Another major cause is the lack of trust and confidence among States, including - especially - among those that have differing economic and political systems. It would seem evident to us that every effort should be made to engage in a continuous confidence-building process and thereby strengthen international peace and security.

It is perhaps true to say that the leaders of the two super-Power nations may well have begun to recognize the desperate need for, and importance of, this machinery for conflict resolution. They may consequently be expected to launch a campaign seeking to enhance its effectiveness.

Much will be expected of Presidents Gorbachev and Bush in the months and years to come. This is partly because of the choice of a new gateway to understanding between their two nations. It is also partly because a confused and embarrassed world has long found it difficult to understand why, in spite of their Charter commitments and the revolutionary ideals of freedom and peace incorporated into

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

their respective systems, the United States and the Soviet Union have not employed their leadership and their material means to foster the common good of all mankind. That concept of common good remains irretrievably entrenched in the constitutional instruments of both nations.

It was with some satisfaction and a sense of relief that we welcomed the agreements that gave birth to the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range nuclear forces - the INF Treaty. The reasonable improvement in relations and the unprecedented collective move to contain regional conflicts could well prove to have been heralds of better times ahead.

This must be only a beginning of movement in the right direction. No one should entertain illusions. In many parts of the world, subregional and regional conflicts continue to inflict suffering and death. Even in instances where procedures for peaceful settlement are being negotiated neither guns nor persistent deprivation have been silenced. The indications of success must spur efforts to find effective ways and means of managing crises and resolving conflicts through viable subregional, regional and multilateral arrangements.

The prevention of conflicts and the peaceful resolution of existing conflicts are already matters of immediate urgency and depend on the concrete action of States. The process involves critical issues in respect of mutual confidence and effective and verifiable measures of arms limitation and disarmament. We are persuaded that priority must be accorded to the implementation of and compliance with the principles and agreements entered into with the United Nations regarding peace-keeping arrangements. It is again to the Charter that we must turn for inspiration and for a raison d'être.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

We have underlined the central role of the United Nations in the promotion of conditions conducive to the maintenance of international peace and security. The Organization is States collectively at work. We need not dig far into history to find credibility in recent events with regard to Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq conflict, the Western Sahara issue and the current delicate negotiations on the complex situation created by obstinate racists in southern Africa.

In spite of the unhappy cloud still hovering over Kampuchea, the multilateral approach to the situation underscores an important function of the Organization. For indeed, the regional approach is often the United Nations' prudence at work, and the political will of States, exercised in a manner consistent with Charter principles and demonstrated either regionally or universally on a given situation, remains the ultimate weapon for the attainment of lasting peace.

Peace-keeping must be addressed by the international community if it is to be effective for peace and security. Endeavours must embrace all facets, from the provision of troops to fill a dangerous void or to supervise cease-fire arrangements to the campaign for disarmament and for new visions of international peace, security and development.

In that connection we should like to express profound appreciation to the Governments of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Norway, Italy, the United States of America and Switzerland, as well as to the Ford Foundation, for their contributions in Africa. They have fostered the process of confidence-building and security-building measures and development in our subregion among States Members of the Central African Economic Community.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Similarly, they were forthcoming at the recent Programme of Training on Conflict Resolution, Crisis Prevention and Management and Confidence-Building among Member States of the Economic Community of West Africa, held under the aegis of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Lomé, Togo. All such efforts towards peace-keeping arrangements must point the way to the quality of co-operation needed.

Teased by the harsh realities of contemporary international relations, bullied by denial of adequate means, the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, deserves praise and encouragement. He continues to symbolize the dignity and mediating facilities of the Organization at work. He has quietly brought those elements and his personal qualities to bear on the quest for a solution to regional conflicts and other security-related issues, thus creating the desirable atmosphere for peaceful settlement of hitherto nagging belligerency and mistrust among opposing parties.

Once again, we pledge to the Secretary-General our nation's full support in his drive to use preventive diplomacy as a viable tool for better international understanding. We believe that his role should be strengthened by both the material and the political support of States. The Organization's vital role in peace-keeping arrangements would be frustrated should such active support not be given.

In that context, our delegation introduced draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.84, entitled "Strengthening of regional and international peace and security", under the item "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". We consider the Declaration to be very important. We fully support the ideas in the Declaration, for they are based on the principles

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

and purposes of the Charter and are intended to strengthen the role of the Organization in the process of peaceful settlement of disputes. Central to the Declaration is the process of peace-keeping arrangements.

The premise of the text is that the process of peace-keeping arrangements and their implementation involve broad areas of conflict resolution, crisis management and confidence-building measures. Peace-keeping operations, on the other hand, are the very result of the peaceful settlement of disputes, leading to the promotion of mutual confidence among States. In its recent successes, the United Nations has reinforced its fundamental responsibility to maintain international peace and security through various peace-keeping arrangements, which will be followed by the deployment of United Nations peace-keeping forces, which are the true essence of peace-keeping operations.

It is not disputed that the Security Council has a central role in the maintenance of international peace and security. However, that role must not be divorced from those of other organs of the United Nations system. The General Assembly and its Main Committees, especially its First Committee, bear an equally important responsibility for initiating dialogue on issues, addressing the progressive development of ideas and norms of peace, and reviewing major issues of universal concern in the field of disarmament and security, thus facilitating more productive endeavours globally. The veto system in the Security Council tends to hide consensus opinion among the vast majority of States, all of whom have a right to security and share concerns for peaceful development and progress. The General Assembly presents the world at large with the opportunity to monitor the true collective opinions of States.

The Government of Cameroon expressed its views and made concrete suggestions on the role of the Security Council in document A/CN.10/71, entitled "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament".

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

The text that we submitted has indeed been revised and there appear to have been some procedural problems. It will, however, be submitted for circulation in the hours ahead. The revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.84 was intended to meet the concerns of a number of delegations, most of which were not substantive or did not fundamentally contradict its substance. We have endeavoured in the text that you will receive to accommodate those concerns in keeping with our traditions as well as with the mood of compromise that has blessed our deliberations this session. Consequently, we recommend it for adoption by the Committee by consensus.

Permit me to address our current thinking on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74 submitted by the Soviet Union and a number of socialist States.

When agenda item 73 was introduced at the last session, the Cameroon delegation posed a number of questions in good faith, desiring to understand the nature and content of the proposal to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security. We sought clarity of expression in the item's conceptual aspects. We wanted to know its relationship to the Charter and the nature and mechanics of what appeared to us to be a novel system.

Earlier in the debate this year, we were treated to an introduction by the Soviet delegation that was hard to understand because of its ideological tint.

We now have a concrete proposal before us in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74. We wish to express appreciation to its socialist initiators for simplifying the text and especially for attempting to accommodate the concerns of various delegations, including our own.

We have also listened with interest to other interest groups in the global power spectrum and thank them, too, for contributing to our understanding of the issues both expressed and unexpressed.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

The process continues. However, we would like to make the following observations.

First, our socialist colleagues have responded to our call for clarity: the present text no longer appears ambiguous to us.

Secondly, in answer to our question, it is clear to us that the preambular part explicitly states that the ideas contemplated are within the United Nations system.

Thirdly, fears concerning a new or even conflicting system are considerably allayed by the adoption of a new title to the text. One approach involves, in our view, a search for guidelines that are within the purview of the Charter. A system exists by reason of the provisions of the Charter and it would thus have been difficult to reconcile proposals for a new one.

The text addresses the strengthening of international peace and security in accordance with the Charter. It is difficult, as a matter of principle, to resist the temptation of examine the ideas of an important sector in the bipolar system, especially since our preliminary queries have in large measure been answered in a way that facilitates a constructive assessment of the implications. Consequently, we will be in a position at the end of the debate to pass final judgement, but we wish to thank them now for clarifying the text.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

We wish to reiterate our view that in the United Nations Charter we have the principles on which to base definitions and action, as well as the institutional framework for embarking on all measures designed to bring about peace and security. Cameroon believes that on matters of international peace and security, the principal organs of the United Nations, where permitted to do so, have increasingly functioned in the manner envisaged by the Charter. We hope that the political will necessary for the more effective functioning of these organs will be provided. President Paul Biya of Cameroon stated in the General Assembly on 29 September 1988:

"Politically, the major Powers have demonstrated that when they want something it can be achieved. That applies to the economic crisis as well.

...

"For us, the United Nations represents a forum for consultation and for seeking solutions. The United Nations reflects the common determination of nations to work together. The United Nations is an assembly. It is a force to reckon with, a powerful tool for development. Let us learn to use it together." (A/43/PV.10, pp. 37-40)

The truth of that sentiment cannot be in doubt. There is a gap which still exists between those principles and the realities of international relations. It must be bridged by the imaginations of our collective action.

Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): The United States delegation welcomes this opportunity to share its views with other delegations on item 73, "Comprehensive system of international peace and security" and on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74.

Let me begin my statement with a bit of history. Last year, the United States voted against a draft resolution under the same agenda item. We opposed that

(Mr. Walters, United States)

draft resolution because we believe that the overall concept of a "comprehensive system of international peace and security", as elaborated by its sponsors in speeches, articles and other documents, poses a serious threat to the United Nations and to the security of its Member States.

The United States was not alone in its concern. Many other nations - indeed over half the members of this body, representing all of the continents of the world - chose not to support the draft resolution. They agreed with our view that existing measures for security under the Charter are workable. Or, as people like to say in my country, "If it isn't broken, don't fix it."

In the year since we last considered this item, much has happened, and what has happened supports the judgement that we and others made last year. Those who insisted that only a new "comprehensive system" of security, or a new "approach" to security as it is now characterized, would solve the world's ills were proved wrong. After all, how could they explain away the fact that the United Nations has played a central role in formulating the agreements which provided for the withdrawal of foreign occupying troops from Afghanistan? How could they explain the central role of this Organization in ending the Persian Gulf conflict, with its tragic loss of life, or the agreement that was finalized last week in Geneva which will secure the withdrawal of foreign forces from southern Africa and allow the coming into being of an independent State of Namibia founded on the basis of free elections carried out by its people?

The United States, in conjunction with a number of other Members of the United Nations, worked vigorously to ensure that those accomplishments came to fruition. We have strongly backed the efforts of the Secretary-General and his representatives to carry out those agreements. Those welcome developments demonstrate that, given the political will, the United Nations can play a

(Mr. Walters, United States)

significant role in dealing with conflict situations throughout the globe. They show that, in the area of peace and security, the United Nations does not need basic fixing.

The sponsors of the draft resolution would have us believe that they have found a magic formula for solving the world's problems and improving the United Nations. Through clever playing with words, they have invented a scheme called "comprehensive security", the real meaning of which is known only to them, if to anyone. They have agreed to chop a word here, change a phrase there in their draft resolution - even offering to drop preambular language referring to past draft resolutions on a comprehensive system of security - in the hope of shielding from the members of the Committee their ultimate intentions. They would have us focus on such insignificant details as the number of times the word "system" appears in the draft, asking us what we could possibly object to, and have us simply overlook the concept which they have developed over the past two years, with all of its wide-ranging implications.

The sponsors have worked assiduously, re-worked the title of their draft resolution as an advertising slogan to have us believe that it is in keeping with the Charter. As we all know, however, the question is not one of labels but of content. We have been subjected to a skilful campaign which seeks to mislead us into believing that the concerns expressed by a majority of our members last year could be met by changing a word or a phrase here or there. The essential point is that, as the sponsors themselves have admitted, the whole agenda of the comprehensive system of international security remains in the background, but central to their main purpose - a Trojan horse that is ready to reveal itself in all its force if we only agree to open the gates and let it through.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

An aide-mémoire which the Soviet delegation circulated in conjunction with its draft resolution explicitly reminds us that the comprehensive concept goes back to an article by General Secretary Gorbachev published over a year ago. The article contains numerous proposals, many of them grandiose, unworkable, and rejected when the Soviets tried to press them on us in earlier decades. While the draft resolution before us today does not explicitly mention that document, it remains the central pillar of the Soviet approach for moving forward, as the Soviet representative said in a statement last Wednesday, "purposefully step by step" (A/C.1/43/PV.47, p. 13) towards the Soviet blueprint for a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

We do not believe that blueprint is the approach that United Nations Members should follow. And I have no doubt that if Member States look carefully at the specific elements in the blueprint, they will reach the same conclusion.

We are all looking for ways to streamline the Organization and make its functions more appropriate to the tasks we face. In the Special Committee on the Charter, we have done just that, and have explored more seriously such questions as the role of the Secretary-General and that of the General Assembly, than has the aide-mémoire presented with the comprehensive system of international security. Through continuing dialogue in the Committee, as well as in many other United Nations bodies, the peace-keeping function and the Secretary-General's role in that process have evolved in a manner that has allowed pragmatic response to real needs.

Those pragmatic developments have been very much to the benefit of all United Nations Members. They have provided a role for the diplomacy of all United Nations Members, large and small, in the maintenance of peace and a channel for their participation in peace-keeping. And they have enabled the United Nations to help resolve regional conflicts.

(Mr. Walters, United States)

Historically, and unfortunately, the Soviet Union has opposed these evolutionary developments. In recent days, we have been pleased to note some signs of change. The Soviets have put forward a number of ideas in the context of "strengthening" the United Nations. We have told them that we are prepared to discuss those proposals that may have merit in the appropriate forums.

In our deliberations with the sponsors of the draft resolution, we said: "If you have ideas as to how to improve this Organization, there are established bodies to which you can address your suggestions. If what you are really concerned with is getting a forum for these suggestions, why not take them to the Special Committee for Charter review and drop the fantasy of a 'comprehensive system' or 'comprehensive approach'?" Our proposal was roundly rejected. Perhaps the sponsors of the draft resolution can explain this to the Committee better than they did to us. The best they could come up with was that, since they had put the label of "comprehensive security" in their draft resolution, how could they take it to a Committee that does not deal with security issues?

(Mr. Walters, United States)

Through its comprehensive approach to international peace and security, the Soviet Union seems to want to introduce a new system of central control. Defining anything and everything as a "security" question suggests an ingenious mechanism by which to control the agenda of this and other committees. This is unnecessary and is a step backwards, not forwards. It is clearly contrary to the interests of us all to deal in this manner with human rights, the world debt problem or economic development. At a time in history when the role of ideology is diminishing and pragmatism increasing, do we really want to impose a new ideology on the United Nations at the expense of pragmatism and progress? We have momentum in this Organization. We have confident, competent leadership. We have committees capable of reviewing and advancing good ideas. Let us use them.

Here let me make one thing absolutely clear. We do not base our views on this draft resolution, nor on any other draft resolution, on its authorship. We would gladly support any draft resolution, irrespective of its origin, if we felt it genuinely promoted international peace and security. We will not support any effort whose ultimate objective is to redefine, amend or rewrite the Charter, while hiding behind assurances that its objectives are otherwise.

We can go down either of two paths. One is the road of pragmatism and co-operation, of trying to find sensible, practical solutions for specific problems we face and sensible suggestions for improving the work of this body. That is the path we have been following - the path that has led this Organization to such significant progress in resolving regional conflicts, the path that has led to a Nobel Peace Prize, in which all of the States Members of the United Nations can take justifiable pride.

The second is the road of trying to impose new structures, new identities, new systems on this body, of trying indiscriminately to mix everything together in one pot and come out with a soup called "security". This is the path that says "We

(Mr. Walters, United States)

know better than the collective wisdom of the membership of this Organization and the collective experience of four decades on what needs to be done." This is a path that, far from giving us comprehensive security, would lead us to incomprehensible insecurity and uncertainty.

For those reasons the United States must once again oppose the draft resolution now before us.

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): The question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is being considered this year in conditions that are significantly different from those that have prevailed over a number of past years. The positive changes that are evident on the international scene and the opening of the dialogue and process for the solution of some pressing international problems have enabled the General Assembly to discuss the complex issues in the area of international security in a more tranquil and constructive way. These circumstances provide an opportunity, as well as an obligation, for an all-round appraisal of the direction and scope of the present tendencies in international relations and their influence on the United Nations, with a view to assessing the priorities of United Nations involvement in maintaining and strengthening international security within the period before us.

These positive trends in the development of international political relations have been reflected in the general debate in the Assembly and in the First Committee and in the overall proceedings of this session, and have accounted for a more constructive consideration of individual issues on the General Assembly's agenda.

It has been noted that the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - INF Treaty, although modest in its overall quantitative effects, has been a first tangible indication that the arms race could

(Mr. Pejic Yugoslavia)

be slowed down and eventually halted. The continuation of negotiations between the super-Powers on some other issues in the field of nuclear disarmament has bolstered such expectations.

Similarly, it has been pointed out that certain progress has been made in dealing with some of the most serious sources of international tension. In this context, most often mentioned have been the Geneva Accords on Afghanistan, the Iraq-Iran cease-fire, the prospects opening up of commencement of the long-awaited decolonization of Namibia, and the initiatives for the solution of the problems of Kampuchea, Cyprus and Western Sahara.

This state of affairs has been brought about in no small measure by the change in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, their rapprochement and the dialogue and the relaxation of tension between them. However, the ongoing processes are not only direct consequences of the negotiations and agreements between the super-Powers. In our view, they reflect the increased awareness of the entire international community that, in the conditions of growing interdependence in the world today, there is no alternative to dialogue and the solution of major issues of international relations with the participation of the broadest possible number of countries.

In this context it should be recalled that ever since the beginning of the activity of their Movement the non-aligned countries have made strenuous and persistent efforts to bring about a world free of bloc policies and divisions and confrontations. This gives us in the Movement the right - shared certainly by many others - to look upon the assessment, at the current developments as a telling confirmation of the principles and goals of the policy of non-alignment. After all, the current General Assembly session, of the international situation and of the future role of the United Nations is very much in line with that contained in

(Mr. Pejic Yugoslavia)

the Nicosia Declaration adopted by the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries at their Conference in Cyprus last September.

Yet, one would err against history, or at least against the test of time, if one were to conclude that, all of sudden, things had irreversibly changed for the better, that solutions to all problems were within easy reach.

The problems that have bedevilled international relations, some for quite some time, continue to exist, with all their harmful consequences. First and foremost, the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, continues unabated, threatening the very survival of mankind. A whole range of issues calls for urgent international action: a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, the conclusion of a convention on chemical weapons and the opening of a negotiating process on conventional arms. The priority objective continues to be the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. It is with regret that we note that an opportunity was missed at this year's third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament to reach agreements that would have enabled progress to be made on some of these issues.

As I have said, a number of regional crises have indeed been addressed. Yet there are still those that continue to pose a most serious threat to international security world-wide. The stabilization of international circumstances will always be defective and short-lived as long as the explosive situations in the Middle East, southern Africa, Central America and elsewhere remain unresolved and threaten the world with broader conflagrations. It is being proved time and again that the solution of these problems and a lasting normalization of international relations can come about only if political solutions are found that rest on the realization of the inalienable rights of countries and peoples to self-determination, freedom and independence, in processes that include all interested parties and their legitimate interests.

(Mr. Pejic Yugoslavia)

Growing interdependence and the indivisibility of international peace, security and development have thrown into sharp relief new sources of international tension, with potentially even more serious distortions of international relations.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

There are examples aplenty. The problems of debt, money and finance, trade, science and technology and the environment have assumed such proportions that one can state, without the sin of exaggeration or over-emphasis, that on their solution will depend the civilizational achievements of the world and its very destiny. Those problems are particularly harmful to the developing countries and constitute not only a rising impediment to their development but jeopardize their political stability and security as well.

It is paradoxical that millions of people should continue to starve, fall prey to poverty and subsist on the verge of social and often existential uncertainty, and that ingrained social, economic and other divisions should continue to obstruct the world integration called for by technological progress and ensuing development.

It is therefore exceptionally important that international economic relations that have been left out of positive international developments be addressed with resolve and vigour so that the profound economic crisis that besets the greater part of the international community can be overcome. After all, peace and security will for ever elude us if the economic position of developing countries is not improved substantially.

Yugoslavia is a non-aligned European country, and, quite understandably, Europe's security is its paramount interest and concern - and not only for reasons of geography. Throughout its long history Europe has seen countless conflicts, and in the past 40-odd years it has had the dubious privilege of experiencing the most direct confrontation between blocs and super-Powers. Today the countries of Europe are of a different frame of mind. They are working hard in unison to overcome those burdensome legacies of the past, to build mutual trust and to engage in beneficial co-operation. We are confident that the Vienna follow-up meeting to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), which is in its final phase, will be yet another important contribution along those lines.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

Within the context of the efforts to promote co-operation in Europe was the ministerial meeting of Balkan countries at Belgrade, the first ever held in the history of that region. Its results are just one - and, we would like to think, an important - stepping-stone in the multifaceted process of the strengthening of security in the area and in Europe as a whole.

Unfortunately, the Mediterranean, whose waters also lap Europe's shores, continues to be an area of increased concentration of weapons and is beset by unresolved crises and open conflicts. The situation in the Mediterranean is a perennial source of danger for international security on a wider scale. Along with other non-aligned Mediterranean countries Yugoslavia is striving to transform the Mediterranean into an area of peace and co-operation. To that end, the important actions initiated at the ministerial meeting of non-aligned countries at Brioni in 1987 are being continued.

International developments last year proved once again that a more secure world is to be sought through the democratization of international relations and through the revival, development and enrichment of multilateral forms of co-operation. After all, lasting solutions to the problems of disarmament, development, peace and security, on which depends the destiny of our world, are possible only with the participation of all interested parties and with the active involvement of the international community through the United Nations. The past year has testified that progress in dealing with world problems can be achieved through direct, or at least indirect, United Nations involvement. The Nobel Peace Prize conferred this year on the United Nations peace-keeping operations is yet another confirmation of the rising role and importance of the world Organization. It is therefore more important today than ever before to strengthen the United Nations and, in particular, the roles played by the General Assembly, the Security

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

Council and the Secretary-General in the maintenance of international security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

In that context we assess as useful the numerous proposals submitted recently on the functioning and role of the Security Council, on peace-keeping operations, on observer and fact-finding missions and so on. Along those lines we also consider as useful the proposal for a comprehensive approach to strengthening international peace and security in accordance with the United Nations Charter, which was submitted by a group of countries and introduced by the delegation of the Soviet Union in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74. We take that position because of our understanding that the authors of that proposal have in mind, first of all, the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations in this field in accordance with the Charter.

The maintenance of international peace and security, by its very nature, calls for the close co-operation of all countries in a world of increasing interdependence. The dialogue on this and other proposals, including the proposal Yugoslavia is traditionally submitting on behalf of the group of non-aligned countries, should be continued if we are to enhance the authority of the Charter and make the world a better and safer place in which to live.

Mr. BELONOGOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Consideration of the question of a comprehensive approach to strengthening international peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations shows that by an overwhelming majority States are in favour of continuing with and developing broad, non-confrontational dialogue on all aspects of the problem of international peace and security, and that is natural, since it is obviously not enough to pursue solely a bilateral dialogue on that question, even between the largest countries. What is essential is an internationalization

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

of the dialogue on global security and worldwide problems, the solution of which requires the participation of the international community as a whole.

In a recent conversation with President Mitterrand of France, Mikhail Sergeyich Gorbachev stated:

There are many actors on the international stage, and none of them should on the sidelines, particularly where world politics are concerned. In today's world the role of the United Nations and other forums for collective consideration and solution of existing problems is constantly increasing."

That development of the role played by international dialogue at all levels with regard to the problems of international peace and security is the goal of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74. In drafting it, the sponsors showed the necessary moderation, flexibility and readiness to consider the views of other States. At the same time, the Soviet delegation would like to clarify some matters that have been raised during the debate on this question. One delegation stated that, notwithstanding the fact that the present draft resolution does not give rise to serious criticism, it should nevertheless be viewed in the light of the contents of last year's draft resolution. The delegation criticized various elements - in particular the word "system" - in last year's draft resolution that are absent from the draft resolution being submitted this year.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

In this connection, the Soviet delegation would like to stress that the new draft resolution means what it says, nothing more. Anything that has been deleted - such as the word "system", which had given rise to misunderstandings - has been deleted: the word is absent from the draft resolution, which is new in the fullest sense of the word. The sole purpose of the draft resolution is to enable all States to take part in a multilateral dialogue on global security on a comprehensive and non-confrontational basis within the framework of the United Nations.

We have often said we do not have ready answers to all the problems of guaranteeing security in today's world. We do not insist on these problems being solved through our prescriptions exclusively. Obviously, we have no "magic formula", as Ambassador Walters just put it. Neither, however, do we have the desire attributed to us by that representative for a discussion aimed at diverting the United Nations and this Committee away from direct, concrete and wholly pragmatic action. No, our approach is concrete, pragmatic and based on the presumption that comprehensive security is a very complex concept requiring not unilateral or prejudiced approaches but broad, large-scale, constructive approaches. We extend our hand to the delegation of the United States in the hope that we can pursue this dialogue together.

In our view, international dialogue means working together to solve current problems. By examining many opinions we must find a common denominator acceptable to all. Many delegations of Western and non-aligned countries have called for the speediest possible consideration of concrete proposals for enhancing the role of the United Nations and strengthening international security. The Soviet delegation fully supports that approach. The Soviet Union has already made a contribution

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

through the proposals and ideas set out in the 17 September 1987 article by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and in a Soviet memorandum placed before the General Assembly at its current session.

I stress that the adoption of our draft resolution on a dialogue would in no way signify adoption of concrete proposals or ideas put forward in this room by any delegation, including those set out in the Soviet memorandum of September 1988. We are not putting forward concrete proposals for adoption at this session of the General Assembly. We understand that the concrete proposals we have put forward require additional consideration, along with other proposals that might be offered by other States.

We are grateful to delegations that during this session specifically expressed their views about the various provisions of the Soviet memorandum. We are prepared for full consideration next year in various United Nations bodies of all proposals offered in that connection by us and by other delegations. We should be delighted if the United States delegation should put forward proposals better than ours; we should be more than happy to consider them in a businesslike way at the next session. We regret that at the present session we have heard no concrete proposals.

We are prepared to consider in a businesslike way the question of broadening United Nations peace-keeping operations in the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations and in the Special Political Committee. We are prepared also to consider the legal aspects of strengthening the role and enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations and its organs in the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization and in the Sixth Committee. We are prepared to consider the economic and ecological aspects of the security of States in the Economic and Social Council and in the Second Committee. We are prepared to consider human rights in the Third Committee.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Here we agree with the delegations of the United Kingdom and many other countries, which have discussed this matter, but I shall go further. The Soviet delegation intends next year to concentrate its efforts on the practical consideration of concrete questions of international security in committees of the General Assembly, in the Security Council, in the Economic and Social Council and in other competent United Nations bodies.

At the same time, however, we are convinced it would be wrong to deprive States of the possibility of taking part in the political debate, in a general review of comprehensive security in all its aspects world-wide in the First Committee, whose job it is to consider disarmament and security questions.

We have no intention of indiscriminately tossing all matters of concern to States Members of the United Nations into a single pile, or of considering the question of security through the prism of all other problems, including those having no direct bearing on the question. We consider that each country has its own priorities in every field: in disarmament, in international economic co-operation and development, in the protection of the environment. I would reply to one representative by saying that we do not intend to consider the question of security through the prism of the various natural disasters that unfortunately occur.

With respect to technological development, we increasingly encounter situations where technical progress brings disaster, where human creativity engenders a threat to the existence of man, albeit from the standpoint of the environment. We therefore consider that the very complexity of security matters calls for a complex approach to the problem. We believe that the First Committee, which deals with security matters, is in general the most appropriate body for consideration of these problems.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

We would also like to do away with undue and baseless alarm on the part of some Western delegations that see in our initiative an attempt to create a new structure in the United Nations for consideration of matters of international security headed by the First Committee, which supposedly would decide when and where we must consider various proposals.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have no such intention. They do not propose to revise existing rules of procedure or the competence of the main bodies of the General Assembly. A dialogue on the strengthening of international peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations can and must develop on the basis of existing rules of procedure and in conformity with the existing terms of reference of the main Committees of the General Assembly, including the First Committee, whose competence, as I have already said, encompasses matters of international security.

If some Western delegations are averse to the role of the First Committee as an idea bank, the Soviet delegation does not insist on that colourful definition, although we believe that the role of an idea bank would certainly not detract from the significance of our Committee. On the contrary, it would only emphasize its special competence as concerns security matters.

We do not reject the views of delegations that consider that concrete questions must be discussed in the competent United Nations bodies. On the contrary, the sponsors agree with that view. We only ask that there be agreement on the fact that the First Committee is the natural forum for a dialogue on the general review of the problems concerning international security.

Finally, we would like to stress that in no way do we consider the United Nations Charter to be obsolete or insufficient for carrying out the task of maintaining international peace and security. On the contrary, we agree with the delegations of the non-aligned and Western countries that consider that the United

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Nations Charter is a powerful instrument, the constitutional foundation and framework for uniting the efforts of States to maintain international peace and security and to develop co-operation between them.

We do not deny, despite the statement of an earlier speaker, the central role of the United Nations. On the contrary, we recognize that role and try to make it even more effective. No one would deny that the United Nations, especially of late, has remarkable achievements to its credit. No one, including the delegations that sit at the same table as I do, would deny that the United Nations has not yet done all that it should do. It is still far from the effectiveness that it must possess in conformity with its Charter.

I would also emphasize that we agree with those delegations, including the twelve countries of the European Community, that consider that, in order to take advantage of all the possibilities enshrined in the United Nations Charter, what is required is the political will of States, a full and comprehensive - and not selective - implementation of all its provisions together with the development and perfection of the machinery for the practical work of our Organization. It is the full and effective implementation of the United Nations Charter that is the object of the proposals of the sponsors on a dialogue for a comprehensive approach to strengthening international peace and security.

We ask for such a dialogue, which, as noted recently by Mikhail S. Gorbachev during his meeting with President Mitterrand, would be characterized not by confrontation but by a will for mutual agreement, not by an exchange of reproaches but by a confrontation of new ideas.

Of course, I regret that Mr. Walters should have said today that the United States of America is not prepared to support draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74. I also regret that I have not heard any substantive arguments from him concerning the

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

problems of comprehensive security. In other words, what negative element is there in a comprehensive approach that displeases the delegation of the United States in the First Committee?

But I do not wish to frame my statement in a confrontational spirit. On the contrary, in reply I would quote a few statements that I hope will show the American position from its better side. I would draw delegates' attention to some statements by President Reagan. At the current session of the General Assembly, President Reagan expressed the following well-founded idea:

"...freedom and peace work together... Free people, blessed by economic opportunity and protected by laws that respect the dignity of the individual, are not driven towards war or the domination of others. Here, then, is the way to world peace". (A/43/PV.4)

I hope that that quotation demonstrates that the humanitarian aspect of the problem of security is not at all denied. It is supposed to be the basis of the United States' position.

Now let us go to a statement by President Reagan at a previous session of the General Assembly in 1987.

"For 40 years the United States has made clear its vital interest in the security of the Persian Gulf and the countries that border it. The oil reserves there are of strategic importance to the economies of the free world. We are committed to maintaining the free flow of this oil...".

(A/42/PV.4)

What is that if not an admission of the existence of a serious economic element in the concept of security as interpreted in the United States?

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Let us look at a statement by President Reagan in 1986:

"We must remember from the experience of the 1970s that progress in arms control cannot be divorced from regional political developments... political tensions cause military competition". (A/41/PV. 4, p. 24).

And, finally, I should like to return to the President's speech at this session of the General Assembly and quote a few of his words:

"... nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they mistrust each other". (A/43/PV. 4, p. 24-25)

That is an illustration of the idea that I expressed in my previous statement concerning the role of trust as an element of security to which all of us must of course pay due attention.

I should like to express the hope that not all is lost and that, despite the rather rigid speech made today by Ambassador Walters, the position of the United States in the matter of comprehensive security will with time come closer to all the ideas expressed by the President of the United States.

After the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74, the sponsors had additional consultations. Wishing to create the widest possible base of support for the draft, the sponsors decided to meet the wishes of several non-aligned and western countries half way and we now present the following changes to the draft:

First, we delete the first preambular paragraph which contains mention of resolutions previously adopted by the General Assembly on the question of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. We do so in order to enable delegations which were not able to vote for last year's draft resolution on the matter, to improve their vote and support the present draft.

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

Secondly, the sponsors adopt the following amendments proposed by some non-aligned countries: in operative paragraph 1 of the draft the words:  
(spoke in English)

"Calls upon would be replaced by the word "Encourages".

(continued in Russian)

In the same line of operative paragraph 1, the words:  
(spoke in English)

"to continue and intensify the" would be replaced by "contribute to an".

(continued in Russian)

The first line of operative paragraph 1 would then read:  
(spoke in English)

"Encourages Member States to contribute to an international dialogue".

(continued in Russian)

Taking into account the amendments of some non-aligned countries, operative paragraph 2 would now read as follows:

"Calls upon all States to intensify their practical efforts towards ensuring international security in "all" its aspects through peaceful means in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations".

What we have in mind is all the principles of the United Nations Charter without overly stressing any of them.

That paragraph will now read:

(spoke in English)

"Calls upon all States to intensify their practical efforts to ensure international security in all its aspects through peaceful means in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations".

(Mr. Belonogov, USSR)

(continued in Russian)

We are officially transmitting these changes to the offices of the Committee and trust that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.74/Rev.1 will be available to all delegations tomorrow morning. The sponsors hope that the draft thus revised will enjoy wide support.

Mr. GORAJEWSKI (Poland) I should like to introduce the draft resolution on the "Tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace" contained in document A/C.1/43/L.87.

Ten years ago, in 1978, the General Assembly adopted - on Poland's initiative - the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace. The Declaration's origins are rooted in a conviction that the process of building a peaceful world, in order to be successful, cannot be limited only to the military sphere but must also give due attention to its social and moral aspects. The international climate of the 1970s paved the way for the emergence of new thinking in relations among States. As never before the world community has become aware of the necessity for world-wide efforts aimed at overcoming the prejudices accumulated among nations in the past and bringing about a radical change in the "mentality of war" accounted for by countless wars waged over the centuries and promoting instead a "mentality of peace". People all over the world have ultimately come to realize that peaceful coexistence in a secure world requires that moral defence lines against war be established in the minds of man.

The Declaration met those aspirations half way by initiating and stimulating a process of building an infrastructure of peace in the consciousness of nations.

(Mr. Gorajewski, Poland)

The decade that has elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration has confirmed the long-lasting validity of the principles embodied therein. As Poland's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Tadeusz Olechowski, stated in the general debate, on 28 September:

"The Declaration has not lost any of its topicality; on the contrary, the putting into effect of its recommendations is becoming an increasingly urgent task. Indeed, attempts to anchor the idea of peace firmly in people's minds are a logical and indispensable supplement to the material infrastructure of peace".

(A/43/PV.9, p. 16)

(Mr. Gorajewsky, Poland)

The last three reviews of the implementation of the Declaration carried out so far have clearly demonstrated that the notion of the right of individuals as well as of nations to live in peace is ever more firmly fixed in the conscience of societies as the most basic human right, necessary for the exercise of all other rights. At the same time, the idea of the preparation of societies for life in peace has been presented in international relations over recent years as a major component of bilateral and multilateral co-operation and as a framework for contacts between various social groups, particularly between young people from different countries.

It is pertinent to recall in this connection that in the programme of the International Year of Peace the Declaration was recognized as one of the documents helping to establish principles of peace, a document significant in the promotion of peace.

The conviction of the growing timeliness and importance of the Declaration has encouraged a group of States to submit a draft resolution entitled "Tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace". On behalf of the delegations of Algeria, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Costa Rica, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mongolia, Panama, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia, I have the honour to introduce that draft resolution, which is contained in document A/C.1/43/L.87

The draft resolution is largely self-explanatory. As its heading implies, its principal objective is to mark the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace. It solemnly reaffirms the lasting validity of the purposes and principles enshrined in the

(Mr. Gorajewsky, Poland)

Declaration, which is based on the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, it recognizes the important role which the Declaration has played in promoting world peace and international security, common understanding and mutually beneficial co-operation. Finally, all States are called upon to spare no effort towards the fullest implementation of the Declaration at the national and international levels and towards increasing its national and international role by strictly adhering to the principles enshrined in that document.

Taking into account that 10 years ago the Declaration enjoyed almost unanimous support in this Committee as well as in the General Assembly, I should like, on behalf of its sponsors, to commend the draft resolution to the Committee for adoption without a vote.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: I have reached the end of my list of speakers on this item, but I have received a request for the floor from the representative of Cameroon, Ambassador Engo, and I now call on him.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): In all our experience in this Organization we have hardly ever had occasion to complain openly about lack of co-operation from certain quarters in the Secretariat. At a time when the Secretary-General is being congratulated on such a valuable, critical contribution to world peace, it is very painful that the views that we expressed here which we hope that the Secretariat will help to facilitate in circulating and ensuring that people do know what our views are, are not being followed as they ought to have been.

When we last took the floor on the disarmament issues you had insisted, Mr. Chairman, that we should co-operate with you to conclude our work as quickly as possible, owing to our heavy workload. Consequently, our delegation worked overnight preparing a statement. It was clear that the statement, which

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

arrived from the office three minutes before we spoke, had not been checked over, and we announced that we would present a properly corrected copy to the Committee and the translation services. What was presented later did not alter either substance or form. But, in spite of your intervention to try to ease the situation, Mr. Chairman, we have consistently been refused by the Conference Services of the Secretariat the right to put across here the views of our country, which is a sovereign State.

We do not want to prolong the argument on this issue. For that reason, if you are not able, until our next meeting, to convince the Services to release our text in accordance with our wish, a wish that does not contain anything more than the Secretariat Services had with them but we did not have in front of us here, we shall be obliged to request the opportunity to read the entire statement again, if that is the only way in which the Secretariat will be satisfied.

I sincerely hope that this very painful experience will not be repeated and that it will not be necessary in the future for delegations to have to insist that what they wish to say be reflected. I repeat that it is not our desire to submit a new text, nor to correct any ideas that we expressed. We merely wanted to save them the trouble of reporting and recording that which is not correct, because secretaries had been obliged within two hours to type and produce copies for the interpreters, and even for Conference Services, what it was the position of our Government to state here.

The CHAIRMAN: As a representative in the Committee for some years, I have considerable sympathy with the representative of Cameroon over the problem of having to prepare texts and sometimes give them in a rush. I have had that experience, and I understand a certain dilemma that he is facing in this situation.

(The Chairman)

Because of my concern that the representative of Cameroon should receive satisfaction on this matter, As I think he knows I have convened a special meeting of the bureau of the First Committee to examine this question. I also had available for technical clarification representatives of Conference Services. Quite an extensive discussion was held by the bureau in order to arrive at a solution that would be satisfactory to the representative of Cameroon and also comply with the rules of the Organization, which the Secretariat, as well as all the rest of us, is bound to follow.

When I went into the question in some detail, my research made it fairly clear that the long-standing rule about which representatives are regularly advised obtains.

(The Chairman)

That is, if any portion of a written statement is not actually read at a meeting it will not appear in the text of the relevant record. That is a rule that goes back many years. Indeed, at, I believe, the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly there was a committee that went into the question extensively, and the rule is there actually to protect all delegations against the possible consequences of the insertion into the verbatim record of something that was not actually read.

The matter, perhaps unfortunately, is not within the purview of the First Committee itself to deal with in a substantive way. It is the responsibility of the Department of Conferences Services, which is in control of ascertaining that the records of the Committee are published in a way that is fully compatible with the rules of the Organization.

The representative of Cameroon indicated that the situation was painful to him. I must say that it is also very painful for me, at this moment, because of my very high regard for the representative of Cameroon. But I think he will understand that I am bound by the rules, perhaps in a special way as Chairman, and I would have to say that in my judgement, upon review of this matter in full, the rules have been followed.

The representative of Cameroon himself offered a way around this dilemma, namely, to read out his statement - not necessarily all of it, but merely that portion of it that was inadvertently omitted in a rush. I think that the Department of Conference Services would co-operate fully with the representative of Cameroon. In any event, I am quite prepared to invite him to offer a solution by responding to the points that were conveyed to him as a result of the meeting of the bureau, which, as I say, gave very extensive consideration to his request.

(The Chairman)

I would therefore leave the matter in the hands of the representative of Cameroon, knowing that he is aware that very full and extensive examination has been given this question. I think that he recognizes from the response I have given that I would certainly like him to be satisfied and that the solution that would be employed would be fully compatible with the rules.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): I apologize for speaking again, but I do not think that it is appropriate that we should leave here without setting the record straight.

Of course you, Mr. Chairman, have met with the Secretariat services and with the bureau. I was not present, but I would have been glad to point out to them that we too have been in the United Nations system for a while. We have been on the Legal Committee of the General Assembly, in which, on occasion, speakers who were not able even to be present and whose names were inscribed on the list of speakers offered to submit their texts without reading them, and the texts were, in fact, taken as if read.

Now, as my second point I would note that we did not "inadvertently" - I apologize for quoting what you said - leave out the page. We did not. The fact is, we were under difficulties. The Secretariat services, everybody except the representative who was reading, had the full text and the particular page we are talking about was badly arranged. This can happen at any time. The fact is that we did announce it. It was not like picking up some material from somewhere to add to or subtract from or to alter. We did announce the fact that that particular page, that part of the statement, did exist, that it was with the interpreters, that it was with the conference services, but that we were not in a position to read it at that time and that therefore we would submit it. Thus, it did exist. It was not inadvertence of any type.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

I would take issue with the Secretariat at any level if it insists that there is no precedent for the fact that a text has been submitted when it was not read. That is the thrust of the argument, and I would take issue on that fact.

I think that you, Mr. Chairman, have very rightly pointed to rules that have been given to you. The rules of procedure of the General Assembly are very, very clear. Nowhere do they say that delegations cannot submit texts in place of what is said or that they cannot correct. Any internal arrangements that have been worked out within the Secretariat do not necessarily bind the General Assembly.

Now, the Chairman has said that the General Assembly considered this. Again, I would be glad not to waste the Committee's time and to meet with the Secretariat representatives so that they can educate me anew as to when, where and how the General Assembly has taken a decision that in future this procedure must be followed.

As I said, I shall be glad at an appropriate time to read out the entire speech so tha' the Secretariat services will have the full speech and there will be no question of a comma or a full stop being omitted. I thank you for your co-operation and I hope that what I have said will be duly communicated by those who are listening to us.

The CHAIRMAN: Again, I can tell the representative of Cameroon that there are present in the room at this moment representatives of the Department of Conference Services who have taken note of these comments, and I can assure him that he will receive a reply. I will ensure that a reply is sent stating the precise rules and researching the whole question of precedents. If there are such precedents for the insertion into the verbatim record of that which was not verbally delivered, I would certainly want to know about them, and I am sure other delegations would also.

(The Chairman)

The publication Information for Delegations that is distributed widely does have the following passage:

"Delegates are advised that if any portion of a written statement is not actually read at meetings it will not appear in the text of the relevant record."

Again, sharing with my friend the representative of Cameroon the pain in this particular incident, I would be glad to invite him to read that text or that part of the text into the record whenever it is convenient to him, starting now.

It is my understanding that the representative of Cameroon wants to give notice to the Chair that he might exercise his intention of reading at a time that is convenient to him. That is certainly satisfactory to me. In the meantime, what I said a moment ago stands: he will receive a full statement on this question from the Department of Conference Services.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.