

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION

*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE

52nd meeting

held on

Wednesday, 7 December 1983

at 3 p.m.

New York

VERBATIM RECORD (PARTIAL) OF THE 52nd MEETING*

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 65: STRENGTHENING OF SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 66: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 67: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF
THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY (continued)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/38/PV.52
20 January 1984

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 65, 66 AND 67 (continued)

Mr. ELFAKI (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation is pleased to be speaking today in the First Committee during its consideration of the important question of international peace and security and the promotion of peaceful coexistence and co-operation among States and peoples with different social systems. The question we are considering today is part of the very *raison d'être* of the United Nations and arises out of the purposes and principles of the Charter, which have been embodied in the historic Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session in 1970, as well as in various other forms in resolutions adopted by other United Nations bodies and organs and the General Assembly itself, in particular resolution 2625 (XXV), the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and resolution 36/103, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, adopted in December 1981.

What is really regrettable and tragic is the fact that, notwithstanding those comprehensive international documents, declarations and resolutions to which the international community has committed itself, stability and international co-operation continue sharply to deteriorate and are today at a lower ebb than at any time during the past two decades. The world today is passing through an extremely complex and tangled period, a time of threats and dangers characterized by tension, instability, cold war and hot war, low rates of economic growth and a reduction in the economic and social co-operation among States, as well as by mistrust not only among the big Powers - where distrust can have very serious consequences - but also among small and medium-sized States in various parts of the world.

This bleak climate in international relations is reflected in the cold war and in the explosive situations we find in many parts of the world, in addition to such other dangerous phenomena as resort to the threat or use of force in international relations, foreign interference in various ways in the internal affairs of States and the conspiracy, sabotage and acts of subversion that are being carried out to

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

an unprecedented extent. Accompanying all this we find that efforts are being made by States both small and large, rich and poor, to acquire all kinds of weaponry far above and beyond any needs of national defence and without taking any account of the danger that such stockpiling represents to their regions or to their neighbours, who are in turn obliged to arm themselves thus creating situations of confrontation, conflict, instability and underdevelopment.

These dangerous manifestations on the international scene today require that all States - large and small, rich and poor - work together before it is too late to adopt urgent collective and individual measures to ward off the imminent dangers that threaten all of us. In our view there can be no more effective measure to end this explosive situation than total adherence to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, to international law and to the resolutions and declarations adopted by the United Nations governing relations and co-operation among States and peoples on behalf of their common interests and objectives in order to solve all conflicts by peaceful means, refraining from any action that could lead to tension, mistrust or a weakening of mutual co-operation.

The persistence of conflicts, wars and hotbeds of tension in the Middle East, essentially due to the belligerent and expansionist practices of Israel, and in southern Africa because of the actions of the racist minority in South Africa, its refusal to yield to international pressure, its continued pursuit of its policy of apartheid and its illegal occupation and colonization of Namibia, as well as the events occurring in Afghanistan, Kampuchea, the Caribbean, Chad, the Horn of Africa, Cyprus, Central America and other regions - all of these endanger the security of all countries and peoples, threaten their survival and endanger their independence, sovereignty, development and progress.

Confronted with such serious threats the Security Council must discharge its fundamental and important role under the Charter in respect of the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council has a collective responsibility for preserving security and peace in the world, and it is incumbent upon all its members, and in particular the Permanent Members, to take every appropriate action under the Charter to control and to find peaceful solutions to such tense situations. The Security Council cannot effectively and objectively deal with such challenges so long as co-operation among the great Powers that are Permanent Members of the Council is not complete and based on a solid and unshakeable faith

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

in the higher common interests of all, beyond narrow national interests, for the benefit of international peace, security and stability.

In this context we reiterate our support for the conclusions contained in the reports of the United Nations Secretary-General submitted to the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly on this important subject. We hope his good offices to increase the effectiveness of that important body will continue in order that it will be able to discharge its tasks and fulfil its important mission in accordance with the aspirations and expectations of all nations and peoples.

Mr. KUNDA (Zambia): My delegation attaches great importance to the three remaining items on our agenda, dealing as they do with international peace and security. They are agenda item 65, the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region, and agenda item 67, the implementation of collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, both of which essentially come under the purview of agenda item 66, the review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which has been on our agenda since 1970.

The review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has become an important point of reference for many of our States to recommit themselves not only in word but also in deed to the principles of the Declaration, which define in no ambiguous terms how State-to-State intercourse should be conducted in carrying out the provisions of that historic document. As we undertake the review today, we are saddened by the fact that the Declaration has been honoured more in its breach than in its implementation or observance. This is evidenced by the ever-increasing international crises and stalemates on many perennial issues, thus throwing the current international situation into profound disarray.

Foremost among the causes of this unwelcome development are the deteriorating East-West relations, which are characterized not by civility but by confrontation. This confrontation has in turn fuelled in its wake an arms race in both the nuclear and the conventional fields to a magnitude hitherto unknown in human history - thus pushing the human race to the brink of total annihilation. The latest casualty of that confrontation is none other than the United States-Soviet negotiations in Geneva on intermediate-range nuclear forces, which were discontinued on 23 November 1983.

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

We regret that discontinuation, coming as it did when both sides had vowed to deploy ever more nuclear weapons. It is our considered view that the United States and the Soviet Union should resume their negotiations and aim at reaching an agreement on arms control under all circumstances. We therefore urge them to resume the negotiations as quickly as possible in the new year. Failing that, the negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces and those relating to the strategic arms reduction talks should be combined.

Zambia is unreservedly committed to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. But nowhere has this commitment manifested itself so poignantly as a focal point of Zambia's foreign policy than in southern Africa. In that region the existence of South Africa's system of apartheid, which has been condemned as a crime against humanity, has been responsible for the extirpation of the principles of the Declaration in many ways.

To start with, the racist South African régime continues to hold in bondage the majority of its indigenous black population. In its usual vile tradition of suppressing the 23 million blacks in South Africa, the racist Pretoria régime concocted the so-called national referendum of 2 November 1983 to endorse the constitutional amendment for the purpose of co-opting the so-called coloureds and people of Asian origin as second-class citizens of South Africa, leaving the black majority with nothing by way of their inalienable right to citizenship in their own land of birth.

The changes flowing from that referendum have been dismissed by my country as fake and cosmetic and, may I add, were not worth the time and effort invested to bring them about. The move was calculated to deceive the world into believing that the racist Pretoria régime was moving towards internal reform. We therefore wish to add our voice to that of those who like us believe that the recent attempts by racist South Africa to modify the face of apartheid were meaningless, since the so-called reforms were designed to distract world attention from the cruel system of oppression that apartheid represents.

Furthermore, the racist Pretoria régime is also responsible for delaying the independence of Namibia, while it illegally occupies that Territory, by predicating the independence of Namibia on the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola when, in fact, the military troops of the said racist régime remain ensconced in southern

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

Angola - not to mention the fact that initially it was because of South Africa's attack on Angola that the latter was forced to look beyond its shores for protection, whereupon Cuba came to its rescue and protection. Cuban withdrawal therefore has no relevance whatsoever to the independence of Namibia. The linkage of the two is therefore unwarranted and unfortunate. Additionally, the Pretoria régime's policy of destabilization of its neighbours through open attacks and subversion renders untenable regional peace and security in the area of southern Africa.

In our undaunted commitment to peace and security in the area, Zambia has constantly advocated the dismantling of the apartheid system of South Africa so that the process of democratization can be set in train. We also believe that South Africa should put an end to the inordinate delay of Namibia's independence by the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The racist Pretoria régime must disengage itself from southern Angola and end its policy of destabilizing its neighbours so that peace can reign for once in southern Africa. That would be a giant step towards the implementation of the Declaration on international security.

There are other hotbeds of conflict that require similar attention - implementing the principles of the 1970 Declaration - including the question of Korea, a country divided against the will of its people. My delegation supports the peaceful reunification of Korea and the withdrawal therefrom of all foreign troops.

My delegation further believes that the Declaration would be enhanced if the Iran-Iraq war were terminated without preconditions. Its continuation only leads to more and more irreplaceable loss of human life and wanton destruction of property.

Recent additions to the litany of conflict situations relate to the grave situation in Central America and the Caribbean region. Zambia has consistently subscribed to efforts through the Non-Aligned Movement to bring about a lessening of tensions and the strengthening of international understanding in the area. To that end, we wish to reiterate our position that the problems facing Central America and Nicaragua in particular are primarily externally sponsored. There must therefore be an end to external intervention in the region. The peace initiatives

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

in the area by Nicaragua and the Contadora Group must be allowed to run their course for the betterment of all the countries within and outside the region.

As regards the grave situation in the Caribbean, we believe that an early return to indigenous civilian rule in Grenada would go a long way in contributing to peace in the region. Peace in Central America and the Caribbean would also constitute a significant contribution to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

I wish now to turn to the question of strengthening security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. I can hardly overemphasize the strategic importance of the Mediterranean region, lying as it does and forming a link between the continent of Africa and the Euro-Asian land mass. The Mediterranean region today is potentially the most volatile because of the existence therein of enormous conventional, nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Additionally, the Mediterranean area has some of the most enduring hotbeds of conflict and tension epitomized by the Middle East and Cyprus crises, which have been on the world agenda for more than three and two decades, respectively. The region therefore demands urgent attention as the solution of these intractable problems would constitute a meaningful contribution to the fulfilment of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

As far as the Middle East crisis is concerned, it is a well-established fact that the question of Palestine has been singled out as the core of that crisis. Any comprehensive solution of the crisis must therefore be based on the centrality of the question of Palestine. Hence Israel must recognize the Palestinians' inalienable right to self-determination and withdraw from all the Arab territories it has occupied since 1967, and the dispossession of the people of Palestine must come to an end, so as to allow them to create an independent State of their own.

The problem of Cyprus has been compounded by the ill-fated declaration of 16 November 1983 purporting to establish a "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" as an independent State. This unilateral declaration of independence by the Turkish Cypriots is a source of grave concern to my delegation because it strikes at the heart of the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and non-aligned status of the Republic of Cyprus. It does not augur well for the efforts envisaged in the strengthening of security and co-operation in the

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

Mediterranean region. Above all, it is a disservice to the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

An adjacent area which would derive benefits from strengthened security and co-operation in the Mediterranean area is the Indian Ocean area, where, like the Mediterranean region, East-West rivalry has reached alarming proportions. Consequently, the peace and security of the littoral and hinterland States of the area, in particular, have been threatened beyond measure. This threat must be removed without delay. It is for this reason that we have in recent years constantly called for an international conference in Colombo to address the issue of declaring the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. To our dismay, 1985 is now being considered as the year for convening the Colombo meeting. This is to be regretted because, in any case, it should have taken place before 1983. We urge delegations that have always stood in the way of the Colombo conference on the Indian Ocean to rethink their stand seriously and thus allow this important conference to take place, once and for all, in 1985.

In regard to the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, it is my delegation's contention that the problems I have just alluded to, among others, are no more than a mirror image of the dismal failure of the collective security system offered by the United Nations. To be sure, the concept of collective security as enshrined in the United Nations Charter has miserably failed to provide total immunity from attack, particularly for the weak and developing countries. The United Nations has not been able to live up to its mission as the custodian of international peace and security.

This development is in spite of the fact that, in theory, the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter is much easier today than ever before because we now have more ways of solving many of the world's intractable problems. In reality, however, there is an ever increasing litany of new problems and the persistence of old conflicts and tensions. The conclusion we draw from this - a sad conclusion - is that the major mechanisms for the maintenance of international peace and security have been and are constantly being rendered inoperable.

Foremost among such mechanisms is the Security Council, whose problems accounting for its failures derive from a host of considerations. To begin with,

(Mr. Kunda, Zambia)

parties to a conflict hardly submit themselves in good time for the peaceful settlement of their dispute under the aegis of the Security Council in order to defuse tension before it develops into a hot crisis. More often than not, they seek the intervention of the Council - if at all - when it is too late for the Council to engage in any meaningful preventive diplomacy. Instead, recourse is readily had to the use or threat of use of brutal force as a means of "settling" international disputes. Although the Council is the embodiment of the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, it is bypassed. This lack of effective utilization of the collective security provisions of the Charter has, in turn, eroded the confidence placed in the Security Council as the grand keeper, if not preserver, of peace in the world.

My delegation believes it is the primordial right of every State to live under conditions of peace and security. These conditions are especially imperative for the developing countries, which are grappling with the problems of development. Failing such conditions, they face the prospect of squandering their meagre finite resources on buying arms for their protection at the expense of their development. This situation makes it all the more urgent for pursuing concerted efforts to reconstruct the machinery for a collective security system originally envisioned by the founding fathers of the United Nations and the authors of its Charter.

It is in pursuance of this belief in the primordial right of every State to live in peace and security that we fully subscribe to all the draft resolutions relating to the three items concerning international peace and security I have addressed today.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): Speaking in the general debate of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly on 10 October 1983, my Foreign Minister made the following statement:

"Today, we are a long way from achieving the basic objective of the United Nations Charter, namely the peace for which the peoples of the world are struggling." (A/38/PV.26, p. 38-40)

The importance of the debate on the items relating to the strengthening of international peace and security demonstrates the deterioration in international relations as the result of the policies of confrontation and the return to a cold war brought about by the American Administration, which is attempting to impose its strength and military hegemony and re-establish the dependency of States.

Although respect for the United Nations Charter implies everyone's obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of States, we note that the forces of imperialism, first and foremost American imperialism, in their belligerent policies have violated this principle and undertaken acts of aggression and invasions against independent countries and peoples struggling for their independence, thereby undermining peace in the world by creating tension and exposing the international situation to serious dangers and threatening a global nuclear war.

They have scorned the principles of the Charter and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session in resolution 2625 (XXV).

Most delegations have stressed the fact that the American Administration is the primary source of tension, insecurity and instability in the world. The United States is threatening the peace and security of peoples which cherish freedom and independence and are struggling to safeguard them; it has also attacked other independent countries, provoked and encouraged conflicts among States, and attempted to thwart the aspirations of countries for political independence and economic and social progress.

The forces of imperialism, by impeding negotiations on arms reductions, carrying out military programmes and adopting dangerous theories encouraging nuclear war, are threatening mankind with a nuclear holocaust. As a result of this belligerent policy of the United States, various parts of the world continue to be victims of explosive situations. In the Middle East, for example, there are grave dangers resulting from an imperialist plot to liquidate nationalist forces and progressive régimes. The imperialists have tried to impose America's military and political domination over the area. They have tried to eliminate the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, who are fighting under the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), their sole legitimate representative, and who are entitled to return to their territory and to an independent State therein. There is no doubt that Israel's intransigent position, as supported by the United States and its allies, goes against the rights of the Palestinian people. Israel wishes to formalize its occupation of Arab territories, which is a serious threat to peace and security in the Middle East and in neighbouring areas. The hostility of

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

Israel and its allies has taken the form of a number of belligerent military acts in the region, including Israel's invasion of Lebanese territory, the denial of Palestinian rights, the torture of Palestinians and Lebanese and acts of flagrant belligerence perpetrated by multinational forces against Lebanese citizens and those of neighbouring countries. Speaking on 10 October 1983, in the General Assembly, my Foreign Minister stated:

"The United States military intervention in Lebanon demonstrates the dangers facing our Arab peoples, as represented by the United States military presence in bases and war fleets in Arab territories and waters, which would take people back to the age of colonialism and endanger the peace and security of our Arab people as well as their sovereignty, independence and progress."

(A/38/PV.26, p. 42)

The air raid by American warplanes against Syrian positions in Lebanon is a threat to that country. That raid is another example of the hostile, belligerent role being played by American military forces, in the Arab region, giving unlimited support to Israeli forces against Arab countries and peoples. They are striving to implement the objectives of the new American-Israeli alliance, which is nothing but an extension of the strategic military alliance between the United States and Israel aimed at stifling the just cause of the Palestinians and other Arab peoples.

The arms race and the accumulation of weapons by the United States and its rapid deployment forces, which are in a number of non-aligned countries, the creation of a central command for those forces and provocative American military manoeuvres in the area are all hostile acts against the peoples of the area and represent a threat to their sovereignty. They are a way of bringing pressure and blackmail to bear in an attempt to terrorize those peoples and exploit their resources. This is in flagrant contradiction of the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law.

These dangers are growing and have extended to the Indian Ocean, following the creation of American bases there, especially on the island of Diego Garcia. In southern Africa, unlimited American support to the racists in South Africa, who are practising policies of racial discrimination, has led to a deterioration in the situation and to South Africa's persistent attacks against the front-line States in attempts to destabilize them. The United States has impeded speedy implementation of the resolution on the independence of Namibia. Through the use of the veto, it

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

has also prevented the Security Council from imposing binding sanctions under the Charter against the Pretoria régime.

Furthermore, the United States has prevented the Security Council from imposing sanctions on Israel and the United Nations from finding solutions to the most urgent problems. In Latin America, Cuba and Nicaragua have been subjected to an economic embargo and are being threatened with American intervention. The United States has used its political and military might to obstruct the will of the peoples of the area with different viewpoints. These hostile policies practised by the United States have taken the form of the invasion of Grenada by American troops under a pretext condemned by the international community.

The United States has deployed medium-range Cruise and Pershing missiles under the specious pretext of wishing to restore a balance of forces in Europe. The deployment of those missiles exposes the continent to the possibility of a new confrontation, the consequences of which would go beyond Europe's boundaries and threaten a nuclear conflagration. The American Government, rather than reacting positively to the peace initiatives proposed by the Soviet Union and going along with the desire for peace of the people of Western Europe, who have appealed for peace in various peaceful demonstrations in Europe, and rather than meeting the wishes of the international community for general and complete disarmament, has only heightened the already existing tension in Europe in order to ensure its military superiority. The dangers threatening Europe and the Middle East have gone beyond the borders of those regions. The Mediterranean area and its peoples are facing growing dangers due to the existence of United States and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bases, which are carrying out actions to undermine peace and security among the peoples of the area.

The belligerent policies and practices of the United States in various parts of the world have even reached Africa, Asia and Latin America, and we cannot help but ask about the basic task of the United Nations: the maintenance of international peace and security. The United States is one of the permanent members of the Security Council, and it has a special responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security under the Charter; but it has failed to respect its commitments. Hence the United Nations has to deal with obstacles to the implementation of its resolutions, obstacles to the task for which it was created. The United States has used its veto to prevent solutions to

(Mr. Al-Alfi, Democratic Yemen)

problems throughout the world. In addition, the United States has introduced new dangerous theories into international relations. It has declared that various parts of the world, thousands of miles away, are strategic areas of vital importance to the United States. Further, through a mistaken interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter, the United States has perpetrated acts of aggression in various parts of the world under the pretext of self-defence, and any act of defence against American aggression is judged to be an act of aggression against the United States.

This American arrogance and flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and of international law require that the international community close its ranks and put an end to all this, if we wish to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security throughout the world.

Democratic Yemen reaffirms the statement of its Foreign Minister:

"Our country has always endeavoured to work with all countries interested in securing international peace and security and in strengthening the role of the United Nations, in an effort to find peaceful solutions to the problems facing the world." (A/38/PV.26, p. 52)

Mrs. CORONEL de RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): The alarming deterioration in the international situation makes our consideration of the items before us particularly important. It stresses the significance of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session in 1970.

To the many conflicts and instances of the use of force in the international arena in recent years, in respect of which no clear progress has been achieved, must be added the many situations which arise day after day in which the rights of peoples and individuals have been denied.

Our region, Latin America, has been no exception to this long list of violations of the principles of international law and the principles of the Charter of our Organization. On the contrary, in recent years there has been an outbreak of acts of intervention and use of force more particularly in the spring of 1982 in the South Atlantic and, more recently, in the Caribbean and in Central America. For all these reasons, and because we have a duty to defend the right of our peoples to live freely in peace, we believe that solidarity is the best means to establish relations based on confidence and friendship.

(Mrs. Coronel de Rodriguez,
Venezuela)

It is this same duty which lends itself to our struggle to put an end to colonialism and prevent the acts of aggression and intervention of the major Powers.

In this connection Latin America, notwithstanding its many years of independent life, still suffers from the consequences of colonial imperialism.

Venezuela, which itself has been subjected to territorial plundering by colonial Powers, expresses its solidarity with Argentina's just claims. As we have said on many occasions, the question of the Malvinas Islands is a typical case of neo-colonialism. The aggression of which that Latin American country was a victim is unacceptable to all of us and, as we have often said on other occasions, it has jeopardized the denuclearized status of the zone established by the Tlatelolco Treaty.

It is obvious that the ongoing British militarization of the territories in dispute has served to increase tension and instability in the region and has undermined peace and security not only in Latin America but also throughout the world.

As regards the situation in the neighbouring Caribbean island of Grenada, our defence of the principle of non-intervention has been clear. The communiqué by the Government of Venezuela reaffirmed our support for basic principles, such as non-intervention, the self-determination of peoples, full respect for human rights and the institutionalization of democracy and freedom.

Furthermore, Venezuela finds unacceptable the presence of armed contingents from beyond our continent which under any pretext would hold sway over territories and peoples they control. As everyone knows, Venezuela wishes the Caribbean to be considered as a zone of peace, free from any military activities by foreign agents against the backdrop of the East and West confrontation.

The maintenance of peace and the preservation of the international system requires mutual respect among States and strict compliance with the principle of non-intervention.

We wish to stress that recent situations such as the conflict in the South Atlantic and the intervention by foreign forces in Grenada are a source of very serious concern to my country.

The peace initiative in Central America promoted by the Contadora Group is the concrete expression of joint efforts being made by the Governments of Colombia, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela to find a politically negotiated solution to the problems of this sub-region.

(Mrs. Coronel de Rodriguez,
Venezuela)

In this connection I should like to draw the attention of this Committee to the documents relating to the Contadora peace initiative, which have been circulated in connection with the items before us. Those documents report on the evolution of this initiative since its inception in January this year.

In particular, I should like to refer to the document of objectives adopted by the Foreign Ministers of the Contadora Group and of the five Central American countries, contained in document S/16041 of 13 October 1983. This consensus text includes the positions and preoccupations of the Governments concerned, the proposals by the Contadora Group and the principles which must underlie any solution to the problems of Central America.

First, the document of objectives enumerates the principles of international law governing the actions of States, the observance of which is necessary if there is to be security and peaceful coexistence in the region. It also contains the objectives those countries intend to achieve.

The Foreign Ministers of the Central American countries, with the participation of the Contadora Group, have already begun negotiations to prepare for the signing of the agreements and the adoption of the machinery needed to formalize and develop the objectives contained in the document.

The Contadora initiative is an example of Latin American solidarity and participation in resolving the problems of our area. Venezuela hopes that this effort will lead to a stable and lasting peace in Central America, free from intervention, through solutions freely agreed upon by the parties concerned.

Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): In his report to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly the Secretary-General said, with the authority of his office, that the world was "perilously close to international anarchy".

No one has challenged this diagnosis, which is exact both in its wording and in its profound meaning. There has been a chorus of assent from most delegations. At its New Delhi Summit Conference the Non-Aligned Movement itself echoed the statement by calling for concerted action to restore peace and security and to promote development and co-operation.

A year has now elapsed. Unfortunately, events we have witnessed and are still witnessing only confirm this diagnosis. The debate on disarmament questions just held in the Committee has shown that total war - that is, nuclear war - is no

(Mr. Slim, Tunisia)

longer impossible, since day-to-day events indicate to what extent the use or threat of force in international relations has become current practice, if not the very expression and the instrument of diplomacy and policy, under all sorts of pretexts, such as security, ideology, reprisals, prevention and even pure and simple intimidation.

The situation in the world illustrates that it has not been possible to extinguish any hotbeds of tension and that, on the contrary, new conflicts have arisen, making the international situation even more complex.

No continent has been spared. None of the principles on which the civilized world rests is scrupulously respected. A people in the Middle East is undergoing a tragedy, while the world watches in practically total indifference, and remains condemned to a life of wandering; another - in Africa - still suffers from the yoke of colonialism and segregation. Almost everywhere on every continent, the rights of States, peoples and individuals are trampled underfoot; everywhere there is violence and insecurity.

Nothing is being done to put an end to this situation. Everything is happening just as if the powerful of the world had adapted themselves to this international anarchy, taking advantage of it to strengthen their own positions, consolidate their gains and expanding their zones of operation, if not of interest or influence.

We believe that it is high time for the principles of the United Nations Charter, to which we are all supposed to have committed ourselves, to be restored and scrupulously respected.

It is high time for us to acquire the firm conviction that the United Nations is the one and only instrument likely to preserve us from chaos, anarchy and war; for us to give more thought to specific measures likely to enhance the credibility and the prestige of the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, which, unfortunately, we know to have been seriously undermined.

In this connection, it seems to us important for the members of the Security Council, its permanent members in particular, to come to grips with the fact that their responsibility vis-à-vis international peace and security is both a collective and an individual responsibility. They are responsible to the entire membership of the Organization and to the international community as a whole for the use they make of the power that has been conferred upon them.

(Mr. Slim, Tunisia)

In so doing, the provisions of the Charter, which governs our work here, must be unreservedly adhered to in spirit and letter. The same goes for the coercive measures and mandatory sanctions, the adoption of which has more than once been shied away from even in cases of flagrant aggression and open defiance, including defiance of the United Nations itself. That holds true also for the provisions on collective security contained in the Charter - which have not so far been fully applied.

It behoves us to be clear in the debate on this particular question, which has been inscribed as a separate item on our agenda.

Either the provisions relating to collective security are timely, relevant and applicable, and we should then consider measures to implement them, as suggested in the draft resolution now before us; or these provisions are neither timely nor applicable, and then the United Nations Charter would appear unsuitable, with faults and gaps, which should be remedied. In the latter case, it would be incumbent on all of us to revise the Charter on that point as well as on others.

This year, for the first time, our Committee is called upon to consider as a separate item of the agenda the "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region". This is evidence of the importance attached to this particularly strategic area, a passage between continents and oceans and a crossroad of the most ancient civilizations.

Tunisia, a Mediterranean country if there ever was one, is definitively committed to co-operation and friendship among peoples and opposed to any spirit of confrontation; for many reasons Tunisia is devoted to the idea of transforming the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation. Aware that such a goal presupposes, inter alia, the establishment of confidence-building measures among the countries of the region, Tunisia is proud of maintaining the highest relations of friendship and co-operation with all its partners of the Mediterranean and, first and foremost, with its immediate neighbours. The Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation, which was signed some eight months ago with the sister Republic of Algeria and which is open to all partners of the Arab region of the Maghreb, is an important milestone in the strengthening of stability, peace and co-operation in this part of the Mediterranean.

Thus my country is already committed to this process aimed at transforming the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation, precisely because we are

(Mr. Slim, Tunisia)

convinced of the value of such a process for all the countries of the Mediterranean basin.

In his noteworthy statement in the Committee on 5 December last, the representative of Malta, Ambassador Gauci, armed with figures presented a very instructive picture of what could result from co-operation not only in the economic and trade areas but also in the cultural and social fields between the Mediterranean countries. Like him, we are convinced that such co-operation would meet the best interests of all the peoples of the region.

It is none the less true that the process into which we wish to enter in greater depth seems indeed a long and difficult one; many problems, not to mention preliminary issues, will first have to be resolved.

We must give extensive thought to the very definition or the notion of zone of peace, as well as to its scope and geographical limits. Similarly, we must also give particular attention to what could be its political character.

In this respect we must note that the Mediterranean is at present the scene of increasing tensions and crisis, as well as a region coveted by Powers outside the region. These tensions, one of the most serious deriving from the absence of a just and lasting solution to the Palestinian problem and to the conflict in the Middle East, are obviously a serious obstacle to transforming this sea into a zone of peace, just as they constitute a threat to the peace and security of the region and of the world as a whole.

The future of the Mediterranean, which we wish to call a "Lake of peace", ultimately depends upon the reduction of these tensions and upon the solution of the serious conflicts troubling the area. In the meantime, any bilateral or subregional initiative, whether South-South or South-North, taken in keeping with our aspirations for the Mediterranean would meet our approval and our total support.

Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago): It is no secret that one of the major attractions which the United Nations, as an Organization, holds for many small developing countries is the system of collective security enshrined in its Charter. This was certainly one of the main factors which impelled Trinidad and Tobago to seek entry to the United Nations immediately upon our achievement of independence. It has therefore been extremely disheartening for my delegation that our Organization, and the Security Council in particular, has been unable to fulfil its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security.

(Mr. Murray, Trinidad and Tobago)

Hence, it is hardly surprising that such a loss of confidence in the United Nations system should see us welcoming the inclusion, on the initiative of the delegation of Sierra Leone, of the item entitled, "Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security", on the agenda of the thirty-seventh session. My delegation was among the sponsors of resolution 37/119, which sought a study of the question of the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter, "with a view to strengthening international peace and security".

It bears repeating that the thrust of that resolution was to find ways of strengthening international peace and security, and it in no way implied any slur on the integrity of the membership of the Security Council or any other organ of the United Nations system.

The importance of the collective security provisions of the Charter cannot be over-emphasized, especially for Trinidad and Tobago. We have neither the desire nor the means to embark upon any large-scale expenditure for arms or sophisticated weapons of war in order to make believe that we could be independently secure. It saddens us to see how many embark upon such a course and delude themselves into believing that they can be secure. History abounds with evidence to the contrary.

Alas the year following the adoption by consensus of resolution 37/119 has seen no significant move towards strengthening international peace and security and, in fact, has seen a further increase in international tension and instability. We cannot continue to vacillate, and for this reason my delegation is again one of the sponsors of a draft resolution - A/C.1/38/L.83/Rev.1 - which suggests the establishment of a special committee to explore ways and means of implementing the collective security provisions.

Let us consider what conditions prevailed when the Charter of the United Nations and the Organization itself came into being some 38 years ago. The world had suffered the ravages of the Second World War and here was an international "parliament" being formed to reorganize and rehabilitate the world and save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

Such a supreme Assembly, consisting then of a privileged few, was to be respected, even revered, and in fact it provided a real source of hope in a desolate world. The political, economic, monetary and technological status, together with the colonial structures which existed then, with its lack of any

(Mr. Murray, Trinidad and Tobago)

widespread national identities among peoples, created the atmosphere for diplomacy characteristic of the time - a time in which the United Nations was held in awe, a time when a small number of its Members could speak for a large proportion of the world's population and, hence, the Organization could function in the particular way that it did then.

Today's world is a far cry from that of 38 years ago. People's expectations and aspirations have changed. There are now 158 States Members of the United Nations and there are far greater demands on the Organization, and on the Security Council in particular. It is hardly surprising that the United Nations does not always appear to be functioning adequately and, as a result, is experiencing a crisis of confidence.

What is necessary now is for us, the Member States, to ensure that this body can satisfy our needs, given present conditions. Thirty-eight years ago, the United Nations could function solely through the moral authority it derived from the principles and provisions of its Charter. Today, it is necessary to implement the machinery for action inherent in those principles in order to prevent or remedy breaches of the Charter. We must take the necessary steps to ensure that the Organization functions in such a way that the noble principles enshrined in the Charter are not in any way diluted by the prevailing political climate.

The Committee may rest assured that my delegation is not advocating any radical changes in the Organization; we are merely seeking to explore ways and means of implementing the provisions of the Charter and of ensuring that its principles find expression in today's political environment.

The implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security is important, because the Government of Trinidad and Tobago considers that development can best be pursued in a climate of peace and security. I make no apology for repeating the fact that my delegation supports the contention that a more stable, more equitable international economic order is an essential prerequisite for international peace and security, and so too is peace and security a necessary factor in promoting economic welfare.

My delegation therefore asks that we not merely acquiesce in adopting the general thrust of draft resolution L.83/Rev.1 but that all - I repeat: all - Member States actively participate in finding ways to implement the collective security provisions of the Charter.

(Mr. Murray, Trinidad and Tobago)

Permit me, Sir, as the First Committee draws near to concluding its work at this session, to express my delegation's commendation of your chairmanship of the Committee. The organization of our work and the manner in which it is being effected have benefited greatly from your exemplary efforts. Your guidance and leadership have certainly enhanced the work of this Committee.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): This year our debate on the items before us takes place in the context of a world situation characterized by great turbulence and several negative tendencies, a loosening of the restraints on the use of power and open preparation for war. Confrontation is being sought rather than avoided. The threat or use of force has become a first option, above peaceful procedures. Threats to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of small States intensify. For example, more than two thirds of the national territory of Guyana continues under claim even though the relevant international border was legally established more than four score years ago.

The growing tendency by States to resort to force in seeking to settle disputes or conflicts is all the more worrisome since parallel to this tendency there is the diversion of increasing quantities of the world's resources into the acquisition of arms which, far from producing the security for which they were intended, merely serve to heighten insecurity.

Genuine and complete disarmament, an essential component of international security, has become an even more elusive goal. Disarmament efforts suffered their most serious set-back recently in Europe, where the war of words has given way to a war of nerves as new deadly weapons are being deployed and dialogue suspended.

In this charged atmosphere the search for negotiated solutions to various problems of global significance seems stalemated. In the area of international economic relations the very effort to begin a process of negotiations is being frustrated.

Relations at both the regional and local levels have been seriously affected by these negative manifestations. Many regional crises remain unsolved and in some cases have even worsened. We have been witnessing, moreover, the open manipulation of local situations of conflict in pursuit of interests that are alien to the peoples of the regions concerned. In this regard we note with concern persistent attempts at imposing ideological conformity on small States, attempts which not only fly in the face of the sovereignty and independence of the States concerned

but also artificially seek to extend the area of super-Power competition and promote discord and instability among States.

While these situations persist there is the ever-present danger that one or other regional conflict could produce effects which would spill over into the complex relations of the two super-Powers, with adverse consequences for peace and security in general.

These trends constitute the most serious test since the creation of our Organization in 1945 of the enduring nature of the bases which were laid then for the conduct of inter-State relations and for the maintenance of international peace and security articulated in the United Nations Charter.

That Charter embodies a set of principles for the creation of a sense of global community and for the establishment of a system of inter-State relations based on sovereign equality and the rule of law.

In addition, over the years we have evolved a number of instruments intended to govern the conduct of international relations, instruments which, if scrupulously respected and implemented, would conduce to the establishment of the régime of security which all States seek. Foremost among these are the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States and the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes which the General Assembly adopted at its last session.

Generally speaking the contract which our founding fathers forged in 1945 has worked. It has worked imperfectly, but over the years it has served its basic purpose, thanks in part to the contribution of such instruments as I have just described. It has been bedevilled by a reluctance on the part of some States to harmonize their national interests with those of the wider international community, and indeed the attempt to reconcile these two sums up the experience of the United Nations. Recently, as well, the régime of relative stability which has that contract as its basis has been imperilled through the pursuit by some of a vision of their vocation in the world that seems to have no bounds.

In this context, therefore, the review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is not seen simply as an

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

annual ritualistic exercise. It is an opportunity for sober reflection and for recommitment - a recommitment that must constitute a moral and political offensive proceeding from a reaffirmation of the unconditional validity of the principles of our Charter. There must be by all a renewed determination to make the principles of the Declaration into a living force and a point of reference for States in their international relations. A review would be meaningless if it did not produce such a result.

The sad reality, as many delegations have reflected in their presentations, is that the provisions of the Declaration have in general not been sufficiently applied to inter-State behaviour, and nowhere is this more evident than in the Middle East. The Palestinian people continue in their dispossession and exile while in their ever-expanding nationalist ambitions the Israeli Zionists blatantly disregard the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of their neighbours and their right to live in security.

Israel must withdraw from occupied Arab and Palestinian territory, and the Palestinian people must be allowed to establish their own independent State. There is no alternative if peace and security in the Middle East are to be achieved.

Regrettably, the search for a secure and lasting peace in the Middle East is now being made extremely complicated by the exacerbation of the situation in Lebanon through intervention and outside interference in the internal affairs of that State. Guyana sincerely hopes for an early end to all interference in Lebanon and for the people of that country to be left to heal their wounds and determine their own destiny.

In southern Africa the racist Pretoria régime continues to hold the majority of its people in bondage, to occupy Namibia illegally and to destabilize and physically attack its neighbours, all with the backing of its powerful Western friends. Those States must desist from supporting South Africa in the prosecution of its oppressive policies. The system of apartheid must be dismantled. The independence of Namibia must be achieved in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). There is no linkage with the sovereign actions of any neighbouring independent State.

The problem of Cyprus also continues. My delegation calls for a solution to this question on the basis of the framework for action long established by this Organization, one that preserves the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and unaltered character of that State.

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

The people of Korea remain divided against their will. My delegation supports the peaceful reunification of Korea without outside interference and based on the withdrawal of foreign troops. We believe that the proposals advanced by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea constitute a positive and constructive step towards this objective.

In spite of several appeals by the Secretary-General, decisions of the Security Council and exhortations by the Non-Aligned Movement, the war between Iran and Iraq continues. Guyana is profoundly saddened by this continuation of hostilities and calls for the strict implementation of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council relating to this matter, in particular resolutions 514 (1982) and 522 (1982).

As a nation of the Latin American and Caribbean region, we are particularly disturbed at recent events in our part of the world. We have consistently opposed the use of force to settle disputes, calling instead for their settlement by peaceful means in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant instruments of this Assembly.

Unfortunately, this principle of peaceful settlement has not been observed in Central America. What is particularly insidious here is that, while some are loudly declaring a commitment to peace, they are at the same time deliberately encouraging military solutions and generously providing the wherewithal for such solutions. Conscious strategies of destabilization, interference and harassment of Governments in the subregion are being openly pursued.

It is difficult to overstate the seriousness of the situation prevailing in the Central American subregion. We are grieved at external efforts aimed at subverting a people's own efforts at restructuring their society on the basis of priorities and needs which they themselves determine. We cannot condone strategies of destabilization, whatever their source or their motivation. Such strategies deliberately sow discord and instability, thereby dangerously threatening the peace and security of the region. It was preoccupations such as these which moved the non-aligned States to work as we did for the adoption by this Assembly of the Declaration proscribing intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States. We call for strict implementation of the provisions of that Declaration in Central America as we reiterate our total support for the efforts of the Contadora Group.

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

My delegation urges the search for peaceful solutions to the conflicts in Central America, based on respect for the fundamental principles governing international relations, in particular respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, the inadmissibility of the use of force to settle disputes and non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

Guyana also hopes for an early return to normalcy in Grenada based on the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops and respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of that State, and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Grenadians.

Early steps need to be taken towards genuine disarmament under effective international control. We hope that there could be sufficient mutual confidence between the two super-Powers to permit an early and meaningful interface for the halting and reversal of the arms race, particularly in its nuclear aspect.

An essential aspect of strengthening international security is necessarily the establishment of reliable and effective structures and mechanisms which would prevent breaches of the peace and even pre-empt or anticipate conflict situations. The collective security provisions of the Charter have not been effectively applied, with the result that States lack confidence in the ability of the Organization, in particular the Security Council, to deal with problems affecting peace and security. The international community has never been more in need of a reliable system of collective security.

The tense relations between the two super-Powers easily prejudice the effectiveness of the Security Council in the area of the maintenance of international peace and security. This is all the more reason for concrete steps towards the establishment of a collective security system that is flexible, reliable and responsive to the urgent demands of conflict situations.

It is clear therefore that the tension in the relations between the two super-Powers lies at the root of much of the insecurity in our world today. Between these two poles stand a large number of States, middle Powers and smaller States, demanding that sanity and reason prevail in international relations and that account be taken of their interests and their right to a secure existence on this planet. The non-aligned States constitute the largest grouping of this majority. It is these States which, in keeping with their commitment to a régime of peace and of stable, harmonious international relations, have been in the vanguard of international efforts for the elaboration of instruments such as the

(Mr. Sinclair, Guyana)

Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

Our Movement, convinced that there is no alternative to co-operation among States, has consistently striven for the establishment of mutual confidence and the promotion of an ethos of collective responsibility for the strengthening of international security. In the present context, that is a most pressing imperative. My delegation hopes that our review exercise this year will contribute meaningfully to the fulfilment of that need.

Mr. NOUANETHASING (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Sir, my delegation has already had an opportunity to congratulate you and the other officers of the Committee on your elections to these lofty positions. Today I should like to wish you further success in your noble task.

Since the last session of the United Nations General Assembly the situation in the world, despite the efforts and aspirations of the peoples, has not improved; on the contrary, international tension has increased sharply. The reasons are obvious: the course being pursued by the United States towards universal militarization and its refusal to take into account the legitimate interests of other States to exercise their right to determine their own fate without directives from Washington.

The general debates in the plenary General Assembly and here in the First Committee have clearly brought out the serious concern and anxiety of the international community at the increasing threat of nuclear war and the escalation of the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race. At the same time, the determination of the peace-loving countries and peoples to oppose more vigorously this tendency so fraught with danger for all humanity has been manifested even more clearly, as has been their determination to seek effective ways and means for strengthening international security and ending the arms race.

That correct line in world politics has been reflected in documents of numerous conferences and decisions of international and regional organizations. In the final documents of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March this year, it is noted that "the greatest peril facing the world today is the threat to the survival of mankind from a nuclear war" (A/38/132, annex, p. 14). The Heads of State or Government clearly stated that it was necessary to take urgent measures to halt and reverse the arms race to ensure international peace and security, measures that would ultimately lead to general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

(Mr. Nouanethasing, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

That position is the expression of the will of the non-aligned countries, which comprise the majority of the States Members of the United Nations.

In order to attract the attention of the peoples of the world to the most urgent problems confronting mankind we should, in our opinion, consider at this session the new Soviet proposals condemning nuclear war, calling for a nuclear-weapon freeze and calling also for the prohibition of the use of force in outer space or from space against the earth. The adoption by the General Assembly of resolutions on these issues would correspond to the interests of the peace-loving forces struggling against the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

In analysing the international situation we cannot fail to note that the situation in the world, which is already characterized by dangerous tension, continues to deteriorate. The United States of America and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) are bending every effort to carry out their military strategy aimed at acquiring military superiority over the socialist and non-aligned countries and, ultimately, striving for world domination. An example of this is the decision of the NATO countries to deploy American nuclear missiles in certain countries of Western Europe. The United States has struck a blow at international security when it undertook the deployment of first-strike nuclear weapons. These actions by the United States will inevitably lead to a reduction of confidence and to deterioration of the situation on the European continent.

However, it would be erroneous to assume that the new American nuclear threat is limited to Europe alone. Many non-aligned countries of the Mediterranean, the Middle East and South-West Asia will be in the sights of the American nuclear missiles.

Considering the destructive power of modern nuclear weapons, the consequences of their use will no doubt be global. Therefore, we call upon the nuclear Powers which have not yet done so urgently to adopt the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In accordance with its expansionist and hegemonistic strategy and ambitions, the Administration in Washington is carrying out an adventuristic policy of confrontation and interference in its many actions to exacerbate tension and to undertake interventions and acts of aggression whenever and wherever that seems possible. It is striving to use existing disputes and conflicts among neighbouring countries - disputes that have been inherited from the past by various

(Mr. Nouanethasing, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

countries and peoples - and also contradictions and dissatisfaction which have been sown by the United States itself among States or groups of States.

The United States is continuing its blockade of fraternal Cuba and occupying part of its territory, threatening Nicaragua with aggression, interfering in the internal affairs of El Salvador and carrying out acts of armed aggression and provocation against the independence of other countries of the region. The latest crime of American imperialism was the armed aggression carried out against Grenada. All of those actions are destabilizing peace and security in Latin America.

In the Middle East, the occupation by the Israeli Zionists of Palestinian, Lebanese and other Arab countries is continuing. The grave crimes they are perpetrating against the Arab peoples are today being carried out with the direct co-operation and participation of the United States. Under the guise of the so-called multinational forces, the United States is using its air and sea forces for direct interference in Lebanon.

In southern Africa, the racist Pretoria régime, confident of the support of imperialism, continues to pay no attention whatsoever to the international community and unceasingly carries out acts of aggression and sabotage aimed at the People's Republic of Angola, Mozambique and other countries of the region, in order to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and criminal policy of apartheid. In co-operating with Israel and certain Western countries, this racist régime is trying to acquire nuclear weapons - weapons which if in the hands of the racists would pose a constant threat to peace and security.

The Lao People's Democratic Republic expresses its solidarity with and complete support for the just struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and apartheid and for freedom and social progress. As a country of South-East Asia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic is in favour of making this region a zone of peace, stability and co-operation. Despite the fact that the Indo-Chinese peoples inflicted a crushing defeat on the policies of colonialism, neo-colonialism and hegemonism and won a final victory in their struggle against the American aggressors in 1975, the hegemonists have made a deal with the American imperialists and continue their hostile acts against these three peoples. In carrying out their expansionist aims

(Mr. Nouanethasing, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

against South-East Asia, they continue to try and maintain tension in South-East Asia. On the Chinese-Laotian and Chinese-Vietnamese borders, the troops of the hegemonists are intensifying their acts of armed provocation and sabotage of all kinds. This tense situation is also continuing along the western borders of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. In this connection our delegation notes with regret that there is a country in our region which offers to the imperialists and hegemonists part of its territory as a base for supplying, arming and preparing the remnants of the troops of old régimes which have fled the countries of Indo-China, in order to undermine the peaceful life of the peoples of these three Indo-Chinese States. It is perfectly obvious that China is the cause of the deterioration of peace and security in South-East Asia and of the tense relations between the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations and those of Indo-China.

As far as the United States of America is concerned, it stubbornly continues its harmful acts against the three peoples of Indo-China. It continues to give all kinds of support to the remnants of the troops of the Pol Pot régime, which is guilty of genocide against the people of Kampuchea, in order to undermine the process of rebirth of the Kampuchean people. It has organized groups of saboteurs in a country adjoining Laos and dispatches them to the territory of the Lao People's Democratic Republic in order to carry out their subversive acts. Such a hostile policy in respect of our country was clearly condemned by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Lao People's Democratic Republic in his statement to the General Assembly on 5 October this year and in the statement of the Permanent Representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to the United Nations on the question of peace, stability and co-operation in South-East Asia.

Having unleashed a campaign of slander against the peoples of Indo-China, the Washington Administration has fabricated the absurd myth of the so-called use of chemical weapons in Laos and Kampuchea, a falsehood which is obvious to the whole world. We cannot fail to be seriously concerned at the existence of American military bases in various parts of Asia and the Indian Ocean which are a dangerous threat to the security of many Asian countries. Recently, attempts to involve other countries in American military preparations have become intensified. For this purpose, a stubborn attempt is being made to create one more military bloc which would include the United States and certain Asian countries. If such a bloc

(Mr. Nouanethasing, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

is created, this will seriously intensify the threat to peace and stability in Asia. Unless we close our eyes to these real facts of life in South-East Asia, we cannot fail to conclude that the United States and the Chinese hegemonists bear direct responsibility for the continuing tension in this region and in Asia as a whole.

As far as the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) is concerned, our delegation notes with satisfaction the appearance there of a certain readiness for dialogue. It would be very desirable for that readiness to become a concrete reality. As was emphasized at the first high-level conference of representatives of Laos, Kampuchea and Viet Nam, relations of friendship and co-operation between the Indo-Chinese and the ASEAN countries are an important factor for peace and stability in South-East Asia. Laos, like Viet Nam and Kampuchea, will continue to make every effort towards further dialogue with the ASEAN countries in order to transform South-East Asia into a zone of peace, stability, friendship and co-operation. This is our principled course.

Considering the seriousness of the world situation and the existence of many sources of tension and conflict in various parts of the world, our delegation feels that the following measures should be carried out in order to ensure and consolidate international peace and security. In the first place, the imperialist Powers, in particular the United States, must liquidate all their military bases and matériel beyond their borders and return territories they occupy to the countries concerned. Secondly, all militarily significant countries must strictly observe the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the non-use of force. Thirdly, considering the danger of a nuclear war, which would threaten the very existence of mankind, the Governments of all countries must seek the commitment by the nuclear Powers not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, decisively oppose the doctrine of limited nuclear war and educate their peoples accordingly. Fourthly, non-nuclear-weapon States must declare that they will not permit the deployment of nuclear weapons on their territories.

The delegation of Laos supports the proposals of the peace-loving countries aimed at strengthening peace and international security, including the proposal by the Mongolian People's Republic for the conclusion of an international convention on mutual non-aggression and the non-use of force in relations between the

(Mr. Nouanethasing, Lao People's
Democratic Republic)

of Asia and the Pacific. At the present time the task of maintaining and strengthening peace and security is particularly important and urgent. The Lao People's Democratic Republic, together with other peace-loving countries, decisively favours improving the international situation on the basis of the generally recognized principles of peaceful co-existence among States, non-interference in internal affairs and respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States. We express the hope that the decisions of the current session of the General Assembly, and of the United Nations as a whole, will make a positive contribution to strengthening international peace and security and the development of co-operation among States.

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece): As my Government has repeatedly stated, Greece is in favour of and strongly supports every initiative aimed at transforming the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and co-operation, free of nuclear weapons and the presence of foreign military forces. In this respect we favour the fact that the issue of the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region is being considered this year as a separate item in the General Assembly. May I recall that my Government's views have been inserted in the report of the Secretary-General in document A/37/355/Add.2 of 1 November 1982.

Security in the Mediterranean is not a notion independent from security in Europe, and in examining the former we should keep constantly in mind the latter as well. Similarly, we feel that, in order for the concept of a zone of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean to become a reality, it must be based on respect for the principles and obligations of the United Nations Charter, the principles of international law, the development of measures of confidence and equal security and the principle of sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States.

Further principles which should prevail are: non-intervention and non-interference in internal affairs, inviolability of frontiers, non-use of force or threat of force, peaceful settlement of disputes and respect for the right of States to sovereignty over their natural resources.

Unfortunately, the continuing Middle East crisis with its latest developments, as well as the purported unilateral declaration of independence of the part of the Republic of Cyprus under Turkish military occupation, have further aggravated an already dangerous situation in the region. While these matters come within the

(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

competence of other forums, none the less there remains the pressing need to strengthen security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. On the contrary, we are convinced that it is all the more imperative for the international community to make serious concerted efforts with regard to the principles and directives set out in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.88/Rev.3, without which this Committee will fail in one of its most important goals, namely, to preserve peace and to strengthen international security in an area which has for too many centuries been a zone of conflict.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, as we move into the final phase of our work in the First Committee, allow me on behalf of my delegation to express to you and the Bureau our appreciation of the splendid manner in which you have conducted the work of our Committee and the innovations you have injected into our process, which we feel have been noteworthy and worthy of emulation.

A debate on the strengthening of international security and co-operation should focus on significant events, events which will lend comfort and hope to the people of the world. We are, are we not, addressing ourselves to the overriding purpose of every session of this Committee? Yet I find myself wondering what we have accomplished, what we hope to accomplish and whether or not we are gathered here only for the exchange of rhetoric. Accordingly, I will take this opportunity to reflect on our activities and accomplishments in the light of our stated goals.

Many participants in this debate have merely recited a litany of problems to demonstrate the seriousness of the current world situation. They have been prompt to affix guilt but remiss in offering genuine and realistic corrective programmes. No one questions the threats to world peace, security and development - individual and collective - in terms of dignity, culture and economics. Neither should anyone believe that the answers will be simple to identify or easy to implement. We know that progress, if it is to be achieved, will depend on our perseverance in good faith, our willingness to engage in genuine debate, to speak and to listen. It is a given that we must build consensus where we can, diminish confrontation whenever possible and maintain our vigilance to ensure that we do not magnify the difficulties of our times. In sum, it is our duty to identify and secure each moment of agreement for all time. Regrettably, an evaluation of our activities leads one to conclude that this session has done little more than demonstrate our divisions. My delegation is disturbed by the abundant efforts some delegations have made to focus the attention of the Committee on divisive issues.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

We are disappointed that it is necessary for us to respond to interventions such as that of the representative of the Soviet Union, who spent a great deal of time lamenting the failure of the intermediate nuclear force (INF) talks and attempting to lay the blame at the feet of the United States and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Of course, we all regret that the talks are now in limbo and hope for an early resumption. My delegation finds it curious that the Soviet representative engaged in such an elaborate effort to shift the blame. Where has he been? The facts are clear to everyone who reads a newspaper, looks at television or listens to a radio, at least where the news is not a State commodity or managed by a State authority. It was the Soviet Union which left the table in Geneva, not the United States. The Soviet negotiators left on the pretence that the implementation of the NATO deployment decision of 1979 made these talks "impossible". Has my esteemed colleague forgotten that the 4-year-old decision was taken because of the Soviet act of stationing a massive and ever-increasing array of intermediate nuclear forces to threaten Western Europe? I would put to him that it is a matter of simple equity and balance that lends rationality to the NATO decision. Then, when one adds to that decision the double-track feature which led to the establishment of the INF negotiations themselves, that decision takes on an even more balanced aspect.

I certainly do not wish to take the time of this Committee to respond fully to all, or even most, of the accusations contained in the Soviet statement to the Committee on Monday. To do so would require undue endurance from all members and divert this intervention from its real purpose: a constructive assessment of the potential of this Committee.

Nevertheless, I feel in duty bound to correct, for the record, the three most egregious misstatements of fact contained in the Soviet speech. Most significant is the Soviet accusation that the missiles being deployed in Western Europe will constitute a "first strike" force. Even the most casual observer will note the uncontestable fact that, even after the deployments are completed, should that prove necessary, the Western countries will have fewer missiles and warheads than the Soviet Union itself now deploys. Full Western deployment will not be sufficient in numbers, range or speed to inflict anything like a disarming strike against the hundreds of command and control sites in the Soviet Union and the thousands of sites containing Soviet nuclear weapons and their delivery systems.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

Secondly, at one point in his statement the Soviet Ambassador said:

"If the United States and other NATO countries show a willingness to revert to the situation that existed prior to the beginning of the deployment of United States medium-range missiles in Europe ... the Soviet Union also will be ready to reciprocate." (A/C.1/38/PV.49, p. 22)

I have no doubt whatever of the truth of this statement, that is, that the Soviet Union would like to continue its build-up without any response from those who are threatened by that build-up. What the Soviet Union has brought about by its own unrelenting quest for dominance in the field of intermediate-range missiles is precisely what it should have anticipated: response - response from the countries against which these weapons are aimed and whose security they threaten. If the Soviet Government is unhappy to see its monopoly in this category of weapons broken, it will certainly receive no sympathy from us. I repeat: the Soviet Union has created this situation itself. If it seeks a remedy, one exists before its very eyes: a return to the negotiating table and a recognition that Soviet efforts to preserve its monopoly have failed and will inevitably fail.

Finally, one other assertion deserves particular attention, that being the mischievous claim that Western missile deployments would somehow threaten countries in Africa and the Middle East. The Soviet Union knows full well the purpose of the Western deployments. However, I invite representatives from all States to examine the deployment patterns of Soviet SS-20 missiles and the capabilities of those weapons. They will discover that these awesome weapons can strike targets in countries washed by the Atlantic, the Indian and Pacific Oceans and all the seas from the north-west coast of Africa to the west coast of Canada.

If inhabitants of States in North Africa, the Middle East, South Asia, South-East Asia and East Asia wish to know the origin of the nuclear threat under which they must now live, I invite their representatives in this chamber to examine the evidence - the very disturbing evidence - which has already raised tensions in a number of countries far removed from the North Atlantic alliance.

The commitment of the United States and the NATO alliance to peace is real, and has been often stated. Still, in spite of the fact that we have stated and continue to repeat that commitment, it is the history of our actions by which we are judged. This is only proper, for, as President Gerald Ford said in Helsinki

(Mr. Fields, United States)

in 1975, when he signed for the United States the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe:

"History will judge not by what we say, but by what we do -- not by the promises we make, but by the promises we keep."

Let us recognize that the security of the world cannot be increased and tensions cannot be eased by simple rhetoric. Governments will continue to be suspicious, especially when words and deeds diverge, for they are entrusted with the sacred duty of protecting their citizens' lives and their way of life.

With the realization that we need more than mere words, more than empty promises, we can dedicate ourselves to identifying practical measures to prevent the rampant conflict and aggression which arise from expansionist ambitions and local rivalries, and thus obtain justice and security for all. It will be necessary to find the way to resolve discord by peaceful means and prevent escalation. For this success will depend upon our dedication to identify and secure the small, seemingly insignificant, steps which will result in increased stability and enhanced security for all people. It is in the interest of securing this peace that my Government works to identify and support initiatives which may seem modest, but are none the less meaningful. They are meaningful because they pave the way to trust and understanding.

As President Reagan stated in his address at the opening of this year's General Assembly session:

"From the beginning, our hope for the United Nations has been that it would reflect the international community at its best. The United Nations at its best can help us transcend fear and violence and can act as an enormous force for peace and prosperity. Working together, we can combat international lawlessness and promote human dignity." (A/38/PV.5, p. 11)

My Government believes the way to achieve this end is to leave the thousands of confrontation and condemnation behind in favour of conciliation and co-operation, no matter how limited it may appear. Let us rekindle our hopes by redoubling our efforts to succeed, even in modest initiatives, in the interest of achieving our larger goal, the prevention of war, as expeditiously as possible.

The people of the United States, no less than anywhere else in the world, are offended by the unnecessary pain and suffering of even one person, and there is no pain more unnecessary than that caused by bigotry and misunderstanding which breed

(Mr. Fields, United States)

wars. This is the reason why my Government urges this body to commit itself to "the prevention of war, in particular nuclear war" rather than just "the prevention of nuclear war alone". We fully recognize the calamity a nuclear war would bring about and are dedicated to preventing it from ever occurring. But we also cannot ignore the lessons of the Second World War. We remember that two nations, the Soviet Union and Germany, lost over 20 million people each in the six and one half years of that purely conventional conflict; other nations involved in that war also suffered massive casualties, including casualties of enormous proportions among the civilian populations. Does anyone doubt that a future conventional war could be less tragic? Does anyone believe, in a world of interdependence, that its misery can be confined?

The reality of the last 40 years demonstrates that war, which should be unthinkable, unfortunately remains ever present. My Government has engaged itself in an effort to identify and support concrete measures suitable for arms control negotiations designed to create a stable security environment. We genuinely believe that practical steps need to be taken, and that much can be done significantly to reduce international tension by co-operating in such areas as the effective elimination of chemical weapons, the timely foreclosure of the threat of the development of radiological weapons, the advancement of efforts to develop a means to compare and then reduce military budgets, and the identification of confidence-building measures which could effectively reduce the risk of war by accident or miscalculation. We urge all delegations to co-operate with us in securing these objectives, and in thus advancing our basic goal.

At this point, I should like to reflect on one of my delegation's disappointing experiences during the current session. I refer to our initiative on the peace and disarmament movement, an initiative which, in its initial form, called for the unimpeded flow of information to all peoples on disarmament issues, and recognized the rights of people to associate freely for the purpose of debating the issues involved and petitioning their Governments. We believe in these goals and view these activities to be consistent with the World Disarmament Campaign, a campaign endorsed by the second special session on disarmament which recognized that:

(Mr. Fields, United States)

"The Campaign should be carried out in all regions of the world in a balanced, factual and objective manner" (A/S-12/32, Annex V, para. 3);
that:

"... universality ... should be guaranteed by the co-operation and participation of all States and by the widest possible dissemination of information ... and opinions on questions of arms limitation and disarmament and the damages relating to all aspects of the arms race and war, in particular nuclear war" (ibid., para. 4);

and that it:

"should provide an opportunity for discussion and debate in all countries on all points of views relating to disarmament issues, objectives and conditions". (ibid., para. 9)

We note that no Government attempted to dispute these principles directly, which could have been reinforced had a vote on the draft resolution in its original form been conducted. Instead, even after extensive consultations with a wide variety of delegations and accommodating them on a number of points, we found the draft resolution subjected to seemingly unending barrages of amendments, amendments whose goal was not to sharpen and enhance it, but which sought to distort and diffuse its focus.

Our intention in introducing this draft resolution was to consolidate an accomplishment of the second special session on disarmament. We hoped to move beyond words into action. My Government's record regarding citizen groups may not be flawless, but we do not fear international scrutiny and evaluation. We welcome it because we depend upon an informed public and are dedicated to ensuring that the information available to it is not limited or manipulated. We respect our critics, whether we agree with them or not. We know that much of the progress of mankind is due to the work of courageous individuals who challenge falsehood in the name of truth, who speak for justice in the face of repression. We are thankful for the passion for truth which leads people to question our weaknesses and expose our errors. We believe that international understanding, peace and security would be well served by a similar respect world-wide and, therefore, whatever the forum, we will strive to promote the free flow of information the world needs to succeed in its goal of building a better and safer future. We will not allow the

(Mr. Fields, United States)

...inspiring spirit of the Helsinki Accords, or the misuse of the United Nations rules and customs of precedent, to deter us from our goal. As sober realists, we must - and must be - prepared for continued and often arduous competition. Yet, we must believe that this competition can - and must be - conducted in a way that leaves room for practical agreements that push back the spectre of conflict. In the nuclear age, this is our mutual responsibility. It is my Government's solemn commitment.

As President Reagan declared on 15 July last:

"We will not flag in our continued determination to work with all Governments and peoples whose goal is the strengthening of peace in freedom. Dialogue, when based on realistic expectations and conducted with patience, can produce results. These results are often gradual and hard won, but they are the necessary building blocks for a more secure and stable world.

"We will persevere, and we urge others to join us in such a dialogue. What all of us have to do is make use of constructive diplomacy to accomplish good rather than of public debate to look good. In this way, we the nations of the United Nations, will identify those measures which, when taken together, will truly strengthen international security and co-operation and thus result in a world that is truly peaceful."

Mr. SAHNOUN (Algeria) (interpretation from French): The current debate on items relating to international security leads us to consider questions relating to the basic scope of our Organization - I would even say its raison d'être: the promotion and consolidation of peace and security for the benefit of all.

Whether they refer to the "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", to the "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region" or to the "Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations", the items on our agenda must be seen from that perspective and are part of the same effort, namely, that of creating the necessary conditions for ensuring genuine world peace.

That there should be such a debate each year in the United Nations indicates the essential role of our Organization as a forum for the harmonization of our respective national policies and as a framework for action for concretely assuming responsibility for the legitimate aspirations of our peoples. For the non-aligned, which has always taken the initiative, this dual role is the outcome of a

(Mr. Sahnoun, Algeria)

stringent doctrine and rigorous action to make peaceful coexistence among nations a credo and democratic debate the best way of achieving it.

In this connection, strict respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter and the need for a stronger and more efficient United Nations become even more crucial in a world increasingly characterized by uncertainty and instability.

It is precisely this general feeling of uncertainty and instability that has led to the recent initiatives to inscribe two new items on our agenda relating to the Mediterranean and collective security.

The Mediterranean - the cradle of civilization and the ancient crossroads of the world - has not escaped the present climate of increased tension. For the most part, the coastal peoples against their will are witnessing the transformation of this sea into an area of confrontation and potentially serious conflict. In this context, the Middle East crisis becomes the festering focal point of an increasingly deteriorating situation.

The many hotbeds of crisis in the Mediterranean basin only increase global tension. Its strategic position raises the stakes and today, mainly owing to external powers, the Mediterranean area has acquired alarming levels of weapons, including nuclear weapons.

In its reply to the Secretary-General on this question, the Algerian Government presented its point of view with respect to the crises threatening security in the Mediterranean and the obstacles to greater development of co-operation, as well as the necessary means for overcoming them.

That an item relating to the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean is inscribed on the agenda reflects the concern of the coastal countries and their determination to have this sea once again become a "lake of peace". They are aware that this goal will take some time and that its achievement will primarily be the work of those immediately concerned. However, the co-operation of other States is obviously indispensable for the success of this undertaking.

Furthermore, our faith in the United Nations leads us to believe that it is within this Organization that such undertakings stand the best chance of succeeding.

This same faith in the Organization has led a brother country, Sierra Leone, to initiate a debate on the collective security system provided for in the Charter.

(Mr. Sahnoun, Algeria)

The corner-stone of the United Nations as a whole, and originally conceived to ensure security in the world and prevent any attempt to undermine it - this system, for various reasons, has ended up being completely ignored and has even become obsolescent, owing to the absence of agreement among the permanent members of the Security Council which prevented its implementation.

For this reason, the United Nations has not been able to assume the basic role it had set for itself, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security, by resolving crises and dissuading and, if necessary, suppressing aggression. At best, it has through various isolated actions attempted to contain certain crises.

The current initiative is a timely effort to put the primary function of our Organization back on the agenda, when most countries increasingly feel that real dangers threaten them.

That is because the permanent risks inherent in international relations, which are for the greater part based on relationships of force and balances of power, are today aggravated by increasing violations of the elementary principles of healthy international life: frequent resort to force as a means of both settling disputes and of subjugation; flagrant attacks against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States and on their right to choose their own political, economic and social systems; denial of the rights of peoples to self-determination in full freedom; attempts at geo-strategically partitioning-off the third world and establishing or strengthening zones of influence and subjugation; persistence of the policy of exploitation and usurpation in total contempt of the rights of peoples to full sovereignty over their natural resources and over their own national economic development; and emasculation of the national liberation struggles of peoples to integrate them into the East-West ideological conflict, thus justifying all kinds of policies of pressure, intimidation, intervention, interference and destabilization.

In a world of crisis and turmoil force all too often prevails over law and violence takes the place of dialogue.

In southern Africa the hell of apartheid continues and Namibia is still being deprived of its independence, while the front-line countries are the victims of the constant aggression of the Pretoria régime, whose actions are abetted by some complicitous Powers which ensure it impunity.

(Mr. Sahnoun, Algeria)

In the Middle East, where the tragedy of the Palestinian people is sorely testing the credibility of the United Nations, Israel is continuing to subject the region as a whole to the law of terror and expansionism. The recent strengthening of a strategic alliance with a great Power will only increase that country's aggressiveness and arrogance while increasing the serious threats its deeds have for decades posed to international peace and security.

In Central America the efforts of peoples to achieve a better national life in freedom and dignity are still being thwarted.

Those three examples, although they do not exhaust an international catalogue that is unfortunately all too rich in hotbeds of tension, are nevertheless critical situations that can rapidly degenerate into open conflicts and threaten peace and security in the world.

At the same time, the world economy is at a crossroads where the imbalances inherent in a basically unjust system are being greatly increased by a growth crisis in which a whole gamut of factors are contributing to the increase in tensions and the risks of an uncontrollable collapse. The faint signs of an upturn cannot wipe out all the symptoms of a profound crisis, nor can they solve its structural problems, so long as in our analysis of this crisis we persist in ignoring its underlying causes.

Worse still, far from slowing down the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, is increasing and spreading to newer areas, and it is now not even sparing outer space. A new round has begun in the renewed cold war between the two blocs which ineluctably draws in the rest of the international community. In spite of the serious level it has reached, the negotiating process is blocked and the very spirit of dialogue has been fundamentally called into question.

Such a tally, hopeless as it may appear, is neither the result of exaggerated pessimism nor even less does it imply resignation. It is the necessary point of departure for any lucid analysis of a situation that calls for necessarily new steps combining boldness in the pursuit of objectives and imagination in their implementation.

First of all at the global level we must proceed to a de facto renunciation of any hegemony, whether of form or of values, and see to it that in the daily life of peoples are enshrined all the principles and implications of a true policy of coexistence and co-operation based solely on the implementation, in good faith, of the principles and purposes of the Charter.

(Mr. Sahnoun, Algeria)

Such a step, difficult as it may be, remains the obligatory action in an embodiment of any real will to divert the world from the suicidal logic it has hitherto been following.

In this connection the independence of States and the self-determination of peoples are the cardinal elements of any effort aimed at a true cleansing in international life, and the third world must cease to allow itself to be used as a pawn or as a field open to the implantation of all sorts of disturbances. In addition to freedom and independence, which are often won at the price of untold sufferings and sacrifices, the peoples today are most in need of strict respect for their own aspirations and choices.

Only a new vision of the world can with assurance bring about the fulfilment of such needs through the establishment of relations among States based upon the indispensable foundations of equality and justice.

Non-alignment has been offering such an alternative strategy for two decades. Going beyond the bipolar organization of the world and beyond any will to exploitation or domination, such a strategy is aimed at ensuring peace and development to all, thereby eliminating all the motives that at present make the use of force the preferred method by which to assert one's will.

In support of that strategy, the Non-Aligned Movement has not stinted either in initiatives or in its willingness to discuss those great ideals that can enable mankind to rise to relatively new stages in its evolution. The establishment of a new international economic order and the launching of global economic negotiations, on the one hand, and general and complete disarmament and the comprehensive disarmament programme, on the other, constitute real opportunities for civilization. The lack of any result in the negotiations on these great ideals, owing principally to the obstruction and absence of political will of certain Powers, in no way detracts from the intrinsic validity of such values or from their invaluable contribution to the definition of new international relationships.

Experience in the field of decolonization has demonstrated and continues to demonstrate how dangerous it is for mankind to nourish the illusion that relations can be perpetuated by force, exploitation and inequality. It teaches us how salutary the path of dialogue can be for gaining an awareness of the changes necessary in relations among States.

It is in that spirit that at the seventh Summit Meeting of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries the Algerian Head of State, President Chadli Bendjedid, stated:

(Mr. Sahnoun, Algeria)

"To the world shaken by a crisis of confidence, a crisis of identity and a crisis of dialogue, our Movement suggests ways of reopening communication. Through such ordered concertation the existing disorder can be put right."

Mr. WEEDY (Afghanistan): The First Committee is discussing the agenda item "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security" this year at a time when the international political and security climate is fraught with greater dangers and threats than at any other time in recent years.

Material preparations are already under way for the implementation of such heinous and inhuman imperialist designs as the launching of a nuclear war, which - they wish us to believe - would be "limited", "protracted" and "winnable".

The United States is busy, in great haste, with the deployment of its nuclear Pershing 2 and cruise missiles in various European countries targeted at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This is being done in sheer disregard of the strong protests of the overwhelming majority of the European and other peoples all over the world. In circumstances in which the world has attached its hopes to the success of the Geneva negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on limiting medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, the United States went ahead to put into effect its gravely dangerous plans, thus making it impossible for the other party to continue with the negotiations.

The declared intention of United States warmongering circles was to confront the Soviet Union, the whole of Europe and the world with a fait accompli. This irresponsible action by the White House proved that the demagogic and hypocritical hue and cry over the reduction in Europe of medium-range nuclear missiles and presentation of some clearly unacceptable proposals to that effect were mere masks to hide the real aim for stationing United States nuclear missiles at the doorsteps of the Soviet Union and other socialist States.

Those highly advanced nuclear arsenals hit the widely publicized doctrines of "first strike" and "surprise nuclear attack" developed by the Pentagon and forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Europe. The Pershing 2, with a speed that takes it to Soviet territory in five to six minutes, and the Cruise with a very low-altitude flight - and thus the possibility of undetected intrusion - and the ultra-high accuracy of both systems could not possibly have been designed for defensive purposes. Therefore, arguments adduced to convince others that those missiles are stationed there because of a hypothetical threat from the Soviet Union completely lose their validity.

(Mr. Weedy, Afghanistan)

Assuming that a nuclear exchange in Europe would make it possible for the United States to escape the fatal and destructive consequences of a nuclear war fought thousands of miles away from its territory, the rulers in the White House have written off the people of Europe as cannon fodder. It is with the same assertion that they are trying to pacify the outrage of peoples in other continents over the rapidly intensifying danger of nuclear war in Europe.

But with the means for conducting a nuclear war scattered all over the world in the form of submarine-based ballistic missiles, the existence of long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles and the various means of long-range delivery, it would be naive to think that a quick proliferation of nuclear exchanges to other parts of the globe could be prevented. It is only logical to believe that a nuclear attack on the Soviet Union by the United States would be met only with a similar strike against the latter.

As far as other countries are concerned, even the present site of United States nuclear weapons in Sicily brings a large number of countries in Asia and Africa within range of such weapons.

It is therefore the present situation resulting from the stationing of United States nuclear missiles in Europe that constitutes a cause of the utmost concern not only for the European peoples but also for peoples all over the world.

While strongly condemning the reckless and confrontational policy of the United States Administration, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has demanded an immediate return to the conditions existing prior to the stationing of United States nuclear missiles in Europe, thus paving the way for the resumption of talks on the limitation of medium-range missiles there.

An end must be put to this war drive before the world is pushed to the point of no return.

As a result of United States aggressive and expansionist policies, one can hardly find any region of the world that is immune from tension and hostility. While the threat of nuclear war haunts the very existence of humanity, the ever-growing hotbeds of tension created by imperialist forces continue to endanger peace and security.

Recently we witnessed the invasion of Grenada by the United States of America, in total disregard of international law and human morality. The premeditated invasion of Grenada and the threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of the Caribbean countries are a source of great concern.

(Mr. Weedy, Afghanistan)

In the Middle East, Israel, in collusion with United States imperialism, continues the occupation of Palestinian lands and denying the inalienable rights of the valiant Palestinian people. Israel poses a great threat to the peace and security of that region. Those threats have been intensified further by the latest military agreements between the United States and Israel. Peace and security in the Middle East will be a lost cause so long as the Palestinian people are prevented from realizing their legitimate rights.

In Africa, the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa, with its continuous acts of aggression against neighbouring countries, its continued occupation of Namibia and its acquisition of a nuclear capability, have greatly endangered the security of that continent. We condemn the inhuman policies of South Africa and the efforts of the Western contact group in prolonging the South African colonial hold on Namibia.

In South-East Asia, the aggressive policies of the hegemonist quarters have endangered the peaceful development of the people of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam. Attempts to destabilize the social system of Viet Nam, Kampuchea and Laos are being made by the reactionary forces with the support of their imperialist patrons.

The continued presence of military bases in the Indian Ocean area and their further modernization present an unprecedented threat to the peace and security of our region. The imperialist forces use every pretext to perpetuate their presence in that area, in total disregard of the desires of the people of the region.

As a hinterland State of the Indian Ocean, we attach great importance to the realization of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

The undeclared war being waged against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan by imperialism and the reactionary States of the region continues unabated. Bands of terrorists are sent to the territory of my country to commit unspeakable crimes against our people.

We have done all we can to discourage the neighbouring countries from pursuing their hostile policies. We are fully confident that through negotiations existing problems will be solved. We are one of the strongest proponents of peaceful coexistence and good-neighbourly relations. We have made and will continue to make every effort to establish an atmosphere of mutual understanding in our region. It is for the countries of the region to set aside their selfish policies and join us in our endeavour to create an atmosphere of peace and security.

(Mr. Weedy, Afghanistan)

I should like to read out parts of the statement of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan on international situations, issued yesterday, 6 December 1983:

"United States imperialism has launched open aggression against the forces of peace and social progress.

"The Reagan Administration tries to cover up its actions by false propaganda about the so-called defence of human rights, or supporting American nationals inhabiting this or that country, and shamelessly sheds the blood of innocent people.

"United States imperialism has resorted to such actions in Viet Nam and now openly practises the same in Grenada, El Salvador, Lebanon and other countries of the world.

"The criminal undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which has been continuing for more than five years, is one of the examples of the aggressive character of American imperialism.

"The heroic people of Afghanistan, who have chosen the way of building a new society in the country under the leadership of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, are compelled to struggle heroically against counter-revolution which is encouraged, financed, supported and armed by Washington and from the centres of some other countries and to put the best of their manpower to this task.

"The people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan are not alone in their just struggle but enjoy the support of all progressive forces of the world, headed by the Soviet Union.

"Now a most dangerous situation has emerged around Nicaragua, and Washington is preparing a major armed invasion of that country using contingents of regular armed forces of Honduras and Guatemala with the direct participation of traitors of Somoza bands and the United States Army.

"These actions of the American militarists, which are part of Washington's general adventurist plan, are a grave and open threat and danger not only to the people of Nicaragua but also for socialist Cuba, other countries of Latin America and national liberation movements in other parts of the world.

"The actions of the White House policy-makers, their hegemonistic and expansionist policies reveal clearly the hostile character of imperialism towards other peoples and humanity as a whole.

(Mr. Weedy, Afghanistan)

"The peoples of the world, the Governments of many countries and representatives of various social organizations have strongly condemned Washington's aggressive actions and voiced their support for the just cause of the Nicaraguan people and their struggle for independence and national sovereignty.

"The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, representing all the peace-loving Afghan people, resolutely condemns the aggressive policy of Reagan vis-à-vis Nicaragua and his reactionary plan for undermining the national sovereignty of a non-aligned country which is also a Member of the United Nations. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan proclaims the firm solidarity of the Afghan people with the brotherly people of Nicaragua.

"We say to our militant Nicaraguan brothers: We are with you; all progressive mankind is with you. All hands off revolutionary Nicaragua."

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the representative of Malta to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.88/Rev.1.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): The Mediterranean countries of Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Tunisia and Yugoslavia, together with Romania, have joined to co-sponsor a revised version of draft resolution A/1.38/L.88, on the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. Other sponsors are still to follow. The co-sponsors have given me the honour and privilege of formally introducing the revised draft resolution before the members of this Committee.

I think the draft resolution speaks for itself. In its preambular paragraphs it recognizes the importance of the matter and its relevance to international peace and security. It recalls the provisions relating to the Mediterranean in the Helsinki Final Act, and of subsequent follow-up meetings within the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation, held in Belgrade and Madrid, which also covered Mediterranean aspects.

It notes with appreciation the repeated declarations made at Ministerial and Head of State level by the Non-Aligned Movement concerning peace and security in the Mediterranean, as well as official declarations in the same sense, and tangible contributions made to attain the desired objective.

It then goes on to express appreciation for the report of the Secretary-General in document A/38/395 of 30 September.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

The preambular paragraphs thus bring together, and highlight, all the many international agreements, declarations and official studies and statements made so far on this particular aspect.

In operative paragraph 1 it brings out, in proper perspective, the concept of Mediterranean security as it relates to neighbouring States and to global security, and it identifies the need for further efforts urgently to promote the required progress, as well as the more relevant principles which should guide those efforts.

The General Assembly thus stamps its seal of approval on the concept and on the underlying principles, while recognizing that further efforts are necessary in order to achieve the desired objective. For this purpose, it encourages the States of the Mediterranean, bearing in mind the special characteristics and security aspects of the region, to join in efforts to concert views and devise initiatives among themselves and, as appropriate, with neighbouring States and with other concerned States, in order to intensify existing co-operative efforts and to devise new ones in as many sectors as possible, particularly with a view to reducing tension and strengthening confidence among the States in the region, thus enhancing regional security.

As a necessary corollary, the General Assembly urges all States to extend their co-operation and to assist in these efforts.

The Secretary-General is also asked to give more attention to this important question, to extend advice and assistance to Mediterranean States if requested to do so, and to supplement and consolidate his report on this question in time for the next session of the General Assembly, taking into account, in the preparation of his report, all replies received and notifications submitted, as well as the current debate, which, it will be recalled, is the first one to have gone in some depth on particular aspects concentrated more directly to Mediterranean security.

Finally, I should like to say that we have been given to understand, and we are pleased to confirm, that no financial implication are involved in the preparation of the study.

As now revised, the text is not the perfect text that any one of the sponsors would have wished to propose, either individually or collectively. In all frankness, I must say that, even though we had shown our ideas as early as we could, it was only in these last few days that we were given some precise reactions. At a meeting held yesterday afternoon, the sponsors bent over backwards and laboured hard to take into account, to the extent considered reasonable, all -

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

I repeat, all - the many observations to the original text that had been made to us. I honestly believe that we have stretched ourselves to a limit beyond which it would be very difficult to go, though we do remain open to last-minute amendments.

In summary, it is only a very modest first step that the sponsors are suggesting. We are only seeking a genuine attempt at concerted co-operation in the common interest. We trust that this co-operation will be forthcoming from all quarters. And, as a positive start, we hope it will be possible for the draft resolution to be adopted by consensus.

May I be permitted to point out two typographical errors that have appeared in the revised text. In operative paragraph 1 (a), in the second line, the sixth word, instead of the word "of" should read "for". In other words, it would read: "regions are interdependent and significant for peace and security", not "of peace and security".

Also, in operative paragraph 6, in the third line, the seventh word should be "resolution", not "resolutions". It would read: "submitted in the implementation of this resolution".

Those two typographical errors notwithstanding, I should like to take this opportunity to thank the Secretariat for having reproduced the text at such short notice.

The CHAIRMAN: That completes our general debate on the agenda items relating to the strengthening of international security. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise the right of reply. Before doing so, I would like to draw the Committee's attention to the decision of the General Assembly, taken at its thirty-fourth session, which reads as follows:

"Delegations should exercise their right of reply at the end of the day whenever two meetings have been scheduled for that day and whenever such meetings are devoted to the consideration of the same item.

"The number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting should be limited to two per item."

Therefore, I shall give delegations the opportunity to exercise the right of reply only twice. The first intervention for any delegation will be limited to ten minutes, and the second intervention to five minutes. These are the ground rules.

Mr. MERRY (United States of America): I must comment briefly on the intemperate falsehood-laden remarks of the Cuban representative yesterday about the United States, to which he appears to attribute all the world's ills.

First, the Cuban representative attacked the United States for its actions in Grenada, comparing them to the methods employed by Hitler during the Second World War. As a result of the intercession of the Eastern Caribbean States, supported by the United States, which, by the way, is now in the process of withdrawing its forces, Grenada is today a free country in the process of rebuilding its democracy. It is free, not least, of Cuba. To the extent that comparisons with the Nazis are in order, I suggest that the representative of Cuba seems himself to be a disciple of Joseph Goebbels - he of the "big lie" technique.

The Committee will, incidentally, not have forgotten that Cuba was among those countries which voted to stifle debate on Grenada in plenary meeting. It is thus doubly inappropriate that Cuba seek to merchandise its squalid distortions here.

As for the allegations of Cuba concerning Nicaragua, they are false. The United States is not at war with Nicaragua and is not preparing to invade it. Cuba's charges regarding the deployment of United States intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe are equally false. These forces are designed entirely to rectify a dangerous imbalance arising from deployments by the Soviet Union.

Likewise, the assertions of the representative of Cuba about Lebanon, the Middle East and southern Africa must be understood for what they are: more propaganda in the Goebbels vein. Such mouthings, I wish to think, fool no one who has access to the facts.

Can anyone be unaware that the United States played a leading role in the defeat of the Hitler dictatorship and in the founding of the United Nations? How ironic that representatives of new dictatorships now exploit this body to attack the United States for its continuing efforts in defence of peace and freedom.

Mr. TARI (Israel) (interpretation from French): The hour is late, and our work is coming to an end. I regret at this stage to have to exercise my right of reply once again, and I shall be particularly brief.

I can only reject categorically the statements made this morning by the representative of Syria against my country. Those statements, as a matter of fact, are in the same vein as those recently made by the representatives of Libya, Iraq and certain other countries. Verbal aggression has now become a commonplace in

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

this Committee, where it frequently replaces a constructive search for solutions. What is particularly striking in the statement of the representative of Syria this morning is not simply the resort to ritualized slander but the truly absurd character of the speech, which would be laughable if it did not concern tragic events. Syria, which was responsible for the Hama massacre - 30,000 deaths in Syria itself - and for the hecatomb of Tripoli and which is practising and encouraging terrorism and which for years has been working without any restraint to bring about the dismantling of Lebanon and its annexation by Damascus - that same Syria dares without flinching to advocate non-intervention in the internal affairs of countries of the Middle East, the right of peoples to self-determination and democracy and respect for human freedoms. This attitude once again pushes hypocrisy to its utmost limits. This is so obvious that it needs no further elaboration.

As for the substance of the matter, namely, the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region - of which the representatives of Libya, Iraq and Syria have just given us such convincing examples - Israel has in the past clearly stated its position and it has reiterated it in detail in its reply to the Secretary-General of the United Nations dated 26 October 1983. That letter has been reproduced in an addendum to the Secretary-General's report on the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region, dated 10 November 1983, in document A/38/291/Add.2.

I would emphasize that the Government of Israel has reiterated in that document, in particular, that it is ready to negotiate on regional measures with all the States of the region, and specifically the countries of the Mediterranean basin, at any time and without any prior conditions.

Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In listening to the statement of the representative of the United States, Ambassador Fields, I understood that each representative has to defend the policy of his country. The question is merely by what methods that is done. The methods of United States diplomacy are falsification and keeping silent with regard to the facts. I shall refer to four points in responding to the United States representative - who, incidentally, has fled the field of battle. I shall be specific and I shall speak with figures at hand.

First, the representative of the United States asserted that in Europe there is apparently some sort of Soviet monopoly over missiles. First of all, this is not true, inasmuch as missiles also exist on the Western side. There are 162 missiles of the United Kingdom and France, each one of which is equipped with one, three or six warheads. Moreover, there are 44 bombers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries equipped with nuclear weapons. However, the United States is playing another trick, in that it is deliberately keeping silent about the fact that the United States side has other means of delivery of nuclear weapons in Europe apart from missiles. These are the United States nuclear bombers, of which there are 651 there. Why are these figures being concealed by United States representatives in the various discussions? Why are they concealing these figures from the United States public itself? It is quite understandable: if these figures became known, it would become clear that, as regards nuclear weapons in Europe, there was approximate parity, and then it would be difficult to justify the deployment in Western Europe of 572 new United States nuclear missiles.

Secondly, our deployment of SS-20 missiles and the present deployment by the United States of its missiles involve two qualitatively different actions. When we deployed the SS-20 missiles we did not violate the approximate parity in Europe. For every two missiles of the SS-20 type, we removed three older missiles: the parity was not violated. Moreover, when we deployed our SS-20 missiles in Europe, those missiles did not constitute a direct threat to the territory of the United States itself. The Pershing and cruise missiles are a threat to Soviet territory.

Thirdly, why, in general, is it that United States representatives speak of the threat of SS-20 missiles? Let us compare the two situations. In 1976, when the Soviet Union still had no SS-20 missiles, we had in Europe approximately 600 missiles of the SS-4 and SS-5 types. These were single-warhead missiles.

Our most recent proposal at the Geneva talks consisted of the following items: we would keep only 140 SS-20 missiles, each one of which is equipped with three warheads, which means that we were ready to leave ourselves with 420 nuclear charges. Thus, in 1976, we had 600 nuclear charges on our missiles. In 1983 we proposed to leave only 420 nuclear charges on our missiles. This is a decrease of one third as compared to the 1976 level. How, then, can the United States speak of any threat of Soviet SS-20 missiles when the number of warheads has been decreased by one third? This is being said only in order to have an excuse for the

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

deployment of its own additional missiles - which are first-strike weapons.

Fourthly and lastly - there are two key questions in international life today according to which one can judge the policy of this or that nuclear Power. The first is whether a nuclear Power is ready to refrain from being the first to use nuclear weapons. One and a half years ago the Soviet Union assumed such an obligation not to be the first. The United States does not wish to assume such an obligation. It is contemplating being the first to use nuclear weapons. The second is that the Soviet Union proposed, and is ready to accept, a mutual freeze of nuclear weapons both qualitatively and quantitatively. The United States rejects this proposal.

These are the words and the actions of American diplomacy.

Mr. QIAN Jiadong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I have asked to speak at this late hour because of the fact that one of the representatives just now mentioned my country, China, in his statement. He said that China was pursuing a policy of hegemonism; that China was the root cause of the unstable situation in South-East Asia, and so on.

Of course, these assertions are not new. I do not intend to waste the Committee's time in refuting these remarks. Besides, they are not worthy of refutation, because the real root cause of the unstable situation in South-East Asia is known to all.

I should only like to mention the following: If this country really intends to make a contribution to the peace and security of South-East Asia, then the best way for it to do so is to let all the foreign troops in this area return to their homeland.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): First of all, I should like to thank the delegation of the United States for the interest it has taken in listening to the statement of Cuba in the First Committee. This is an incentive to us in our work and encourages us all the better to prepare ourselves every day.

I am in complete agreement with what the representative of the United States said about the United States contribution to the defeat of fascism during the Second World War. That is true. It is also true that later they harboured a large number of Nazi criminals; and it is also true that many American military units to this very day are using the same symbol, the same skull used by the Nazis.

(Mr. Nunez Mosquera, Cuba)

The brief reference made by the representative of the United States to events in Grenada does not surprise me. In a previous statement, as well as today, the United States representative spoke about democracy on the island. We have read in the newspapers that the person whom the Governor-General wanted to head the Government of the island did not take over that Government because the invading marines do not want to withdraw. That is respect for democracy in Grenada. They spoke about the presence of Cuban soldiers. But it has been proven that those soldiers were, in fact, ill-equipped workers who did not have a single piece of ammunition or weapon, and they were captured by the marines in Grenada. They said they would withdraw from Grenada, but they are still occupying the island. They said they had found I do not know what quantities of weapons. They even pompously organized an exhibition of these "weapons", which they had to close down because the public failed to attend.

It is also ridiculous that the representative of the United States should assert here that the actions of his country in Central America do not represent a threat to Nicaragua. Of course, the United States has not declared war on Nicaragua. The United States is carrying on an increasingly dirty and undeclared war against Nicaragua. Let the United States representative say here whether or not it is true that \$24 million were approved by the Congress recently to continue their covert action against Nicaragua. Let the United States representative say here whether or not it is true that they are continuing with military manoeuvres, the longest in the history of the Western Hemisphere, with no end in sight. Let the United States representative say here whether or not it is true that they maintain their warships in the Caribbean area and in the Pacific near the coast of Nicaragua. Let him say whether it is true or not that the Pegasus plan exists - which was denounced here this morning by Ambassador Chamorro Mora, the representative of Nicaragua. Let him say here whether or not what I am about to quote was said by the United States Ambassador to Costa Rica, Mr. Curtin Winsor, to a Costa Rican newspaper, La Nacion:

"It is not impossible that Nicaragua will be invaded, although there is no definite plan. The United States is not prepared to live with a Marxist-Leninist régime which is subversive and active in the region."

He further said:

"My country is creating the conditions to change the Nicaraguan régime. To achieve our objective, we need to persuade and also to use pressure. If

(Mr. Nunez Mosquera, Cuba)

this does not work, it is possible we may have to do something more."

But I completely agree with the views expressed a few minutes ago by Ambassador Fields that this Committee is not the place for launching into tirades. In an interview given by President Reagan after the events on Grenada, there was a very interesting dialogue, part of which is as follows:

(spoke in English)

"Why did 100 nations in the United Nations not agree with you that this was a world-wide venture?"

(continued in Spanish)

President Reagan replied:

(spoke in English)

"One hundred nations in the United Nations have not agreed with us on just about everything that has come before them where we are involved, and it did not upset my breakfast at all."

(continued in Spanish)

With such a Head of State, what can one expect from that State's representatives?

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): We have heard the words of astonishment uttered by the representative of the Zionist entity because it has become a habit of the Arabs to attack the representatives of the Zionist entity in the General Assembly and various Committees of the United Nations. I wish to assure the Zionist representative that not only the Arab countries criticize them. The vast majority of the delegations here have condemned the Zionist occupation of Palestine and the displacement of the Palestinian people and compared this Nazi-Fascist régime with that of the minority régime in southern Africa.

The Zionist representative talked about the situation in Tripoli, when this Committee is dealing with international security and not Tripoli. However, in view of the fact that the Zionist representative made this reference, I wish to assure him before this Committee that the question of Tripoli is an internal conflict within the framework of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), Syria and other Arab countries, which are endeavouring to do their utmost to put an end to the fighting between brothers, and we have succeeded in closing Palestinian ranks and directing the Palestinian guns towards liberating our Palestinian land. If the

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Zionist representative weeps over the Palestinian situation, he should direct his efforts towards his Government to stop displacing Palestinians, massacring them and expelling them to other Arab countries.

Syria does not have the reputation of disturbing international security. The annals of the United Nations show that our record is clean. On the other hand, Israel has a long record of disturbing international peace and security: the General Assembly and every single Committee at the United Nations have all condemned and denounced Israeli policies.

Mr. NOUANETHASING (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): One delegation indicated that I referred to the true cause for tension in South-East Asia. However, that delegation seems to be displeased. I shall have to add, therefore, a further set of real facts relating to the situation in that region.

A few moments ago the representative of the People's Republic of China spoke and demanded that some people should withdraw from my country. I should like to tell him that, if he does not like what I said, then why is it that China is training, arming and feeding the remnants of the Pol Pot régime, which is guilty of genocide against the Kampuchean people? Why is it that China is collecting - not all - but some 30,000 Lao counter-revolutionaries? Why is China training them? Why is China feeding them in the southern province of China, namely, the province of Hunan? Why is China doing all that?

Then there is the further fact: Has China not committed armed intervention in Viet Nam? How many people have they killed there? And now China is occupying Vietnamese islands. That is a genuine fact.

If the representative does not like all of this, then his country should cease the actions I have mentioned, and then the situation would improve.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the delegation of Malawi has become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.83/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.