

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

*Official Records**



UN LIBRARY

DEC 11 1984

FIRST COMMITTEE
59th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 5 December 1984
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTY-NINTH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 67: STRENGTHENING OF SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 68: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 69: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 143: INADMISSIBILITY OF THE POLICY OF STATE TERRORISM AND ANY ACTIONS BY STATES AIMED AT UNDERMINING THE SOCIO-POLITICAL SYSTEM IN OTHER SOVEREIGN STATES (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 67 TO 69 AND 143 (continued)

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

Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Our discussion of the range of issues which are connected with the strengthening of international security this year is a particularly timely event. It is perfectly obvious that the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, has led mankind into a deadlock: either a further spiral in that race and a slide into the abyss of catastrophe, or limiting and reducing the piles of weapons, disarmament and peaceful coexistence among States with different social systems. There is no other option. The world has approached the point where inaction becomes dangerous and even criminal.

As a nuclear Power, the Soviet Union bases its policy on a feeling of responsibility for the fate of the world. We have never counted on achieving military supremacy. We have never initiated new spirals in the arms race. And these are not mere words; these are facts which cannot be expunged from history. It is not the Soviet Union and the socialist countries which started the escalation of military expenditure. It is not they who started to turn away from agreements concluded previously, who have hindered their ratification or who have refused to bring them into force. It is not we who have broken off talks on a general and complete nuclear-weapons test ban, on the question of the weapons trade or on anti-satellite systems. It is not the Soviet Union which has undertaken efforts to emasculate and block the whole process of limiting and reducing armaments by putting forward proposals which are deliberately calculated to produce a deadlock in the talks.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

It is not the Soviet Union which started to deploy nuclear missiles near the United States, but rather the United States which began the deployment of its new first-strike nuclear missiles in Europe, on our very doorstep. By that very act they torpedoed the talks on nuclear armaments, both strategic and medium-range.

Those irrefutable facts clearly show that the policy of confrontation pursued by the United States and its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, and that only, is responsible for further aggravating the confrontation. Warlike circles of imperialism stubbornly pursue a militaristic policy in international affairs. The implacable spirals of the arms race continue. Yet further piles of weapons are being accumulated. It is precisely that sort of policy and that kind of action that constitute a threat to peace, undermine international security and increase the danger of nuclear annihilation.

The United Nations is acutely aware of the alarm over the growing threat of nuclear war and the dangerous course of international events, as is reflected in the resolutions condemning nuclear war, those concerning a freeze on nuclear weapons and those on prevention of an arms race in outer space and so on. All those resolutions, as well as the numerous statements made by representatives of the majority of States, indicate the universal awareness of the need to halt present dangerous developments and bring about real progress towards peace.

The Soviet Union has consistently favoured, and continues to favour, strengthening international security, disarmament and the non-use of force in international relations.

The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet,

Mr. K. U. Chernenko, has emphasized:

"We favour the peaceful resolution of international disputes through serious, equal and constructive talks. The Soviet Union intends fully to co-operate with all those States that are prepared through practical deeds to help to reduce international tension and to create an atmosphere of trust in the world - in other words, with those whose actions will really not lead to preparations for war, but, rather, to strengthening the foundations of peace. We believe that to this end full use should be made of all existing tools, including, of course, the United Nations, which was created precisely in order to preserve and consolidate peace."

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

The seriousness of the Soviet Union's intentions has been proved by specific deeds, including our unilateral undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, our readiness to impose an immediate freeze on all our nuclear devices, if other nuclear Powers do the same; and the unilateral moratorium that we have declared on putting anti-satellite weapons into space, as long as the other side acts in the same way.

We have recently heard from Washington rumours to the effect that there is a desire to solve questions relating to arms limitation. If those statements do not remain simply words, it will finally be possible to start to move towards more normal relations and a more secure world. However, the point at issue is that the United States should in fact join us in our search for real solutions to specific problems.

It is important to bear in mind the following statement by Mr. K. U. Chernenko also:

"The desire to achieve military supremacy and honest, business-like talks on matters affecting the national security of the parties are irreconcilable." We cannot believe in the olive branch offered in one hand if the other hand is brandishing a weapon. The one that has done everything to undermine trust between States must give a cogent demonstration that it is sincerely prepared now to turn over a new leaf and is not simply seeking camouflage in order to continue its old policies.

I should like to quote the following passage from the communiqué of the recent meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, held in Berlin, capital of the German Democratic Republic:

"The States represented at the meeting welcomed the agreement which has been reached by the United States and the Soviet Union to hold talks on the whole range of issues relating to nuclear and space weapons and attach great importance to it. The States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty believe that from the very outset there should be an accurate definite definition of the aims and tasks of the negotiations, whose purpose is to strengthen strategic stability, prevent the militarization of outer space and reduce the degree of nuclear confrontation in Europe and in the world at large by reducing nuclear armaments, both strategic and medium-range, until they are completely eliminated."

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

Experience has shown that a policy based on force in international relations can only lead to stalemate and increase the threat of war. It would be of fundamental significance in the present conditions if relations between the Soviet Union and the United States - and other nuclear Powers as well - were to be governed by specific basic norms and were they, first and foremost, to regard the task of averting nuclear war as the main goal of their foreign policies.

A radical improvement is needed not only in relations between the nuclear Powers but in the international climate as a whole. There is an urgent need to resolve old international conflicts. An end must be put to the dangerous state of destabilization in international affairs created by recent acts of aggression. We must seek to forestall new instances of the use of force.

The list of such problems is endless. In the Middle East a running sore on the body of the Arab nation is Israel's continued occupation of lands it seized in 1967 and after. In order for peace to endure in that region of the world it must be a just peace and one that eliminates the consequences of Israel's aggression. The conclusion of an agreement on "strategic co-operation" with the aggressor, however, encourages rather than restrains it. Firing from ships onto Lebanese territory can in no way be seen as assisting the victims of aggression. Nor can the Arabs have an Israeli-style peace foisted upon them. The Middle East problem can be resolved only through honest collective efforts. Five months ago the Soviet Union put forward a detailed proposal on the principles on which a Middle East settlement should be based and the ways of achieving it. We are convinced that this is the only correct approach and one that is likely to succeed.

In the southern part of Africa the inhuman apartheid régime continues brutally to oppress the indigenous population, to occupy Namibia and to have dangerous effects on the territories of neighbouring States. So-called "constructive engagement" with that régime and preventing the Security Council from taking any effective steps against it are in blatant contradiction with the interests of the African countries and peoples and serve simply to encourage the racists.

In Latin America an attempt is being made to resuscitate the era of gunboat diplomacy. The independence of the small country of Grenada has been trampled under the boots of the interventionist. In the case of Nicaragua actions have been taken that flout the generally accepted norms of international law. Nicaraguan

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

ports have been mined, the country's populated areas have been bombed, mercenaries have been trained and armed and the assassination of statesmen and politicians has been planned - in short, the policy being pursued against that small country is becoming one of the most shameful pages of history.

Outside interference has further aggravated the situation in Asia, where a policy of force is being used in the Far East and in the Indian Ocean. The increasing military co-operation between the United States, Japan and South Korea is aimed at creating a kind of eastern branch of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The provocations against Viet Nam, Kampuchea and Laos have not ceased. A meeting of the Security Council was needed for Thailand to withdraw its troops from Lao territory.

The Soviet Union supports the constructive programme put forward by Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea designed to turn South-East Asia into a zone of peace and stability and to bring about dialogue between the countries of the region. Positive proposals for guaranteeing the security of the Korean peninsula, one of the conditions being the withdrawal of American troops, and for the peaceful reunification of that country, have been put forward by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Acts of provocation continue to be directed against the sovereign and non-aligned State of Afghanistan. Intervention in that country's internal affairs by outside forces has increased in an attempt to undermine the April Revolution of 1978. Overt American assistance for arming, training and dispatching counter-revolutionary bands into that country has doubled.

Campaigns of outright slander are being waged against independent sovereign States. One wonders why such subterfuges are thought necessary in the case of the Seychelles Islands, particularly the groundless assertions that have been appearing in the American press about plans for a Soviet military base there. That kind of lie is a further example of the attempts to put up a propaganda barrage to camouflage the military preparations of the United States itself, first and foremost its plans to expand and strengthen the Pentagon's bases in the Indian Ocean. The United States has even gone so far as openly to make use of the policy of force in the United Nations, where it has threatened with economic sanctions not South Africa, but independent developing countries, a threat that has been made

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

merely because those countries voted as their consciences dictated in the interests of peace.

We cannot avoid remarking that attempts to turn the United Nations into an American puppet theatre are an affront to the sovereignty of States. It is an overtly imperialistic policy.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

Such a triumph of a policy of force, if it is allowed to continue, would threaten the overall stability of relations among States. The purpose of such a policy is to reduce international relations to the law of the jungle - and that is not merely a rhetorical device if one looks at the headway which has been made recently by the cult of force and violence in the West, particularly in the United States. The organ of the well-known Tripartite Commission, the journal Dialogue, published at the beginning of this year a number of articles on the subject of sovereignty and intervention. In that edition of the magazine it was openly stated that the use of armed force by so-called Western democracies was, it was alleged, both moral and legitimate. At the same time, the strike is being aimed primarily at the countries of the "third world". The authors publicly expressed regret that the "balance of deterrence", was protecting the socialist countries from "armed aggression". Therefore, they select the weakest as the first victims and they announce publicly that they are preparing new acts of intervention against them.

But in this connection the American think tanks are particularly active, and primarily the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University. We mention that particular centre because at present it is the main supplier of official plans and doctrines. In a book published a few months ago by that centre, entitled Strategic Responses to Conflict in the 1980s, the entire "third world" was literally imagined to be covered by a thick network of American interventions. They were being planned in Asia, Africa, the Near East and Latin America. It was recommended, inter alia, that preparations should be made for "surgical operations" by the United States in the light of the growing confidence of the larger Powers - Mexico, Venezuela and Colombia - and also the crises which they might create. Military operations including bombings from the sea, are being planned, against the independent States in the southern part of Africa. Finally, the authors of that work - and they include senior officials of the Pentagon - believe that the United States could successfully use binary chemical weapons - I repeat, successfully use binary chemical weapons - against "third world" countries. Those weapons, the authors say, would be the most promising ones.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

In its turn the Hoover Institute, whose alumni are now also occupying official posts, recently published, under the blasphemous title of To Promote Peace, a book which states that only people with weak nerves can flinch from war, that the United States should encourage the discontented ethnic groups in Ethiopia, that the United States should arm and train UNITA bands in Angola and that, generally speaking, the United States should make it clear to African Governments that in certain respects their policies do not serve the West's interests.

All of this abundantly indicates that militarism and interventionism are two sides of the same coin. They are giving an impetus to the arms race not in order to look after their own defence but in order to crush the defence of others, primarily small countries. The Soviet Union rejects such policies. Our country believes that Washington should renounce its hegemonistic ambitions and actions. No one elected the United States to be the arbiter of other countries' destinies and peoples. Legality should reign in the world, not arbitrariness. Every people and every country should be guaranteed the right to peaceful development in conditions of independence.

We would now like to focus particularly on other agenda items which are at present before the First Committee.

There is growing concern about the ongoing policy of militarizing the Mediterranean region and the escalation of military and political confrontation there. As far as the Soviet Union's position on this point is concerned, it remains a matter of principle and is unchanging. We fully support the efforts of States in that area, primarily the non-aligned States, to reduce tension and increase trust and security. Since it is on the Black Sea and are therefore a Mediterranean Power, the Soviet Union is in favour of declaring the Mediterranean as a zone of stable peace and co-operation. In order to bring that about we need first and foremost to counteract the growing nuclear threat in the region. Particularly dangerous is the deployment of American first-strike nuclear missiles in Italy. What needs to be done is not to build up but to reduce nuclear weapons there. The Soviet Union has already proposed that the nuclear Powers should refrain from deploying nuclear weapons on the territories of Mediterranean non-nuclear States, that they should undertake not to use nuclear weapons against

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

any other State in that region which has not allowed such weapons to be deployed on its territory, and that all vessels carrying nuclear weapons should be withdrawn from the area.

A major contribution towards relaxing tension in the Mediterranean region would be made if there were an agreed reduction of armed forces, particularly naval forces, in that part of the world, and if the measures of confidence-building in the military area which have already proven themselves were extended to that region. I am speaking about the prior notification of large-scale military exercises and inviting observers to witness such exercises, and the exchange of military delegations.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

The state of affairs in that part of the world directly affects the security interests of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries because that region is in the immediate vicinity of their borders, which means that the security of the Mediterranean is closely related to the security of the adjacent areas.

We would like to express our readiness to do everything we can to promote the successful realization of the idea of making the Mediterranean Sea a zone of peace and to take an active part in the consideration of this question, both in the United Nations and in other forums, whether they be multilateral, regional or other.

Of particular importance is the item on the implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, which was adopted at the initiative of the Polish People's Republic. The Declaration confirms the inalienable right of individuals, States and all mankind to live in peace. It emphasizes that a war of aggression, its planning, preparation or initiation are crimes against peace. This is an important document, whose purpose is to promote the adoption of practical steps to develop the necessary mutual understanding and to create an atmosphere of trust in international relations. The intent of the Declaration is to promote the prevention of war by means of creating the proper moral and psychological climate. The implementation of the provisions of that Declaration would help to relax tension in international relations and to improve the international situation as a whole.

For these reasons the Soviet Union is prepared to continue actively to co-operate to ensure that the provisions of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace are implemented.

Mr. TINCA (Romania) (interpretation from French): The Romanian delegation wishes to participate in this debate in order to express some of Romania's concerns with regard to the strengthening of international security as they have emerged from a thorough analysis of the international situation by the thirteenth Congress of the Romanian Communist Party, which was held a few days ago. The Congress, a major event in the life of the Romanian people, established guidelines for the economic and social development of Romania for the next five years and prospects through the year 2000. In his report to the Congress, the Secretary-General of the Party, President Nicolae Ceausescu of Romania, underscored that the achievement of the plans and programmes for economic and social development in our country is possible only in conditions of international peace and security and co-operation with all countries of the world without distinction

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

as to their social or political systems. That is the point of departure of our consideration of the issues being debated at present in our Committee.

As other speakers before me have stated, the situation concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security during the 14 years which have elapsed since its adoption is not at all positive. In recent years, international life has seen an unprecedented worsening of tensions. It may be said that never since the Second World War has the world faced such a state of tension. We are witnessing a strengthening of the policy of establishing new spheres of influence and domination, of the policy of force, diktat and interference in the affairs of other countries. Old conflicts between States have been aggravated and new conflicts have emerged. Expressions of the present economic crisis affecting virtually all countries, especially the developing countries, have broadened, further accentuating political and economic instability throughout the world.

A very aggravating factor in the international situation today is the acceleration of the arms race, primarily the nuclear-arms race, which has increased the danger of a new world war, which in the present circumstances would inevitably become a destructive thermonuclear war. The deployment by the United States of America of medium-range nuclear missiles in Western European countries and then the countermeasures adopted by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries of Europe have further aggravated the world situation and especially the situation in Europe.

As was recently emphasized by the President of my country:

"The development of nuclear weapons, the nuclear arsenals possessed by the two great Powers - the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics - which can destroy mankind several times over, have created a wholly new situation. The existence of these powerful weapons capable of destroying life on the planet renders war inconceivable. There is no alternative but to eliminate war once and for all, to adopt a policy of co-operation and peace."

Removing the threat of war from the world means above all to eliminate the instruments of waging war, especially nuclear weapons. This is why Romania and President Nicolae Ceausescu feel that the fundamental problem of our times is halting the arms race and moving on to the achievement of substantive measures of disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament; and the preservation of the supreme right of peoples and nations to life, freedom, independence and peace.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

In our view, any responsible approach to the problems of international security today must have as its point of departure the necessity of exerting every effort to halt the arms race and reduce weapons. The military balance required by the stability and security of all States must not be sought through the continued accumulation of new weapons, the sole result of which is to increase danger to the security of all, but rather through the reduction of existing weapons to increasingly lower levels.

We welcome the fact that the Soviet Union and the United States of America have agreed to initiate new talks with a view to achieving agreements on the range of problems pertaining to nuclear and space weapons and disarmament. The resumption of the negotiations between the two great Powers will be an important factor for disarmament and peace and should be conducted with all the earnestness required and should also envisage solutions for the elimination of medium-range missiles from Europe and following that the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

In the present international circumstances, Romania resolutely declares itself in favour of halting the deployment of United States nuclear missiles and thus the halting of Soviet Union countermeasures and the establishment of a deadline for the withdrawal of the missiles already deployed.

Since medium-range missiles especially affect the European countries, it is necessary for the European States, especially the States members of NATO and of the Warsaw Treaty, to participate appropriately in the negotiations to achieve an agreement aimed at eliminating nuclear weapons from Europe.

The existence of the European peoples themselves is endangered and the peoples of Europe must not and cannot remain passively watching the results of the negotiations. They must assume their share of responsibility in defending their peoples and sheltering Europe from the prospect of a nuclear catastrophe.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

Together with the efforts to halt the arms race and achieve disarmament, the strengthening of international peace and security more than ever requires that relations between all States be based on scrupulous and continuous respect for the principles of sovereignty, independence, legal equality, non-interference in internal affairs, mutual benefit, non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of all disputes among States. There can be no acceptable justification for violating those principles, the implementation of which should be universal and the observance of which in relations among all States, without distinction as to their size, economic potential or social and political system, is the corner-stone of international peace and security.

In view of the numerous acts that violate those principles, often in a brutal way, the United Nations or the States Members can never do too much to reaffirm the universal validity of those principles, to develop their content and make it more specific and to find ways and means whereby the United Nations can contribute to the consolidation of those principles and to their systematic implementation in practice.

The initiative of Romania, expressed in the United Nations Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes, adopted by consensus by the General Assembly in 1982, is based on our firm conviction that all States should contribute to strengthening the primacy of law over the policy of force, reducing the amount of arbitrariness that still exists in international relations. We must, once and for all, abandon the harmful idea that international life can be reduced to a mere clash of forces and strategic positions, with complete disregard for the interests of peace and security of the great majority of the States of the world, especially the small and medium-sized countries.

It is the same conviction that inspired the Romanian initiative on the development and consolidation of good-neighbourly relations among States, a question which, having been considered for two successive years in this Committee, is now being considered by the Sixth Committee. Together with other countries, Romania acts consistently for the establishment within the United Nations of a special body to provide good offices, mediation and conciliation, a body whose activities would be designed to prevent new armed clashes and peacefully settle, through negotiations, any conflict or other similar problems between States.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

As was emphasized by the General Secretary of the Romanian Communist Party in the report made to the Party's thirteenth Congress and in conformity with the decisions adopted on that occasion, Romania will in future also continue to act with all necessary firmness to ensure that all problems between States are settled exclusively by political means and with a view to strengthening international security. Long and difficult though they may be, today negotiations represent the only rational means of resolving differences between States, the only alternative to conflict and war.

It is in that spirit that Romania firmly supports a political solution in the Middle East, a solution that should bring about a comprehensive peace in that region based on the withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied since the 1967 war, on guarantees of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people and to the establishment of an independent State and on guaranteeing the right of every State in the region to a free and sovereign existence, independence and territorial integrity.

In order to achieve that fundamental aim, Romania supports the convening of an international conference for peace in the Middle East, under the auspices and with the active participation of the United Nations, in which all States and interested parties would participate, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), which is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, as well as the Soviet Union, the United States of America and other States able to make a positive contribution to the settlement of the Middle East conflict. This idea - put forward as early as 1978 by the President of Romania and recently endorsed by a growing number of States - has not lost any of its timeliness, and increased efforts by the international community are required to achieve the convening of such a conference at the earliest possible date.

It is our view also that it is necessary to put an end to the war between Iran and Iraq, to move on to the withdrawal of troops by both sides within their international borders and to begin negotiations between those two countries to settle their disputes and re-establish co-operation and good-neighbourly relations between them.

My delegation has had repeated opportunities to emphasize that Romania supports the struggle of the peoples of Africa for the complete elimination of colonialism, the safeguarding and consolidation of their national independence and their unhampered economic and social progress. In this context, we lend our full support to the struggle being waged by the Namibian people, under the guidance of

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to achieve independence and to move on without delay to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the accession of Namibia to independence. We oppose the policy of apartheid, in order to ensure the full equality of all the citizens of South Africa and their full-fledged participation in the country's political life.

Similarly, we support the position and initiatives taken by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aimed at the peaceful, democratic and independent reunification of the country. We welcome the struggle of the peoples of Latin America for economic and social development and independence and express our solidarity with the people of the Republic of Nicaragua. Romania is of the view that the problems of Central America should be settled on the basis of the proposals put forward by the Contadora Group, by means of negotiations based on respect for the rights of each people to free and independent development, without external interference.

Bearing constantly in mind that in today's world there are countries which have different social systems and that that reality will continue for a long time, international peace and security require respect for the principles of peaceful coexistence, the right of each people to choose the social system it wishes and its right to free and independent development.

Romania opposes both the export of revolution and the export of counter-revolution. The peoples are the only ones who must choose - and we are convinced they know how to do so - the best way to achieve their progress, freedom and independence. Reality shows that nothing and no one can prevent a people from choosing a new path to development and that any effort to halt their development is doomed to failure.

It is evident that the great problems facing mankind today cannot be resolved by a small group of States, however great and powerful they may be. The maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security thus require the democratization of relations between States, in conformity with the far-reaching changes that have taken place on a world-wide scale. In this context, let me emphasize the importance of participation on an equal footing in the resolution of all problems, large and small, by the developing and non-aligned countries, which constitute the great majority of the world, countries which are directly concerned with the achievement of a policy of peace, independence and international co-operation.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

Romania is determined to make further contributions to the enhancement of the role of the United Nations in international life as a unique forum with a universal vocation for the transformation of the Organization into an effective instrument available to all States for the maintenance of international peace and security. We must enhance the role of the General Assembly as a supreme body capable of resolving great issues of concern to the world; respect for the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly would play an important role in this.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

Similarly we favour an improvement in the functioning of other United Nations bodies. In this context we think it desirable to examine the activity of the Security Council in general so as to identify practical measures to enable that organ to fulfil the duties that fall to it under the Charter.

Even in the grave situation prevailing today, we have no doubt as to the course that must be followed in international affairs. Recent events have clearly shown that the policy of détente, disarmament and international peace and international security cannot be safeguarded and consolidated except by an ongoing struggle by all peoples.

Peoples have the strength and capacity to change the present course of international life and to give events a new and democratic direction towards détente, security and peace.

We feel that in order to intensify and guide those efforts a primary role falls to the United Nations, whose raison d'être is the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security. In the present debate our Committee has the opportunity and, indeed, the duty to contribute to enhancing still more vigorously this central role of the United Nations.

Mr. PEREZ RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to refer today to the agenda items of the Committee that deal with the strengthening of international security, security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region and the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism.

These items are taking on greater importance at this time because of the growing accumulation of all types of weapons of mass destruction and because precisely those chiefly responsible for that accumulation oppose or abstain in votes on the draft resolutions concerned with the great majority of disarmament issues, as was demonstrated in recent weeks. To justify that performance, those States are fomenting tensions in the most diverse regions of the world and do not balk at endangering peace, coexistence and international security. This is why it is necessary for us to express ourselves frankly.

The cessation of the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race, the adoption of practical measures to avoid the outbreak of a nuclear war, the immediate prohibition of all tests of nuclear weapons in all parts of the environment and for an indefinite time and the initiation of serious and constructive negotiations in

(Mr. Perez Rivero, Cuba)

good faith aimed at the achievement of concrete disarmament agreements are initiatives that have been called for on more than one occasion by the United Nations General Assembly. The same may be said about the duty that all of us have to respect the right to self-determination, independence, equality, sovereignty and the territorial integrity of States, the inviolability of borders and the right freely to determine the economic, political and social régime that is best suited to the interests of each people without foreign interference.

However, we have seen that there are Governments which, in open disregard of the legitimate interests of peace that they themselves claim to uphold, spend millions of dollars on preparing, arming and training mercenaries to be used against sovereign States; increase their interference in the internal affairs of other countries; violate the most elementary rules of international law and the freedom of navigation by mining the ports of other countries; and maintain, strengthen and establish military bases throughout the world on the pretext of defending their so-called vital interests.

Let us cast a glance at the policy and action promoted and conducted by the Government of the United States with the support of some of its allies in Central America, in the Caribbean, in southern Africa or in the Middle East, and we shall realize the extent of that reality.

The blockade and the constant aggressions waged against our kindred Republic of Nicaragua by the United States Administration are well known to us all. Its ports were mined, its territory has been surrounded by military bases from which constant harassment is conducted and its airspace is violated without scruple, as recently happened with the use of SR-71 strategic spy planes. We all know as well, and we cannot forget, the cowardly invasion of the small island of Grenada and the maintenance of ongoing military occupation by Yankee troops, which constitutes an affront to the nations of our region.

Those are the same forces that are conducting military manoeuvres to threaten and intimidate nations in the Caribbean area. During the present year the Government of the United States has increased its naval and aerial manoeuvres, with growing hostility, in the vicinity of Cuba and around the naval base of Guantánamo, a territory it occupies against the will of our people.

(Mr. Perez Rivero, Cuba)

My delegation cannot fail to alert the international community, and we once again decry in this forum the fact that the Government of the United States persists in attempting to create a military crisis in the Central American region. Today it is using the pretext that the possible acquisition of certain defence equipment by some of our countries might constitute a threat to the security and peace of the region. We all know very well - and the Pentagon knows better than anyone - that no Central American or Caribbean country represents a threat to the security of the United States. The only threat to peace in this region - a threat that is growing daily - is the hostile and aggressive policy of the Government of Washington in the area, a policy which must be brought to an end.

We must never forget the incident created by the United States in the Gulf of Tonkin to "justify" its military intervention against the heroic people of Viet Nam. Nor should the Government of the United States forget the lessons that it learnt from that adventure. In a statement he made on 26 July, President Fidel Castro said:

"We are not threatening anyone, we cannot threaten anyone, and it is truly ludicrous to hear some of the spokesmen of imperialism saying that El Salvador is a threat to the United States, that Nicaragua is a threat to the United States or that Cuba is a threat to the United States. It is ludicrous because it constitutes a militarily impossible absurdity."

It is necessary for the Government of the United States seriously to face the necessity of working for an upright and honourable solution to the problems affecting our region. That solution must be based on mutual compromises, and Washington must participate in them. My delegation reiterates its support for the peace initiatives of the Contadora Group and we urge all to give those initiatives the recognition and respect that they deserve.

(Mr. Perez Rivero, Cuba)

Another region where peace and co-operation are constantly being threatened is southern Africa. The events that continue to take place in southern Africa demonstrate that racial discrimination and the policy of apartheid persist in opposing the forces of progress.

The threats and pressures of United States imperialism in southern Africa maintain a climate of tension in that area, where the racist régime of Pretoria, Washington's strategic ally, continues to pursue a policy of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and other neighbouring States and prevents the political and negotiated solution of the problem of Namibia. The racist régime of Pretoria, following the dictates of Washington, is boycotting every serious effort to find just solutions to the problems affecting the region and, counter to public opinion and the wishes of the immense majority of the international community, it persists in requiring the so-called linkage, which attempts to make the application of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) dependent on the withdrawal of the Cuban military contingent which is present in the People's Republic of Angola by an express agreement between the two Governments.

The People's Republic of Angola and Cuba have on various occasions reiterated their willingness to co-operate in the search for a political solution to the problems affecting the region, in particular through the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) of the Security Council, through the cessation of all external assistance to the armed organizations fighting against the recognized Government of Angola and through the cessation of all acts of aggression or threats of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, including the withdrawal of South African troops, which even today remain on its territory.

As an unmistakable token of its willingness to co-operate, the People's Republic of Angola has held talks, both directly and indirectly, with representatives of the Governments of the United States and of South Africa. Cuba supports the position taken by the Government of Angola as well as the platform put forward by the People's Republic of Angola to the representatives of the United States during the talks held in Luanda on 6 and 7 September, which may be found in document A/39/688. Here the United States and its strategic ally in southern Africa have an opportunity to demonstrate whether they are truly interested in negotiated and lasting solutions or whether they will persist in obstructing the road to peace and security in the region.

(Mr. Perez Rivero, Cuba)

Another area where the Government of the United States is bent on blocking the peaceful settlement of disputes and is obstructing the road to peace and security is the Korean Peninsula. There United States troops persist in their illegal occupation and constitute a very serious obstacle to the peaceful unification of the country, as is in the interests of the Korean people.

Allow me at this point to make a few brief comments on security and co-operation in the Mediterranean. There cannot be security in the Mediterranean, nor can there be true co-operation, so long as Israel, with all of the military, political and diplomatic support it is receiving from the United States and from several of its allies, continues its aggressive policy against the Arab peoples.

Nor can there be peace, security and co-operation in the area so long as the United States persists in conducting intimidating military manoeuvres against the countries of the region and maintains its fleets in the area in a threatening manner, indiscriminately shelling the civilian population of countries of the area and strengthening its military presence there. There will not be peace as long as foreign military bases present there are not dismantled and as long as the senseless nuclear arms race being introduced into the region is not brought to an end.

In document A/39/517, we find the reply transmitted to the Secretary-General by the Government of the Republic of Cuba in which we express support for the conversion of the Mediterranean Sea into a zone of international peace and co-operation. My delegation wishes in particular to recall the measures and compromises contained in that reply, which Cuba considers will contribute to reducing tension and strengthening confidence and security in the area over the short and medium term. Those measures would be: the prohibition of the installation of new nuclear weapons on board ships, submarines and aircraft carriers operating in the area; the prohibition of the use or threat of force as well as any act of piracy, blockade or naval harassment between the riparian countries or against any one of them on the part of a foreign Power; the limitation of naval manoeuvres to the territorial waters of the participating States; and the adoption of measures necessary to guarantee the free access, movement and security of navigation through straits and canals by all types of vessels, in conformity with the principles established by international law and the Law of the Sea.

(Mr. Perez Rivero, Cuba)

The peaceful settlement of disputes between States, the non-use of force or the threat of force in international relations, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and respect for the right of all freely to determine the economic, political and social system best suited to their interests, are constantly being threatened by the application of a policy of State terrorism that is now reaching alarming proportions.

Apparently it is not enough to apply doctrines that are clearly based on the use of nuclear weapons, with the promotion of such concepts as limited or winnable nuclear war, with the elaboration of policies from positions of strength and crusades against other States and national liberation movements. Increasingly, direct use is being made of military force, economic coercion and political destabilization.

And now, rapid deployment forces are being created whose mission is to guarantee the vital interests where they are being threatened, not only in Central America, the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea, but also the Persian Gulf, the Arabian Peninsula, North-East Africa and South-East Asia are all regions for which the United States armed forces have created a central command to which all of the rapid deployment forces are responsible. According to General Kingston, Chief of the Central Command, the number of troops available to that Command has already reached 300,000 men, who are prepared to go into action in any part of the world. Never before has State terrorism been so well served; never before have international peace and security been so compromised.

Mr. LIPATOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Fourteen years have passed since the General Assembly adopted, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, but never before has the debate on its implementation taken place in such a difficult situation - indeed, to be blunt, such an explosive situation.

As has been borne out by the present session of the General Assembly, the facts of current international life clearly indicate that international tension has increased further, that in various parts of the world there are still extremely dangerous sources of conflict, that there has been an unprecedented acceleration of the spiralling arms race and that the conditions that can lead to nuclear warfare are growing.

In the opinion of our delegation, responsibility for the fact that mankind today finds itself so close to the nuclear threshold lies with imperialist reaction, headed by the United States, which has based its foreign policy on the aim of disrupting the military and strategic balance that has been attained achieving military supremacy over the socialist States and turning the whole world into a sphere of its vital interests. Specific examples of such a policy are available.

It was none other than the United States that started the new round of the arms race when it proceeded to manufacture and deploy MX and Midgetman missiles, atomic submarines with Trident missiles, new strategic bombers, long-range cruise missiles and other weapons systems. It is none other than the United States that is preparing to turn outer space into an arena for military rivalry by blocking the implementation of the constructive proposals of the Soviet Union to prevent the militarization of outer space and to turn it into an area of peaceful co-operation among States. It is none other than the United States that has covered the entire globe with a network of military bases that are being extended to more and more parts of the world - primarily, those close to the Soviet Union - the obvious intention being to create a genuine threat to the Soviet Union and its allies from all directions.

It has now become abundantly clear that it is not a strengthening of security but, rather, further weakening of the security of all States, that has resulted from locating new American first-strike nuclear missiles in certain countries of Western Europe. As is stated in the communiqué of the meeting of the Council of

(Mr. Lipatov, Ukrainian SSR)

Foreign Ministers of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, held on 3-4 December in the capital of the German Democratic Republic, Berlin:

"There has been a further deterioration of the situation in Europe as a result of the continuing deployment of American medium-range missiles in certain Western European countries belonging to NATO. This has opened up a new and particularly dangerous stage in the arms race on that continent."

Recently, the United States and its allies at various levels, including here in the Committee, have said a great deal about their dedication to the cause of peace, their readiness to prepare practical steps to restrict arms and to bring about disarmament. In this connection we should like to quote the words of the founder of the Soviet State, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, as long ago as 1922, when he said:

"It should be borne in mind that the amount of pacifistic phrases, talk, assurances and sometimes even solemn oaths against war being bandied about the world at the present time is unusually large, but the degree of readiness to take genuine steps, even the simplest ones, in order to secure peace is found in the case of most States to be unusually small, and on this and similar issues we should like to hear the least possible number of declarations, solemn pronouncements and pompous language and the largest possible number of simple, clear-cut decisions and steps which will really lead to peace."

The Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community have always advocated, and continue to advocate, such an approach to resolving the paramount problems of war and peace. There is no important problem, no area relating to international security, on which even at the present session they have not come forward with concrete and constructive initiatives, which my delegation has had occasion to dwell on in detail in our previous statements. This, we believe, is a practical expression of the aspiration to peace and working towards peace.

In this connection, we remind the Committee of just one initiative on a key issue of the present day - removing the risk of war. There can be no doubt that that risk would not exist if the Western countries had enough realism and political will to accept the proposal made by the Soviet Union as long ago as 1946 to prohibit for all time the production and use of atomic weapons and to destroy stockpiles of those weapons. No verbal manoeuvres or unsavory ploys will make it possible to

(Mr. Lipatov, Ukrainian SSR)

tarnish the essentially peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union, clear evidence of which is the undoubted priority it attaches to how to resolve, in the interest of all mankind, the problem of a new and dreadful weapon now available to some.

Over and above the question of reducing weapons and the question of disarmament, the resolution of which will create the necessary conditions for removing the threat of nuclear war, it is also extremely important to step up United Nations efforts to strengthen the political and legal safeguards for international peace and security. In the present extremely tense international atmosphere, the question of implementing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is particularly timely. We should not allow ourselves to forget that the principles proclaimed in it have served as valuable and important guidelines for the activities of States in the international arena. If they were respected that would greatly promote an improvement in the international situation, something that was achieved in the 1970s.

Today, as never before, it is essential that all States redouble their efforts to prevent nuclear war, preserve peace and safeguard international security. Therefore, we believe it is important that our discussion on this item and the decision taken on it by the General Assembly should help to reveal the true reasons for the deterioration in the international situation and at the same time indicate specific ways and means of achieving the purposes set out in the Declaration.

It is in this light that the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic interprets the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, adopted by the General Assembly in 1978 on the initiative of the Polish People's Republic. That Declaration emphasizes the urgent need for all States to take concrete acts that will help avert war by establishing a moral and psychological climate that does not tolerate any acts that increase the threat of war. That task has today become considerably more urgent, since certain Western Powers have indulged in attempts to reconcile people to the idea of the admissibility of using force and methods of State terrorism, allegedly in order to protect their vital interests in various parts of the world, and propaganda has been disseminated on the mindless doctrine of limited and protracted nuclear war, based on the dangerous illusion that by being the first to use nuclear weapons one can emerge victorious from a nuclear war.

(Mr. Lipatov, Ukrainian SSR)

All this flagrantly contradicts the humanitarian ideals contained in the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe, the resolution on the condemnation of nuclear war and other General Assembly documents. The main task of mankind, that of guaranteeing universal peace and strengthening international security, would be greatly promoted by acting on the provisions of the Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace, which was recently adopted by the General Assembly at the initiative of the Mongolian People's Republic. We believe that the provision in the text which emphasizes that guaranteeing this inalienable right requires that States' policies - primarily the policies of those States possessing nuclear weapons - should be focused on removing the nuclear threat and that relations among nuclear Powers should be governed by agreed norms of behaviour in the interests of averting nuclear war.

In the present conditions there is a growing need for fresh efforts to be made to draw up and conclude a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, the purpose of which would be to prohibit any use of military force including a ban on the use of nuclear weapons. A substantive step towards strengthening trust and security would also be the implementation of the proposal made by the socialist countries that a treaty be concluded on the mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations between the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries.

Strengthening international security and consolidating political stability in the world require that a speedy settlement be found, by peaceful means, to existing sources of tension and conflict, and that acts of aggression which are taking place in various parts of the world be halted.

We continue to be alarmed by the explosive situation in the Near East, which arose as a result of the aggressive policy of Israel against neighbouring Arab States and the Palestinian people with the direct and far-reaching support of its strategic protector, the United States. The tragic events in the Middle East, particularly those in Lebanon, have proved that durable peace in that region cannot be brought about by separate deals and military intervention but by a comprehensive and just settlement. Practical ways and means of bringing this about are set out in the Soviet proposal, which suggests that an international conference be convened on the Near East with the mandatory and equal participation of the Palestine

(Mr. Lipatov, Ukrainian SSR)

Liberation Organization. This initiative is an example of a realistic and fair approach to tackling the most acute international problems, taking due account of the legitimate interests of all parties involved.

Tension in Central America has reached an extremely dangerous point. The independence of defenceless Grenada has been trampled underfoot, an undeclared war is being waged against Nicaragua and efforts are being made to stifle the liberation struggle of the patriots in El Salvador. This region is an unequalled example of Washington's policy of manipulating the destinies of sovereign States and intervening grossly in their internal affairs. It is perfectly obvious that such acts, which have been raised to the status of State policy, are directly at variance with the aims and purposes of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and serve to destroy the foundations of peace and stability, not only in this region but throughout the world.

The Ukrainian SSR cannot countenance any acts of outside interference aimed at changing and undermining by force the social structure of States, or toppling their legal Governments. In this connection, we think that the proposal of the Soviet Union at this session on the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States is particularly timely and appropriate.

In the opinion of my delegation, the cause of preserving peace demands that international relations should not be vitiated by ideological dissension, but rather that they should be founded on a strict observance of the United Nations Charter and also the generally recognized principles and norms of international relations. Concepts such as policies based on a position of strength, crusades, psychological warfare or any others that are intended to vindicate subversive activities on the part of States should be resolutely rejected. The General Assembly should call upon all States to respect and strictly to observe the right of peoples freely, and without outside interference, to select their own socio-political structure and to pursue independently the political, economic, social and cultural development of their people. In this way, the United Nations would be making an important contribution to the creation of political safeguards and guarantees for peace, strengthening the security of individual States and consolidating international security as a whole.

We have only dwelt on some of the issues, the solution of which would help to further the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International

(Mr. Lipatov, Ukrainian SSR)

Security. In addition, an immediate settlement of the problem in South Africa and Namibia, on the basis of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, also brooks no delay. The task of strengthening international peace and security would also be served if the imperialist intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and the States of Indo-China were halted. The question of the final elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism, racism and apartheid has also not yet been resolved.

Our delegation shares the view that the present difficult international situation requires that States follow a realistic policy and adopt a thoughtful approach to acute international problems. The only means of ensuring that they are resolved in the interests of all are disarmament, a return to détente and the confirmation in international relations of the principles of peaceful coexistence and respect for the legitimate interests of States. Our Committee could also play a positive role in achieving these goals were it to adopt a resolution on the item under discussion which would direct the collective efforts of States to taking specific measures to strengthen international security, to remove the threat of war and to preserve peace on earth.

Mr. NOWAK (Poland): The examination of the item which is the subject of the present debate in this Committee once again offers us an opportunity to concentrate on the state of international security. Fourteen years have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted the historic Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. At that time, there were justified expectations that consistent implementation of the principles enshrined in the Declaration, and in particular those of non-use of force, non-intervention in internal affairs, peaceful settlement of disputes and development of international co-operation, would greatly contribute to the positive development of international relations and the strengthening of international security. The significance of the Declaration was reflected not only in the establishment, reaffirmation and further development of principles governing relations among States, but also in the creation of a concrete programme of action aimed at their implementation.

Today, after 14 years, we have to note with much regret and concern that the record of the implementation of this document is in no way positive. True, there was a brief time of increased understanding among States and the development of international co-operation, but that process has been slowed down and even reversed in some fields.

(Mr. Nowak, Poland)

The cause of this state of affairs is well known. International peace and security continue to be threatened by attempts on the part of the American Administration to return to the policy of acting from a position of strength and to gain military supremacy. This policy is closely linked to neglect of the mutually agreed principles of the post-war global order, in particular in Europe. One of the adverse results of such a policy is that it strikes a serious blow against the infrastructure of peaceful coexistence among nations and spurs on a costly and dangerous arms race.

I would add a few words on the nature of security policy per se. Since the security of each State is concrete in nature and since, in an interdependent world, it should be considered in relation to the security of others, it follows that disregard for or infringement upon the security interests of other participants in the international system leads to that system's destruction. It means, inter alia, that a threat is posed to world peace when a great Power views its national security in absolute terms and arbitrarily designates most parts of the world as its "vital security zones". On the other hand, if one of the great Powers, be it only temporarily, attains military superiority the result is increased apprehension on the part of the other Power, which cannot but feel that it has fallen behind, and, as a consequence, a redoubling of efforts to restore a state of equilibrium. In fact, international security in the East-West dimension, based on a functional equilibrium, has for over 40 years prevented the outbreak of an armed conflict on a global scale. That is why trampling upon the principles of equality and equal security has to be a matter of particular concern for the entire international community.

The situation is further aggravated by efforts artificially to transplant ideological differences into the area of inter-State relations. Very often this takes the form of hostile propaganda against another State, something to which Poland has also fallen victim. It is worth recalling that Governments are under legal obligation to refrain from spreading propaganda hostile to another State in time of peace. According to the United Nations Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States encompasses:

(Mr. Nowak, Poland)

"The duty of a State to abstain from any defamatory campaign, vilification or hostile propaganda for the purpose of intervening or interfering in the internal affairs of other States". (General Assembly resolution 36/103, annex, II (j))

The policy of resorting to force and making direct use of military, economic and communications-media power against States is illustrated by the recent actions against Nicaragua. Such actions are inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and with the Declaration under discussion here today. It is our duty to voice our concern over the dangerous aspects of this kind of confrontational policy in various regions of the world.

The persistence of underdevelopment and the deteriorating position of many poor States in international economic relations are no basis for stability and for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The link between progress in disarmament and the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is obvious to everybody. The destructive implications of a further build-up of military arsenals in the nuclear age are also evident. The extension of the arms race to outer space only increases the potential for nuclear destruction. This subject has already been discussed extensively in this Committee, as well as in the Special Political Committee, and I shall therefore limit myself to emphasizing once again the dangers stemming from the militarization of outer space, in particular in conditions marked by lack of confidence among the major nuclear Powers. The arms race and the persistent East-West tensions constitute a stumbling-block to efforts to solve other world problems - including underdevelopment, hunger and the protection of the environment.

Indeed, the relations between the two major Powers, decisive as they are for the maintenance of international peace and security, continue to be at a low ebb. Billions of dollars have been spent on a reckless arms race. The proposals put forward earlier by the United States in negotiations with the Soviet Union were so obviously one-sided that it became clear that no serious bargaining was intended. No serious effort was made even to consider the Soviet disarmament proposals.

(Mr. Nowak, Poland)

Poland welcomes the announcement of talks between the Soviet Union and the United States and hopes that they may bring about tangible results to satisfy the widespread expectations for a shift for the better and for a dialogue between Moscow and Washington. We hope that the current improvement in Soviet-United States relations will also have a positive influence on the international climate and thus a positive bearing on Polish-United States bilateral relations as well.

However, we must express our concern that a mere change in rhetoric will be meaningless unless assurances of good will are to be followed by deeds. This is true for global as well as for regional and bilateral matters. In his reply to questions put to him by The Washington Post on 17 October 1984, the Soviet President, Konstantin Chernenko, listed a number of Soviet initiatives left without a reply by the American side and expressed readiness for an improvement in relations with the United States, emphasizing that "it requires a mutual desire to build relations as equals". The Soviet leader again confirmed the desire to improve United States-Soviet relations in answers to questions put by a National Broadcasting Company (NBC) correspondent on 17 November.

The communiqué issued yesterday following the meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, referring to negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States, notes that the Warsaw Treaty parties:

"favour the identification from the very outset, and in unmistakable terms, of the subject-matters and aims of those negotiations, which are aimed at enhancing strategic stability, averting the militarization of outer space and lowering the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe and the world at large through the reduction of nuclear weapons, both strategic and medium range, until they are completely eliminated."

The stark truth of the international situation is that without a major reversal of present negative trends the threat to peace will continue to be grave. In this respect the situation in Europe is edifying.

The whole process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe was set up as an attempt to adjust the frequently conflicting interests of States having different systems and belonging to opposed military groupings. The common denominator in that search is the prevention of a situation in which antagonistic

(Mr. Nowak, Poland)

contradictions could boil up into an armed conflict. However, the negative implications of international tensions have also been strongly reflected in Europe. The deployment of United States first-strike weapons in some Western European States cannot be interpreted other than as evidence of an attempt to establish a first-strike potential and to achieve military supremacy. That step has led to the further deterioration of European relations and the state of security in that continent has decreased.

Poland has on many occasions voiced its concern over the waste of the considerable gains achieved in the construction of a whole network of political links and economic and cultural co-operation, as well as human contacts. The Polish Government has also expressed its concern over attempts to call into question the fundamental decisions taken 40 years ago at Yalta and Potsdam which laid the foundations for the peace and security of European States.

(Mr. Nowak, Poland)

The reversal of these negative tendencies, the continuation of the policy of peaceful coexistence, a return to a disarmament dialogue and the development of the results achieved in the period of détente are possible and would indeed be in the interest of all members of the international community. Poland is firmly convinced that the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe forms a solid basis for inter-State relations in Europe. My Government will continue to work for the full implementation of the principles and recommendations embodied in the Final Act and the Madrid Concluding Document and will make every effort to achieve progress at the Stockholm Conference.

Poland continues to follow with interest and understanding the initiatives and actions aimed at strengthening security and co-operation in other regions of the world. The idea of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world has lost none of its vitality. Its promotion is now more necessary than ever. The Berlin meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty States has supported the efforts to establish nuclear-free zones in the Balkans, Northern Europe and other regions of the European continent.

We favour regional peace initiatives aimed at the elimination of current conflicts and tensions. At the plenary meetings of the General Assembly we have already had an opportunity to support the so-called Contadora process in Central America and the programme of action on the Middle East conflict, set out in the Soviet Union's statement on the Middle East of 29 July. My Government also strongly supports the struggle of the Korean people for reunification on the basis of recent constructive and comprehensive proposals put forward by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

We consistently support the strengthening of the United Nations role in general efforts to eliminate the vestiges of colonialism and the policy of apartheid, to build a new economic order and to establish a new world information and communications order.

Along with efforts to bring about disarmament, the strengthening of international security requires strict and constant respect for the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and other internationally binding instruments. The primacy of legal norms and their strict observance in international relations should be reaffirmed.

(Mr. Nowak, Poland)

A significant contribution to this end would be the full implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. That implies respect for all the provisions of the Declaration. Only by their simultaneous application in their entirety can the Declaration serve its intended purpose.

Our approach to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is a broad one. The Polish proposal for the reconstruction and reinforcement of economic relations, known as economic confidence-building (General Assembly resolution 38/196) was aimed at a gradual increase in economic security and, through it, in international security as a whole. We feel that it is our duty to continue our efforts in this field and we count on further support for them in this Organization.

The process of a search for a realistic concept of preparing societies for life in peace, begun six years ago by the Declaration on Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, of which Poland had the honour to be the initiator, is an extremely important factor in strengthening international security. The adoption of the Declaration cannot be treated as a one-time act defining the stance of States concerning this problem. It was a stage in the historical process aimed at the lasting eradication of wars from the lives of nations and building an infrastructure of peace in the minds and hearts of men.

Most eminent minds in many countries have for ages advanced various schemes for eliminating war as a social phenomenon together with plans for "eternal peace". This Declaration and the ideas on its implementation stand in the mainstream of those noble thoughts and practical efforts. The creation of a world without wars requires constant and consistent action on many planes. It cannot result exclusively from the activities of Governments. It requires the co-operation of Governments and governmental organizations and the active efforts of societies and non-governmental bodies.

As the Polish delegation pointed out in its statement in the plenary meeting on 12 November, the process of the eradication of war means first of all the establishment of an extensive system of international and internal legislation on the right to peace - jus ad pacem - which should be the next stage after currently applicable anti-war legislation - jus contra bellum. The policies of States should be shaped in such a way that effective efforts, supported by conscious public opinion, are directed towards the elimination of the threat of war, particularly

(Mr. Nowak, Poland)

nuclear war, the renunciation of the use of force and interference in internal affairs and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations.

There is one aspect of the Declaration's implementation that I have to emphasize. Against the background of large-scale efforts for peace in various fields of international life the Declaration makes a strong link between peace and morality. It is directed at making the struggle for peace a firm part of our social consciousness and national ethos.

This is a complicated task and a reasonable programme of implementation still remains to be worked out. Such a programme should embrace first of all education in a spirit of tolerance and co-operation, in the formulation of a strategy of non-violence and education aimed, inter alia, at combating ignorance, poverty and exploitation. It should further embrace assistance in teaching people how to strive for and participate in the creation of a new world economic order and the establishment of a new world communications order. An activity that is supposed to serve peace must also involve respect for human rights and human life. Education for peace should be helpful in rallying public opinion around the cause of peace. In other words, education for peace means linking efforts to maintain "eternal peace" with humanistic and moral values.

Our fundamental concern is to seek effective ways of giving effect to the moral and political obligations undertaken by all of us when adopting the Declaration. The practical efforts of a number of States, Poland included, have been illustrated in the report of the Secretary-General (A/39/143), dated 1 October 1984. The comprehensive presentation of Poland's approach to the subject, as contained in that report, retains its full validity. We are grateful to a number of Governments which have found it proper to present their views on the implementation of the Declaration. I can assure their representatives that their effort was worth taking, as every step in pointing to a better world based on the lofty principles of the Declaration expresses the genuine aspirations of our respective peoples. The Polish delegation will dwell on those important matters when introducing a draft resolution on the subject.

Mr. KAUSIKAN (Singapore): My delegation has asked to be allowed to speak on agenda item 143, entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States".

This is a new item. The inscription of a new item on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly is a serious and significant event. It has to be taken seriously. The question has to be given the most careful consideration and study. We must be conscious that what we are engaged in here is a continuing process of defining international norms. It is our duty to give the most careful consideration to any new resolution in order to ensure that this process is taken in directions that are in our interests, and that in seeking to define and advance new norms or principles we do not inadvertently weaken or jeopardize the existing corpus of international law.

When we consider a new item it is appropriate to begin by asking the very basic question: what is it all about? Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 was introduced yesterday by Ambassador Oleg Troyanovsky of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In his statement Ambassador Troyanovsky laid emphasis on "the right of peoples to choose their socio-political system freely and without outside interference and to pursue their political, economic, social and cultural development independently". (A/C.1/39/PV.57, p. 29-30) Ambassador Troyanovsky accurately called this a "sacred right".

My delegation agrees. Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 is, in its basic thrust, a resolution on self-determination. Our colleagues in this Committee need hardly be reminded that this is perhaps the most fundamental norm affirmed by the international community. Most of the Members of the United Nations would not have achieved their independence were it not for the general acceptance of the principle of self-determination. It is the principle of self-determination that sustains our independence in the face of the many uncertainties and dangers of an international system that is still imperfectly regulated by law and in which, unfortunately, the use and threat of force is all too common. For Singapore and the majority of small third-world States, it is the principle of self-determination, and its corollary principles, that defines our most fundamental security concerns.

It is, however, unfortunate that in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 this fundamental principle, which I believe is clear and has widespread acceptance, has been linked with a concept that neither is clear nor enjoys widespread acceptance. This is the concept of State terrorism. What is State terrorism? It is perhaps

(Mr. Kausikan, Singapore)

worth reminding ourselves that our colleagues in the Sixth Committee have been grappling with this very question for almost a decade. They have as yet not been able to find an answer.

The concept of State terrorism is a vague one. There is no agreed definition and there are multiple interpretations of what it means. When we consider draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 we shall have to ask ourselves whether this draft resolution implies a particular definition; whether this definition takes into account the full range of views of the international community; whether the international community is able to arrive at an agreed definition; and, most important of all, whether the definition proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 is in the interest of the international community. Those are difficult and complex questions. I suspect that none of us in this Committee is yet in a position to give unqualified and satisfactory answers to any of them.

My delegation is concerned that the linkage of a widely accepted principle that is fundamental to the security interests of the majority of States - self-determination - with a concept that is vague, contentious and controversial - State terrorism - could result in the dilution and weakening of the principle of self-determination. We are concerned that the result would be neither to define State terrorism with any greater precision nor to reaffirm self-determination with any greater vigour. We are concerned that the linkage of these two concepts in a single resolution could open a Pandora's box of new interpretations of the principle of self-determination which could dilute its effect and which would thus adversely affect the vital security interests of small third-world States.

It is thus extremely important that we give the text of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 the most careful scrutiny in order to ensure that it contains nothing that could harm our basic interests.

In undertaking this scrutiny, my delegation wishes to advance two criteria. First, is the principle of self-determination given the broadest possible definition with the fewest possible exceptions? Secondly, is the principle of self-determination given the strongest possible interpretation?

We believe that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 does not fully meet either of those criteria. In his introductory statement yesterday Ambassador Troyanovsky alluded to consultations which his delegation had undertaken. Nevertheless, some

(Mr. Kausikan, Singapore)

important points seem to have been somehow overlooked. Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 still contains lacunae which could have the effect, no doubt unintended but none the less dangerous, of weakening the vital principle of self-determination.

It is to meet these shortcomings that my delegation, together with the delegations of Bahamas, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Jamaica, Kenya, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea and Trinidad and Tobago, have proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1. They are contained in document A/C.1/39/L.92. With your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, I shall now proceed to explain why we have thought these amendments necessary and how they would improve the text of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1.

Our first amendment is to the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. We have sought to follow, as closely as possible, the language of the original resolution. Our proposal is that the existing fifth preambular paragraph should be replaced by the following formulation:

"Categorically rejecting all concepts, doctrines or ideologies intended to justify actions of States aimed at undermining the socio-political systems of other States".

It is an unfortunate fact of contemporary international relations that ideologies, whether of the East or of the West, have most often formed the pretext or justification for attempts to undermine the principle of self-determination. Ideological differences have been used to justify attempts to undermine the socio-political systems of other States. Equally, however, ideological similarities have also been used to justify attempts to deny peoples the right to self-determination. It is only logical that if peoples have the right to freely choose their own socio-political system, they must also have the right to freely change their minds. We cannot accept the notion that any particular choice, once made, is enshrined in the laws of history or is irreversible. We believe that it is important that any draft resolution on this crucial subject state categorically that members of the international community are not prepared to accept any pretext whatsoever to deny peoples the right to self-determination, whether in the form of a concept, a doctrine or an ideology.

(Mr. Kausikan, Singapore)

Our amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph also seeks to delete the phrase "in contradiction to the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States".

We believe that the inclusion of this phrase would weaken the categorical rejection of all concepts, doctrines or ideologies intended to justify actions of States aimed at denying peoples the right to self-determination.

(Mr. Kausikan, Singapore)

We find it difficult to conceive of any action aimed at undermining the socio-political system of other States and thus to deny peoples the right to self-determination which could be in accordance with the United Nations Charter. To be sure, the Charter does contain exceptions to some basic principles. Thus, for example, the right to self-defence qualifies the Charter injunction against the threat or use of force. But is draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 focused only on the threat or use of force? Would it not unnecessarily complicate and confuse the fundamental principle that we are dealing with in this draft resolution if the text were to lay emphasis on the exceptions rather than on the rule? Are we indeed prepared to admit any exception to the principle of self-determination? Given these ambiguities, would it thus not make more sense to stress that there are no exceptions to the principle of self-determination that could be used as a pretext to deny peoples this inalienable right? This is the intention of our amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph.

Our second amendment is to operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.2/Rev.1. We seek to replace the existing text with the following formulation:

"Demands that all States take no actions aimed at military intervention and occupation, forcible change in or the undermining of the socio-political system of sovereign States, the destabilization and overthrow of their Governments and, in particular, initiate no military action to that end under any pretext whatsoever, and cease forthwith any such action already in progress".

Delegations will note that we have again closely followed the language of the original Soviet draft and have only sought to insert the phrase "military intervention and occupation".

One of the most striking omissions in the original text of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 is that nowhere in any of its preambular or operative paragraphs does it mention the notion of military intervention. And yet military intervention and occupation must surely be the most brutal denial of the right to self-determination. Military intervention and occupation must be the most extreme form of any action aimed at undermining the socio-political system of a sovereign State.

(Mr. Kausikan, Singapore)

In his statement introducing draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 yesterday, Ambassador Troyanovsky himself pointed out that:

"The peoples fighting for their inalienable right to self-determination are falling victims to colonialist and racist policies. They are being deprived of their territory, annexed by the occupying forces, and they are being denied the right to political independence and a State of their own."

(A/C.1/39/PV.57, p. 26)

My colleague from Cuba in his statement a few minutes ago took up, among other ideas, the idea of State terrorism. He too dealt exhaustively with the serious problem of military intervention in various regions of the world. My delegation agrees: military intervention is a very serious problem; and seen in the complex of circumstances described by my colleague from Cuba and Ambassador Troyanovsky, the omission of any mention of military intervention and occupation in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 is a most dangerous oversight. It is vital, therefore, that we insert language in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 that makes it clear that military intervention and occupation is the most flagrant violation of the principle of self-determination.

Indeed, we believe that military intervention and occupation lies at the very centre of the concerns expressed in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1. If this phrase were to be omitted, then the draft resolution would contain a fatal flaw that would negate its importance. For this reason, if our second amendment is accepted by the Committee, we would ask that appropriate consequential changes of language be made in the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 in the interest of editorial consistency.

My delegation and the other delegations which have sponsored the amendments I have just introduced believe that if these amendments are accepted draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 would be brought into accord with the many other United Nations resolutions which, at heart, strongly affirm the principle of self-determination, in particular the resolutions on Central America, the Middle East, Namibia, Cambodia and Afghanistan. These resolutions enjoy the overwhelming support of the international community.

It is heartening to note the concern of the Soviet delegation that the fundamental principle of self-determination be upheld. We regret, however, that the Soviet Union has not yet seen fit to support the United Nations resolutions on Cambodia and Afghanistan, which also affirm the very same fundamental principle of

(Mr. Kausikan, Singapore)

self-determination. We venture to hope that the initiative of the USSR in submitting draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 for our consideration will presage a less selective application of the principle of self-determination.

The amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 which I have introduced are not the only amendments that this Committee will be called upon to consider. There is another set of amendments presented by some Western developed States. We do not believe that those amendments are incompatible with our own. We believe that they are complementary and have as their source the same concern that fundamental international norms and principles should not be inadvertently weakened or misinterpreted. We support them.

It is of some significance that both a group of Western developed countries and a group of non-aligned developing third world countries have independently submitted amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1. It demonstrates one thing: this is not an East-West issue, nor is it a North-South issue. It is an issue that affects the interests of all States, whether of the North or the South, the East or the West, because what is at stake when we consider draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 is in the interests of both North and South, East and West. What is stake is some of the most basic international principles and norms. These norms should not be considered from the viewpoint of narrow political or group interests, but rather from the viewpoint of the long-term interests of the international community as a whole.

We thus urge members of this Committee to examine all the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 in this light and to make their judgements accordingly.

Mr. MASTAMAND (Afghanistan): This year the First Committee is discussing the item on peace and international security at a time when the international political and security climate still remains endangered. Deployment of United States Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe in disregard of the strong protest of the overwhelming majority of peoples all over the world has increased the danger of a nuclear attack by those who speak of the possibility of a so-called limited and winnable nuclear war. These highly advanced nuclear weapons, which are first strike in nature, may cause a holocaust that would annihilate the human race forever.

The irresponsible action by the White House proved that the demagogic and hypocritical hue and cry regarding nuclear disarmament and negotiations with the Soviet Union are ephemeral and for propaganda purposes only.

(Mr. Mastamand, Afghanistan)

The present hue and cry raised by the United States Administration will not deceive those of sound mind. The Reagan Administration has submitted to Congress a budget for the 1985 fiscal year that includes a military expenditure of \$305.7 billion, the largest since the Second World War. In order to continue to finance the military build-up, significant social programmes would again be cut. The budget calls for spending nearly \$1.8 billion on the development of "star wars" equipment, \$226 million for killer satellites, \$5 billion for the 40 MX and \$8.2 billion for 34 B-1 bombers.

In the international arena no one can veil what the Reagan Administration did to the peace-loving peoples of Lebanon, Nicaragua, Grenada and my own country. The \$129 million additional aid being demanded by the United States President for his Administration's operation in Central America is actually a request for blood money, to be invested in the elimination of those who are either fighting for or defending freedom and peace in the region.

(Mr. Mastamand, Afghanistan)

United States imperialist aggressive forces, in disregard of the United Nations Charter, invaded Grenada and called it a "rescue mission". One might ask: Why not a rescue mission to your own people from the grips of the economic crisis and especially from unemployment? When the United States Administration calls the invasion of Grenada a "rescue mission", that reminds the peoples of the world that His Excellency Hitler described as a "rescue mission" the invasion by his Nazi hordes of Poland, Czechoslovakia, France and Belgium. The peoples of the world are now saying "God save us from Reagan's 'rescue mission'".

The United States Administration recently embarked on a campaign as though it were thinking about nothing except how to attain a durable peace, prevent war and promote arms control. One might say that if they really meant that, they would join in the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons; otherwise, hollow words mean nothing. The non-first use of nuclear weapons is very important for the international community to live in peace and eliminate the danger of a nuclear holocaust. Unfortunately, the United States and its allies are not only refusing to commit themselves to the non-first use of nuclear weapons but are also openly declaring that if the allies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) committed themselves to the non-first use of nuclear weapon it would destabilize the present world situation. That is why, it is alleged, the United States and its allies do not take into consideration the international community's request to make that pledge.

In this regard, I shall quote the following from the statement of the representative of France in this Committee on 5 November 1984:

"It is to maintain the stabilizing effect of deterrence that France and its allies cannot accept a commitment on the non-first use of nuclear weapons. Such a commitment would have as its effect a strategic and political destabilization with incalculable consequences not only for the region in question but for the world as a whole." (A/C.1/39/PV.28, p. 26)

According to that French view, the international community should and must request the USSR to renounce, as soon as possible, its pledge of non-first use of nuclear weapons in order to achieve peace and maintain and stabilize security all over the world. The main reason for present tension, according to the French view, is the pledge of a nuclear-weapon State not to be the first to use its nuclear weapons in order to save mankind from the danger of a nuclear holocaust for ever.

(Mr. Mastamand, Afghanistan)

Furthermore, if the decision not to pledge the non-first use of nuclear weapon is really correct and helps to maintain peace and security all over the world, one should ask the NATO allies why they delayed their valuable initiative and said nothing about it in 1982 when the USSR made its pledge.

In the Middle East, Israel with the direct support of United States imperialism continues to occupy Arab and Palestinian lands and deny the valiant people of Palestine their inalienable rights. No settlement of the Middle East problem is possible unless the Palestinian people's right to self-determination is ensured.

We believe that without a peaceful solution on the basis of self-determination for the valiant people of Palestine the grave situation in the Middle East will remain as is, for which United States imperialism and its regional accomplices are responsible.

My delegation strongly supports the Soviet Union's proposals for the peaceful solution of the Middle East problem. A lasting peace is possible only if the aggressive forces in that region withdraw from the occupied Arab territories without delay.

In Africa, the policies of apartheid of South Africa not only remain unchanged but also pose a threat to the whole continent. Mr. Botha's tour of some Western European countries encourages the apartheid régime strongly to suppress the black majority of South Africa and to continue its occupation of Namibia.

In South-East Asia, the aggressive policies of hegemonist circles co-operate with imperialist forces to destabilize the social system of the region, in particular of Viet Nam, Kampuchea and Laos. The continuous increase and modernization of military bases in the Indian Ocean by imperialist circles are a great threat to peace and security in our region. Those circles try to use every pretext to perpetuate their presence in that area.

As a hinterland of the Indian Ocean, my country attaches great importance to the efforts of the littoral States aimed at the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and in favour of the urgent implementation of the 1971 United Nations Declaration on the subject.

The undeclared war being waged by imperialism, hegemonism and the reactionary States of the region against our people continues unabated. Bands of terrorists,

(Mr. Mastamand, Afghanistan)

financed and armed by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), have been infiltrated into my country to destroy schools, hospitals, roads and other useful property of the State and people. Western mass media shamelessly describe those terrorist activities as "successful operation of freedom fighters".

I should like to cite a few of the facts that we have previously disclosed in many international forums about United States imperialism, Chinese hegemonism and regional reactionaries and their subversive activities, which indicate that peace and stability are impossible until the aforementioned aggressive forces stop their brutal activities.

Recent official documents show that they have increased their subversive activities so as definitely to destabilize peace and security in the region. The hue and cry of imperialist circles is only to deceive the international community and to cover their brutal deeds. The facts, which reveal the real aggressive nature of United States imperialism and its regional accomplices, are stated in The New York Times of 28 November 1984, as follows:

"United States officials say \$280 million has been earmarked in covert military aid for the Afghan insurgents this fiscal year, more than doubling the aid in the fiscal year that ended Sept. 30.

"... This does not include additional aid of \$100 million provided last year by Saudi Arabia and other Arab countries, China and Israel, according to official estimates.

"...

"The sources described the system for supplying arms to the rebels. According to these accounts, American dollars are used to purchase mainly Soviet-made arms from countries such as China, Egypt and Israel ...

"The arms are then delivered to Pakistani ports. At that point, by agreement between the C.I.A. and Pakistan, the supplies pass to Pakistani control for delivery to the political leaders of the Afghan [rebels] in Peshawar, Pakistan, and elsewhere. They, in turn, are supposed to pass them to the guerrillas.

"'Accounting procedures are next to nil', said an American intelligence official." (The New York Times, 28 November 1984, pp. A1 and A9)

(Mr. Mastamand, Afghanistan)

In such a situation, when brutality is accompanied by a hue and cry, how could someone think of real peace and security in a world where imperialist and hegemonist forces, together with their regional reaction, not only continue their acts of aggression but also double their brutal activities. Actually, they tend to forget their empty words of a week ago about peace, security and non-interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State.

(Mr. Mastamand, Afghanistan)

How would the international community be able to achieve durable and lasting peace when the words of the aggressive forces are not in harmony with their deeds? How can we talk about the security of a State which has broken the imperialist chain of oppression and has chosen its own way of development and social progress which is not in accordance with the wishes of the United States and its allies? Why are United States imperialism and its allies intensifying subversive activity in Asia, Africa and Latin America? Why are they speaking of peace and security? They should obviously declare themselves to be what their deeds show, that is, warmongers and aggressors who are against peace and stability.

The subversive and ominous acts of world imperialism and its allies will not reverse the way which our people have chosen; we will succeed in achieving our humanitarian goals, but with a lot of sacrifices which our valiant people are ready to accept. They will not spare their lives to defend their motherland against the aggression of imperialists, hegemonists and other regional forces.

Furthermore, in this regard President Babrak Karmal said:

"The counter-revolutionaries have not become more powerful, but they are breathing their last breath and are being crushed. The leaders of the counter-revolutionaries are not able to organize a big military operation. Their tactics are directed towards making attacks on communications, destroying enterprises and blackmailing the people. We can say with confidence and pride that our revolution is defending itself against all kinds of mischief done by the enemies. Let none of them be confident of escaping punishment. But anyone who realizes the futility of the campaign against the revolution, the people and the country can expect compassion and justice.

"We have done all we could to prevent the neighbouring countries from their hostile policies. We are one of the strongest proponents of peaceful coexistence and good-neighbourly relations. We will continue our efforts to accomplish an atmosphere of mutual understanding in our region. World imperialism has created the so-called issue of Afghan refugees and is using it against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. A real solution of the refugee issue demands that all the intervention and aggression against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan be ceased and thousands of Afghan refugees allowed to return to their homeland without any hindrance from the terrorist bands, the military régime and their CIA advisers."

(Mr. Mastamand, Afghanistan)

Concerning the State terrorism which has been recently and widely practised by certain States against the sovereignty and political independence of other States, gravely undermining the socio-political system of States, this is another great danger to the peace and security of the international community.

Effective measures should be taken to prevent the subversive activity of State terrorism and protect the sovereignty and independence of Member States from the aggressive acts of the world imperialism of the United States and its military allies.

We strongly support the Soviet proposal in this regard and the international community should take the necessary measures to prevent State terrorism and maintain peace and security in order to save mankind from the scourge of any kind of war.

Mr. MEISZTER (Hungary): The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1970, was whole-heartedly welcomed and consistently adhered to by the Hungarian Government for two fundamental reasons. First, it was the considered view of my Government that strict adherence by all States to the principles enshrined in the Declaration was the only way of strengthening international security, preventing nuclear war, and eventually all wars, and maintaining peace all over the world at present and in the foreseeable future. Secondly, we did it with good conscience, being aware of the fact that there was an absolute convergence between the purposes and objectives set forth in the Declaration and the foreign policy priorities declared and pursued by Hungary.

The Declaration was adopted at a time when, owing to favourable international circumstances, one could justifiably look to the future with a certain degree of optimism. Nowadays, owing to changes in some countries' conduct of their international relations, there is a growing feeling in the international community about the need persistently to call upon all States strictly to adhere to the purposes and objectives contained in the Declaration. It seems to us that such a reminder is more urgent and imperative now than it has ever been since the adoption of the Declaration.

As my delegation has stated in its different interventions both in the General Assembly and in the First Committee during the present session, we cannot but point out that the past year saw no improvement in the tense international situation. On

(Mr. Meiszter, Hungary)

the contrary, the military-political situation has continued to worsen and has reached an alarming point. The imperialist circles with a vested interest in the arms race have persisted in their policy of obtaining military superiority. As a consequence of this, mankind is faced today by two major dangers: the first is the looming possibility of a nuclear war and the second is the threat of a new, steep and unprecedented rise in the spiral of the arms race posed by its eventual extension to outer space. All this is followed with the deep concern of peoples all over the world, a concern faithfully reflected in the more than 60 resolutions adopted by the Committee some days ago.

Against this background it is our conviction that the solemn call of the Declaration - namely, that all States adhere strictly in their international relations to the purposes and principles of the Charter, that all States refrain from the threat or use of force, that all States settle their international disputes by peaceful means - is incontestably topical.

A positive reaction by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries to the proposal made by the Warsaw Treaty Organization would be a decisive step in this direction. The Warsaw Treaty member States in their appeal of May 1984 offered to conclude with the NATO member States a treaty on the mutual renunciation of the use of armed force by undertaking a mutual commitment in the form of a legally binding treaty not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against each other and therefore not to be the first to use any military force at all against each other. Faced by a lack of any response to that positive proposal, we feel constrained to express once again our conviction that in the current complicated international situation it would be especially important to make progress towards a positive solution of the issue of concluding such a treaty.

We are all aware of the fact that the relations between the two great Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, have been and remain a decisive factor in the international situation. It is with this in mind that we have learnt with great pleasure and encouragement that the Soviet Union and the United States have agreed to meet in Geneva on 7 January 1985 to enter into new negotiations on the issues concerning nuclear-arms control and the prevention of the militarization of outer space. It goes without saying that reaching agreement in these fields would be of paramount significance for the security of the whole world and for the entire future of disarmament efforts.

(Mr. Meiszter, Hungary)

Therefore, the Hungarian delegation, together with the representatives of peace-loving nations, wishes those negotiations a successful outcome.

My country attaches great importance to the situation in Europe and hence to the development of the Helsinki process, one which in its emergence, time horizon and content is consubstantial with the Declaration. Our attachment to it is motivated not simply by the geopolitical position of Hungary, but also by our awareness of the very fact that the highest concentration of dreadful arms is to be found in Europe so that any conflict in the area could lead to nothing but a world conflagration. We are therefore deeply interested in maintaining the vitality of the process initiated in Helsinki, a vitality amply evidenced by the successful conclusion of the Madrid meeting and the convening of the Stockholm Conference. My Government has been doing its utmost to help to unfold the process of Helsinki at both these meetings and continues to deploy all efforts to promote the full and balanced implementation of the principles and recommendations contained in the Final Act.

(Mr. Meiszter, Hungary)

We see in the decision to have Hungary as host country for the European Cultural Forum in 1985 a recognition of our efforts in this direction. We are preparing for the Forum in the strong belief that the furthering of co-operation in Europe, in any sphere of social activity, may be an important step towards the strengthening of confidence.

Alarming relations between States are not unique to Europe. We are deeply worried about the situation in the Middle East. Every passing day we become more and more convinced that the only way out of that perennial crisis would be nothing less than a comprehensive settlement which would ensure for the Palestinian people the exercise of its legitimate rights, including the right to establish a State of its own. It would also create all the conditions and guarantees necessary for all States of the region to live in peace and security, within internationally recognized borders. Success can be achieved only if all States of the region, as well as those having an influence in the region, make every effort to bring about negotiations on such a basis.

The situation in Central America is also a cause for concern. Moments of hope, motivated by initiatives made by the Contadora States, alternate with those of desperation, as tension is artificially maintained by a State with great influence in the region. In our view, the cessation of threats, of dubious military manoeuvres, of covert and overt interference, is a prime condition for the States concerned to embark on the path leading towards a negotiated settlement of the crisis and a climate of détente in the Caribbean region.

To our great regret, Cyprus remains a hotbed of tension. Maintaining that the restoration of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus, respect for its sovereignty and non-aligned status is a condition sine qua non for eliminating the tension in that region, we support every effort, including the negotiations between the interested communities, directed towards a negotiated settlement in the spirit of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations.

In the same spirit, we deeply appreciate the efforts by countries of Indo-China to reduce tensions in South-East Asia. We are convinced that the controversial issues of the subcontinent can and should be solved peacefully by the States directly involved, on the basis of respect for their mutual interest and of the existing realities.

(Mr. Meiszter, Hungary)

The realization of initiatives by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for a peaceful and democratic reunification of the country would mean significant progress in improving the international climate. It is for this reason and out of our solidarity with the just struggle of the Korean people that we continue to support every effort to this end.

The Hungarian Government, after reviewing the events that contributed to the worsening of the international climate during the previous period, and analysing the causes which provoked such a state of affairs, arrived at two main conclusions.

The first one is that there is nothing irreversible in this process, provided that all parties in the international arena are ready to demonstrate the necessary political will, their readiness to negotiate in earnest, and a willingness to take account of the security interests of the other partners as well.

Secondly, the search for ways and means to solve any international crisis, to eliminate any hotbed of tension, can be contemplated only on the basis of recognition of realities.

The overall reality of our world is the existence of States having different socio-political systems. Our entire previous experience proves that the curves marking the ups and downs of the ever changing tensions in the international climate have had a tendency to rise whenever a State disregarded this basic reality; whenever there was an attempt to undermine, by whatever means, the socio-political system of a sovereign and independent State. As we witnessed an increasing number of such attempts in recent times, we found more than timely the initiative of the Soviet Union in proposing that the General Assembly condemn the policy and practice of State terrorism, demand that all States take no actions whatsoever aimed at a forcible change in or the undermining of the socio-political system of sovereign States and call on all States not to initiate military action to that end and cease forthwith any such action already in progress. It is for this reason that the Hungarian delegation strongly supports draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1, whose adoption and immediate application in international relations would undoubtedly contribute to a saner climate.

The Hungarian Government, while shaping its foreign policy and eager to comply fully with the purposes and objectives set forth in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, is guided by the aforementioned principles. What is more, we regard this activity as being only one part of a twofold obligation. The strengthening of international security demands from any

(Mr. Meiszter, Hungary)

State not only a corresponding foreign policy but a complementary internal effort as well, directed towards preparing its society for life in peace. The molding of human consciousness for the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter is as significant a task as the implementation of peaceful principles in our international activities.

We stated at the very outset that the Hungarian legislation, the constitutional guarantees, enactments and other instruments of domestic law, were in full conformity with the principles enshrined in the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace. That did not stop us from undertaking purposeful activity for furthering the realization of those principles. Now we are able to report with some pride that Hungarian society is in a position to intensify preparation for life in peace.

In this connection I would like to mention only the most significant events that mark this process. We have for the third consecutive year organized a national peace rally at Pusztavacs, the geographical centre of Hungary, to commemorate the atom bombing of Hiroshima. More than 350,000 participants expressed in a wide variety of ways the inalienable right of all individuals to life in peace. In its content and dimension the peace rally at Pusztavacs can be compared to the mass impact of the Easter peace marches in Western Europe. It is an established tradition that the Month of Peace and Friendship is observed every year following the anniversary of the victory over fascism. This year it was marked by a great variety of events, such as demonstrations for peace, debates at clubs, an Esperanto peace tour, peace festivals of nationalities and peace meetings of clergymen. Some 500 leaders of Hungarian churches and denominations met in the House of Parliament on 29 March 1984 to discuss the responsibility of believers to the homeland and to mankind. The participants adopted an appeal entitled "The Future Belongs to Men of Peace", reaffirming their faith that defence of life and peace is a sacred duty of all believers. In response to the needs of young people, the National Peace Council set up its Committee of Youth and Students last year to help in the realization of comprehensive and varied programmes related to questions of peace. At the end of last year, in response to a disarmament initiative of Hungarian youth, a peace appeal was signed by 2.5 million citizens, mostly young people, representing one fourth of the population.

Being fully aware of the fact that for the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter, Government actions alone are not sufficient, that lasting peace can only be secured if peoples, individuals and especially the young

(Mr. Meiszter, Hungary)

generations are educated and brought up in a spirit of understanding, friendship and common concern for the future, we strongly consider that the international organizations, governmental or non-governmental, and in particular the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), have a vital role to play in complementing the Governments' efforts to this end. It is on the basis of this understanding that we lend our full support to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.89 concerning the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace.

(Mr. Meiszter, Hungary)

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that in our view international security and its strengthening demand a very complex set of conditions: the elimination of force from international relations; the observance of certain norms and principles in shaping inter-State relations; consistent efforts to create better understanding among peoples; and the education of individuals concerning their role in the manifold endeavours to secure peace all over the world.

The United Nations system of organizations has an important role to play in furthering the realization of these conditions. We are pleased to state that the United Nations approaches its fortieth anniversary with a worthy record of activities. This provides genuine grounds for hope that the United Nations and the specialized agencies will continue to contribute to the establishment, maintenance and strengthening of a just and durable peace for the present and future generations.

Mr. GAUCI (Malta): I shall deal today with agenda item 67.

The stirrings of inquietude over the situation in the Mediterranean, the strivings for positive change, have borne some fruit over the past 12 months. It cannot of course be asserted that significant advances have been made in resolving any of the hot spots that highlight the confrontation in the Mediterranean, but nevertheless the new sense of awakening to which my delegation referred last year can claim at least to have preserved its dedicated momentum.

For the first time, at our previous session, the situation in the Mediterranean was discussed on its own merits, as a separate item. Many delegations gave a comprehensive survey of their individual attitudes concerning the Mediterranean region. My own delegation did the same, and even produced ample statistical evidence to substantiate the importance of the Mediterranean as an international centre of shipping and trade, showing its growth rate in the past and its potential for the future. At the end of the debate, and as a product of intensive consultations, a resolution was adopted by consensus which, in the intentions of the sponsors, constituted a basis for future efforts to attain the stated objectives.

As a result, we now have before us the analytical report submitted by the Secretariat, contained in document A/39/517. My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to express its appreciation of the brief but comprehensive and constructive report submitted for our consideration.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

The number and the representative nature of the replies submitted, the analysis of the debate last year and the special insight shed on the situation by the Mediterranean countries - those most directly concerned - show much convergence and in fact indicate broad support, even from outside the region, on practical measures designed to improve the present situation.

Let me first recall what I said last year as being Malta's objective:

"We also know that difficulties left to fester can augment negativism to extremes, the Middle East crisis being a prime example. We simply cannot allow the smoke from that conflagration to choke the entire Mediterranean. Our determination is to nourish the positive and reduce the negative and eventually confer upon the Mediterranean its proper role as a major corridor of peace serving international trade and communications." (A/C.1/38/PV.49, p. 9)

I also added then that:

"We need to act now if we wish to shift the course away from disaster. Let the Mediterranean countries rise to the occasion. Consultations and co-operation can and must prevail over confrontation and division."

(A/C.1/38/PV.49, p. 10)

I am glad to report that the Mediterranean members of the Non-Aligned Movement responded to this call and made a first but significant step in a determined attempt to permit the regional States themselves to define the course of action most conducive to a lasting and peaceful settlement of regional problems.

On 13 September this year, the non-aligned Mediterranean members, after holding two preparatory meetings at the invitation of my Government, at the level of senior officials, adopted at the ministerial level the "Valletta Declaration for Mediterranean Peace."

The participants in that meeting recognized in all seriousness that we are still far from the end of our endeavours for peace and security in the Mediterranean. We were all acutely conscious that serious threats exist in the region, which make it extremely difficult to consolidate the social, economic and political gains already achieved by the participants. Indeed, some fears were expressed that those very gains could be jeopardized in the present unhealthy situation persisting in the Mediterranean.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

In emphasizing that the most serious threat arises from the fact that the super-Powers have transformed the Mediterranean area into one of the focal points of their global confrontation, my Foreign Minister pointed out on that occasion:

"It is stunning to contemplate the reality. The two mightiest navies the world has ever known deploy their most prized possessions here, together with the bulk of half a dozen other navies. Well over 150 major surface combat units, carrying the most sophisticated weaponry, including nuclear weaponry, as well as an unquantified number of submarines, including many with sea-launched ballistic missiles, daily ply the waters around us. Nuclear weapons have been deployed not only in the sea but also on land around us. Continuous manoeuvres, on land and sea, heighten the tension around us and make unsafe even the sea and air lanes intended for peaceful commercial traffic."

We firmly believe that this serious situation need not persist; it certainly should not deteriorate and in fact we are determined that it can gradually be reversed. We feel that, as in other regions, the Mediterranean countries can take the lead in persuading the super-Powers that the pursuit of their legitimate interests is better served by a reduction, rather than an increase, in the level of armed confrontation. And we also feel that non-aligned Mediterranean countries in particular have a vital role to play in demonstrating that a reduction of armaments and tension in our region can be accomplished without the interests of either super-Power being at any moment jeopardized through a lop-sided or biased approach.

Those were the overriding objectives of the meeting. The results have been brought to the attention of all Member States through the kind offices of the Secretariat and were circulated on 27 September 1984 as document A/39/526. Permit me briefly to indicate some of the highlights of the Valletta Declaration.

The Declaration, the first of its kind covering security and co-operation among the non-aligned countries of the Mediterranean, was - also for the first time - diligently and carefully negotiated and finally adopted at the ministerial level.

The meetings preceding the adoption of the Valletta Declaration were held in an open and co-operative attitude, which naturally attracted the attention and interest of countries outside the Non-Aligned Movement, including in particular the Deputy Foreign Minister of Greece, who personally attended the opening ministerial meeting and whose presence we found most gratifying.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

Permit me to say that the Maltese Government considers the 21-point Declaration as a 21-gun salute peacefully heralding a new dawn for the Mediterranean. It represents an honest and comprehensive assessment of the major problems which have to be tackled; on these problems the non-aligned members recognize their common interest and express their common determination to seek progress, and to act in concert in order to bring about peaceful and positive change, so as to give practical substance to their commitments under the Valletta Declaration.

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

Nothing important was left out during the meeting; nothing was avoided. The ominous shadows cast over the Mediterranean by the unresolved questions of Cyprus and of Palestine, for instance, or the dangerous presence of opposing naval forces roaming the Mediterranean, were brought out with compelling clarity. The purpose was not to find a new forum for the discussion of these issues. Rather, the meeting resulted from our recognition that they are terribly important and will have inevitable repercussions for the Mediterranean, unless concerted action is taken to have them resolved. The participants in the Valletta meeting have therefore recognized what needs to be done, and we have accepted our primary responsibility to set a good example and to start the difficult road to halting and reversing the present negative factors that are damaging our region.

Important practical decisions were also taken. As a first step, for instance, the Mediterranean members of the Non-Aligned Movement have now given a specific regional content to the general principle of the non-use of force, by reaffirming their solemn commitment not to resort to the use of force or the threat of force in our relations with one another. We have also reiterated the importance of not allowing our national territories and facilities to be used for aggressive purposes against one another, and we have called upon other countries, on a basis of reciprocity, to do likewise.

The national contribution of Malta in having permanently eradicated the former military bases has been recognized as a valid and practical asset to the principles and objectives of non-alignment and of peace and security in the region.

These commitments on Mediterranean security are all positive and significant factors on which the participants have agreed and of which they have reason to be proud. We trust that these elements will find favour and effective world-wide support. The forward-looking decisions have already gained the endorsement of the entire Non-Aligned Movement. Indeed, we hope and expect that even countries belonging to military alliances will recognize the significance of these positive first steps towards reducing regional - and hence global - tension, and will respect them accordingly.

My country was also actively engaged in Venice, Italy, in a seminar on co-operation in the Mediterranean in the fields of economy, science and culture, which was opened by the Foreign Minister of Italy. The report issued at the end of

(Mr. Gauci, Malta)

that seminar was considered the best to come out of it and similar events held since the Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. The Venice meeting was itself a follow-up of a similar gathering in Valletta a few years ago.

As I joyfully bring you, Sir, and the Committee these good tidings of progress achieved and of solemn undertakings given, we are among the first to recognize that much more needs to be done. That is why we solemnly undertake to continue our search for collective action to bring about progress on the long-standing problems that, as I mentioned previously, have inevitable repercussions on the entire Mediterranean region, particularly, of course, the questions of Cyprus, Palestine, Lebanon and the Middle East. On these issues we have all pledged full support to the efforts of the Secretary-General, and we have urged him to continue and intensify his current efforts.

What we have done is but a first step for the Mediterranean, but one we consider to be of tremendous significance. We therefore also pledge to follow up on our activities. Already we have decided in advance to meet again in 1986, and even earlier if considered necessary. We also intend to extend the contacts initiated as and when possible.

We naturally hope that these historic undertakings will find adequate reflection in the resolution to be adopted this year by the Committee. That is why, together with other Mediterranean countries, we have worked on a text which we again this year hope will be adopted by consensus. We would have wished to have more time to finalize our consultations before having to deposit the text of the resolution, but we felt obliged to honour the deadline set by the Committee, and we deposited the text yesterday evening. It has now been issued as document A/C.1/39/L.90, and further consultations are already under way to achieve a positive outcome.

The meeting was suspended at 6.15 p.m. and resumed at 6.30 p.m.

Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): The delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic is participating seriously and with concern in the debate on the subject of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which was adopted 14 years ago by the General Assembly on a subject crucial to the harmonious development of relations among States and peoples. There is no need to say what is of concern to the international community and the United Nations at the present time - as this was borne out by the statements made during the plenary meetings by almost all of the heads of the participating delegations, is the deterioration of the international situation, for which responsibility resides in the policy of confrontation of the military circles of United States imperialism and some of its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, which have embarked on, and continue to conduct, an unbridled arms race, in particular a nuclear-arms race.

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

It is clear that all theories that advocate military supremacy through an unbridled arms race, both conventional and nuclear - "first strike", "surprise nuclear attack", "limited nuclear war" and so on - cannot but destroy the climate of trust we are so arduously attempting to establish among nations, and in particular among the great Powers of the two military and political blocs that possess nuclear weapons. Such theories cannot but irreparably undermine the already shaky foundations of international peace and security.

The well-informed observer knows whether it is the Soviet Union or the United States of America that is sincerely and constantly striving towards the maintenance and strengthening of peace and security in this world. He knows which opposes and has always opposed all proposals and initiatives for peace put forward by the Soviet Union in bilateral and multilateral negotiations, here, in Geneva, in Stockholm and in Vienna, in the field of arms control and disarmament. The deployment in November of last year of Pershing-2 missiles and United States cruise missiles in some Western European countries demonstrated the obvious bad faith and unbounded desire to attain military superiority of the military circles in the United States and some members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and it posed an obvious and serious threat to the peace and security of the peoples of all of Europe, as well as to those of Africa and the Middle East. What is beyond human understanding is that those apostles of the arms race stated, and continue to state loudly, that they too are pursuing a policy of peace, peace based not on disarmament but on force or the use of force. It goes without saying that the Soviet Union and the community of socialist countries, along with all countries truly and not hypocritically dedicated to peace, security, justice and progress, cannot accept an aberrant philosophy that promotes the use of force in all its forms, including State terrorism, as a means of resolving conflicts among States and as a principle governing inter-State relations.

That is the root cause of the present deterioration of the world situation, a tension that generates a serious threat to the peace and security of the peoples of the various regions of our world. In southern Africa, with the multifaceted political, economic and military support given it by the United States Government through its policy of so-called constructive engagement, as well as by some of its allies, the illegal racist régime of Pretoria is continuing to use its diabolical

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

machinery of repression against the oppressed people of South Africa, and to commit acts of military and economic aggression against neighbouring independent countries, including Angola, and to delay the process of granting rapid and unconditional independence to Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The international community must condemn with even greater vigour the policy of apartheid and aggression currently being implemented with total impunity by the racist and expansionist Pretoria régime against the front-line countries. That policy can be described as State terrorism under international law and by virtue of the principles of our Charter, since it threatens the peace and security of the countries and peoples concerned and violates their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. More serious still, such policies and practices, in addition to comprising the use of such reprehensible elements as mercenaries, are aimed at destabilizing the social and political system of the States concerned and even at overthrowing Governments in power.

The same tragedy is to be found in the Middle East, where the Israeli Zionist régime, with the increased political, military and economic support given it by Washington, its strategic ally, and other Western military circles, is with impunity continuing its acts of repression against the Palestinian and Arab peoples in the territories it has occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and its acts of aggression and occupation against certain Middle East countries, such as Syria and Lebanon. Zionist forces and their protector, United States imperialism, have not hesitated and do not hesitate to use the subversive ploys of destabilization and aggression against those countries, manoeuvres that take the form of State terrorism.

If we turn to the regions of Central America and the Caribbean, we see that the threats posed by the policy of provocation, intervention and aggression being pursued by the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) against the peace, security, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of revolutionary Nicaragua, as well as against socialist Cuba, are being intensified and worsened. All of these manoeuvres of intimidation, of overt or covert intervention through the use of mercenaries or the soldiers of reactionary

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

countries in the region, as well as through the mining of ports, constitute State terrorism in that they are basically aimed at destabilizing the social and political systems of Nicaragua and Cuba and at denying them their right to independent economic development. Lastly, they are aimed at toppling, if possible, the régimes in power to replace them with reactionary régimes in the pay of the imperialist aggressors. The case of the small island of Grenada, invaded by United States troops in November of last year, is symptomatic. It goes without saying that such a policy of the United States Government runs counter to the principles and purposes of our Charter, as well as to the relevant declarations of the General Assembly, in particular those concerning the inadmissibility of intervention in the affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty. That policy also contravenes the peace efforts being made with regard to Central America by the Contadora Group, efforts that are, as we know, actively supported by the international community.

In the region of the Indian Ocean, the presence of the United States naval and military bases and their expansion and modernization - especially the air and naval base at Diego Garcia, with its notorious rapid-deployment forces - clearly pose a threat to the peace, independence and security of the countries and peoples bordering that region, as well as to the hinterland States. Of course, the powers holding those bases justify their military presence there on the basis of the need to defend or safeguard their so-called vital interests. As to the legitimate interests and aspirations for peace and security of the peoples concerned in the region, those have been sacrificed on the altar of imperialist aggression.

This may perhaps explain why the United States of America and some of its allies have thus far adopted a negative or obstructionist attitude towards the idea of convening an international conference on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

Equally reprehensible are the activities of destabilization and subversion daily being carried out by imperialist, expansionist and regional reactionary forces against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. It is well known that Washington is financing the undeclared war against that independent and sovereign country, a member of the Non-Aligned Movement. The amount of that clandestine aid will, according to The New York Times of 28 November 1984, be increased, as noted by the representative of Afghanistan. It is clear that that policy of State

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

terrorism, in addition to posing a threat to the peace, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country, violates the principles of the Charter and poses a serious threat to the peace and security of the region and the world.

This brings me to the region of South-East Asia, to which my country belongs. The particular importance our world Organization attaches to peace, stability and co-operation in that region has been illustrated by the fact that for five years now that question has been the subject of an annual debate in the General Assembly. It is accurate to say that the history of South-East Asia is one of a long and heroic struggle waged by the peoples of that region against colonialists, militarists, imperialists and expansionists in order to regain their individual independence and freedom.

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

But it is the peoples of Kampuchea, Viet Nam and Laos who have made the heaviest sacrifices and undergone the most serious devastation. Since its complete liberation from imperialist domination, the Lao people, like the fraternal Kampuchean and Vietnamese people, have just one heartfelt aspiration: to live in peace, understanding and co-operation with all peoples of the world and in particular its neighbours, without distinction as to political or social system, in order to reconstruct its country, so brutally devastated by the war of imperialist aggression, and to build a new, happy and prosperous life; but unfortunately those very legitimate wishes of the three peoples of Indo-China clash with the expansionist and hegemonist designs of Peking, which, in connivance with United States imperialism and international and regional reactionary forces, dreams of dominating South-East Asia. These expansionist and hegemonist forces, in order to achieve their sinister goals, endeavour to sow division among the three countries of Indo-China on the one hand and the countries belonging to the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) on the other. They have used and continue to use the debris of the genocidal Pol Pot clique and other reactionary elements gathered together in the so-called Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea.

The deterioration of the situation in South-East Asia is caused by the global strategy of imperialist and expansionist domination. In order to subjugate the three Indo-Chinese countries, the Chinese expansionists, in collusion with the imperialist and reactionary forces, both international and regional, use all sorts of illicit methods and means which can be described as State terrorism, such as military provocation at borders, aggression, territorial occupation, economic blockade, psychological warfare - all for subversive ends. The ultimate objective of the expansionist and imperialist forces has clearly been to topple the democratic People's Governments that have been established in Laos, Kampuchea and Viet Nam following their complete victory.

It will be recalled that my country, Laos, has since 6 June last been the victim of a clear-cut aggression by ultra-rightist Thai reactionary forces. I believe everyone here will be familiar with the matter of the three Lao villages. The Thai troops have not yet completely evacuated Lao territory although the administration of the three villages has already been taken over again by local Lao authorities. In other words, the Chinese troops and the ultra-rightist reactionary Thai troops continue to exercise strong pressure at our borders, thus posing a

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

serious threat to the independence and territorial integrity of our country. In these conditions it is difficult to maintain and restore peace, stability and security in South-East Asia.

In North-East Asia the situation remains equally tense because of the presence of United States troops in South Korea, which thus far has prevented a just solution to the problem through the peaceful reunification of Korea.

To come back to the region of South-East Asia, Laos, like Kampuchea and Viet Nam, will spare no effort to make its contribution to the solution of the problems of achieving peace, stability, friendship and co-operation in this very important region of the world.

The international situation, as can be seen, remains very tense because of the global strategy of expansionism and domination which is single-mindedly pursued by the military circles of United States imperialism and some of its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). This strategy is inevitably leading the world to the brink of disaster. The international community has the moral and legal obligation to do everything in its power to preserve present and future generations from the scourge of another war, which, since it would be nuclear, would destroy all mankind. All States, large and small, rich and poor, regardless of their political and social systems, must coexist peacefully in this world and more than ever before must promote relations of friendship and mutually advantageous co-operation for the well-being and good of their respective peoples.

The rules of conduct and principles which govern international relations are already set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, principles which are constantly reaffirmed and developed in innumerable declarations by the General Assembly. Clearly, in order to promote friendly relations and co-operation among nations the international community must also issue prohibitive rules or list negative attitudes and types of behaviour which States should refrain from adopting. In this connection my delegation, which is peace-loving in nature, welcomes and whole-heartedly supports the revised draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 on the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States, a draft resolution which the Ambassador of the Soviet Union, Mr. Troyanovsky, submitted to this Committee for consideration yesterday. We are convinced that the adoption of that important draft resolution by the United

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

Nations would contribute greatly to the strengthening of peace and security in our world.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): The Bahamas delegation would wish to make a brief statement on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 on the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States.

The Bahamas delegation is in total agreement with what it perceives to be the main thrust of the text of this draft resolution, that is, that terrorism should not be encouraged or tolerated in the international community and should not be used to deprive anyone of basic human rights. My delegation's difficulties, inter alia, lie in the interpretation of the phrase "aimed at undermining the socio-political system". Terrorism, like any other act of violence or aggression, should receive general and complete condemnation and should not be pigeon-holed into a narrow or specific orientation, as is done in the draft resolution.

A further concern is that the references to the observance of the Charter and to international law seem to be equally specific in nature. One may get the feeling that their implementation could be altered in other cases where terrorism or any other heinous act might occur.

Thirdly there are several draft resolutions before this Committee, and indeed the General Assembly, which call attention to the main thrust of the draft resolution and which could probably obtain wider acceptance than the present form of this draft resolution. The representative of Singapore, in his introduction of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.92, expressed several views with which my delegation concurs. I place particular emphasis on the last two paragraphs of his statement regarding the two sets of amendments before this Committee. My delegation could support the amendments to this draft in document A/C.1/39/L.92 and would recommend that those ideas be incorporated in the text in an effort to broaden the base for dealing with terrorism, an act which all civilized human beings cannot help but deplore.

Mr. CESAR (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): This year marks the fifteenth anniversary of the Soviet Union's proposal, at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, to discuss international security and appeal to the Governments of all States to strengthen it. One year later the General Assembly unanimously adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

International Security, which is one of the most important international instruments for maintaining peace, as is confirmed by the annual discussion of its implementation.

The ideas underlying that Declaration still remain relevant today, when the circles of militarism and revanchism have caused a very serious deterioration in international relations, characterized by an acceleration and increase in the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race. The expansion of aggression and the creation of hotbeds of tension in various regions of the world are seen through acts of State terrorism which, taken as a whole, have led to the creation of a direct threat to international peace and security and increased the threat of a nuclear conflagration.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

A particularly dangerous manifestation of this development is the continuing deployment of United States medium-range nuclear weapons on the territory of the Western European States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). This deployment is dictated by the desire to gain a military advantage over the socialist countries, to disrupt the historical balance of forces between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty countries. This decision by NATO not only has not led to an increase in the level of security but, on the contrary, has created distrust and tension in Europe and in the world.

The countries of the Warsaw Treaty have frequently stressed that there is a way out of this situation. It lies in taking practical steps to demonstrate the determination to overcome the obstacles that led to the halting of the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva. It is in that context that we regard as being of primary importance the recent invitation by the Soviet Union to the United States to begin negotiations on a whole set of mutual, interrelated questions concerning the non-militarization of space and the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons and medium-range nuclear weapons.

The constructive and realistic attitude of the countries members of the Warsaw Treaty in regard to a radical solution to the questions of limiting the nuclear arms race, achieving nuclear disarmament and eliminating the threat of nuclear war are clearly set out in the communiqué of the recently concluded meeting in Berlin of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the countries of the Warsaw Treaty. We hope that the United States and its allies will heed those proposals and, in a spirit of realism, adopt an attitude that will make it possible to enter into constructive negotiations. To that end, there must be no further attempts to inject ideological disagreements into international discussions, in particular into the process of disarmament negotiations. Rather, such negotiations must be based on the principles of equality and equal security. Only by following such a course can we implement the fundamental principle of this era - the principle of the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems - and thus ensure a peaceful future for the world.

Of far-reaching importance in this regard would be the observance in relations among the nuclear Powers of certain norms indicating a recognition by those Powers of their particular responsibility for the maintenance of peace, norms that would

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

guide them on the path to the prevention of nuclear war. We repeat our full support for the draft of such norms put forward in March this year by Konstantin Chernenko, and we hope that the provisions of this important draft will be seriously and responsibly studied by all the other nuclear Powers. In our opinion, the adoption of such norms, including the obligation to strive, step by step, for a reduction and ultimate elimination of all forms of nuclear weapons would be a real step towards restoring normal relations among the nuclear Powers in full conformity with the United Nations Charter.

In addition to nuclear weapons, a destabilizing factor in international relations is the ever-more-threatening scale and ramifications of the arms race, particularly in space, chemical and conventional weapons. This race swallows up vast financial and material resources.

The question of the prevention of the militarization of space brooks no delay. Extending the arms race to outer space would lead to a further abrupt increase in the threat of a global nuclear conflict and, in addition, could undermine the already shaky foundations of international security as a whole. Czechoslovakia has been consistently in favour of a comprehensive solution to this problem. It has proposed the complete prohibition of the deployment of any kind of weapons in space and the prohibition of the use of force in space, from space to earth and from earth to objects in space, in order to ensure that outer space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes and for the good of mankind. We shall continue to seek to reach the relevant agreements in this respect - inter alia in the forum of the Conference on Disarmament.

In addition to the plugging of all the existing channels of the arms race, we regard as of primary importance the adoption of major moral, political and legal measures to reduce tension and re-establish an atmosphere of trust among States. In our view, the significance of such measures is that their adoption would stimulate a general improvement in international relations and would facilitate constructive negotiations on disarmament and the solution of other acute international problems. Among such measures we would single out the proposal, put forward at the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, held in Prague in January last year, for the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

of relations of peace among the countries of the Warsaw Treaty and the countries of NATO. As is well known, the countries of the Warsaw Treaty have frequently stressed that the conclusion of such a treaty would be a major contribution to the strengthening of the security of third States as well. They have put forward a proposal for an agreement on the text of such a treaty. They have done so in, among other forums, the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, now taking place in Stockholm. We hope that the States members of NATO, which so far have avoided making a direct response to our proposals, will take a constructive position in the future.

We fully support the initiatives for confidence and security building measures and co-operation in various parts of Asia, in particular the initiative of the Mongolian People's Republic on the conclusion of a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations among the States of Asia and the Pacific, the proposal of the Soviet Union on confidence-building measures in the Far East and the initiative of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea on the strengthening of peace and security in South-East Asia.

The achievement of an international treaty on the non-use of force in international relations would also be of great importance for the strengthening of international security. We believe that the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations, established by the General Assembly as long ago as 1976, should begin practical work very soon on the text of such a treaty.

The strengthening of international peace and security is closely linked to the question of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace and co-operation in various regions of the world - for example, the proposals to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Northern Europe and in the Balkan Peninsula and a nuclear-free corridor in Central Europe. These proposals are widely known. For our part, we are ready to do everything we can towards the implementation of these important proposals.

Like other States, Czechoslovakia is in favour of the holding very soon of an international conference to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. This

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

matter has been postponed from year to year, because of the position of the Western States.

The situation in the Mediterranean region remains dangerous. There are several trouble spots there, complicating the general international picture. The armed aggression of the United States in Lebanon and the continuing occupation of southern Lebanon by Israel have led to a further deterioration of the situation in the eastern part of the Mediterranean region.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

The situation in Cyprus continues to be disturbing. Of particular concern is the appearance of American first-strike nuclear missiles in that region. In the light of such developments, we attach great importance to the question of strengthening international security and to peaceful co-operation in the region of the Mediterranean and we support the well-known proposals of the Soviet Union, in particular on lessening military tension and limiting military weapons in that region.

Strengthening international security and ensuring peaceful relations among States is unthinkable until policies of diktat, interference in the internal affairs of other countries and peoples and attempts to impose on them not only other views but also other social, political and economic systems are abandoned. Such a policy at this time is being pursued with increasing frequency against the independent States of Africa, Asia and Latin America and in various forms, be it direct armed aggression or occupation, a demonstration of force, the mining of ports and blockades, military provocations, limited conflicts, support for terrorist groups or other subversive actions, not to mention attempts on statesmen and political figures in other countries. In other words, there is an undeclared terrorist war, either with the sanction of a State or with its direct participation, aimed at undermining or changing by force the socio-political system of another State, that is, a policy of State terrorism. As a result, a further deterioration is occurring in the general international atmosphere with an exacerbation of existing hotbeds of tension and the creation of new ones, in particular in the Middle East, in Central America and the Caribbean area, in South-East Asia and in southern Africa. The policy of State terrorism is in flagrant contradiction of the fundamental provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, which demands that States refrain in their mutual relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, and tramples on the inalienable right of peoples to determine for themselves their own political and economic system and path of development.

Therefore we attach great importance to the initiative of the Soviet Union in raising the question and submitting a draft resolution on the inadmissibility of a policy of State terrorism and any other actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States. We feel that the adoption of the

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

mentioned draft resolution would be a significant contribution to strengthening the security of States, confidence building and ensuring the peaceful development of international life. We are also in favour of the consistent implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, adopted on the initiative of the Polish People's Republic so as to put an end to military psychosis and hostility among peoples.

The improvement in the international situation and the resolution of the complex problems of maintaining and strengthening peace are possible only through a serious and constructive dialogue. Czechoslovakia, in co-operation with other States, will continue to exert every effort in order to use the irreplaceable potential of the United Nations in the interest of such a dialogue, of strengthening universal peace and security and ensuring social and economic progress.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): I should like to make a few remarks with regard to agenda item 69, entitled "Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security". But first let me briefly trace the origin of the subject-matter of this item, which in the opinion of my delegation is of crucial importance and relevance to every facet of our work in this Committee.

It will be recalled that in its resolution 38/191 of 20 December 1983, the General Assembly decided at its session last year to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on the Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the purpose of exploring ways and means of implementing those provisions. In the same resolution the Secretary-General was requested to invite the views and comments of Member States and to pass them on to the Ad Hoc Committee for inclusion in its consideration of the matter. The Ad Hoc Committee was expected to submit a progress report and recommendations to the Security Council for its consideration and comments and to the General Assembly at the present session. A final report was also to have been submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee to the General Assembly at its fortieth session.

A whole year has passed since that resolution was adopted and all we have to show for it is the Secretary-General's note contained in document A/39/144, which consists of replies received from a small number of Member States in response to the invitation extended to all Member States to transmit their views and comments

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

in accordance with the resolution. In spite of the fact that the Secretary-General circulated a reminder for replies, the number of substantive responses received by him and annexed to his note is less than encouraging. Even more important, extensive consultations conducted among the regional groups failed to produce agreement on the composition of the Ad Hoc Committee, which consequently has not come into being.

It is a matter of grave concern and disappointment for my delegation that nothing has otherwise materialized from the programme just outlined for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/191 of 20 December 1983, which was adopted by a vote of 109 in favour, 20 against and 18 abstentions. In view of the record of votes cast last year in an attempt to kill the whole idea of an Ad Hoc Committee, it was perhaps ambitious to have been hopeful that anything concrete would have happened by now. We are aware that powerful groups are opposed to the idea and are determined even now to do everything possible to frustrate it. We cannot concur in their opposition to the process because such fear is groundless. It is necessary therefore to reiterate yet again that the intention is not to rob the Security Council members of their powers and influence, but rather to find out how best such attributes can be supported and utilized to achieve greater international peace and security.

But my delegation has not yet given up all hope. It is our confident belief that, after a year of sober reflection and the continuation of incidents that prejudice international peace and security around the world, those who had not seen eye to eye with us last year will now be more receptive to our point of view on this matter.

In dealing with it, it is necessary to repeat also that we do not advocate the whittling down of the Security Council's responsibility. It is clearly no longer open to doubt that attempts to address this matter within the restricted framework of the Security Council have been unsuccessful and deadlocked. We cannot, for that reason and in all good conscience, leave the collective security provisions of the Charter to fall into disrepute and become a dead letter.

We deeply regret that on a matter of such crucial importance no progress has been possible after a whole year owing to the uncompromising stand taken by some groups on such a relatively minor question as the allocation of seats on the Ad Hoc Committee.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

We think it is time we all pause for a moment to reflect on what is really at stake and our responsibility in the matter. What are we aiming to achieve by the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee? Do we not, as Member States of the United Nations, all profess our attachment to the principle of the maintenance of international peace and security? Do we not all proclaim that because of the escalating arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, international peace and security are under serious siege and threat? Are we not genuinely disturbed by the fierce regional conflicts that persist and the sad inability of this Organization to bring them to an end? Even at this very session this Committee has already adopted a number of solemn draft resolutions which attest to our legitimate concern over the sorry state in which we find international peace and security. Are we satisfied only with adopting pious resolutions of concern which call for improvements in the international peace and security situation but unwilling to follow them up with concrete and practical measures designed to bring about meaningful change?

The Ad Hoc Committee to be set up under resolution 38/191 was envisaged to lead us on to the necessary and practical changes that it may find appropriate to recommend for strengthening the United Nations. The concentration of efforts is of course to be directed at the collective security provisions of the Charter. It is a well-known fact recognized by all, including even those who are resisting any idea of a review, that if the collective security provisions of the Charter have been prevented from being invoked in certain circumstances when it was appropriate to do so, it was because of the misuse of the veto power of some of the permanent members of the Security Council.

The practical result is that those provisions have become virtually unusable and the Security Council severely hamstrung in the exercise of its primary responsibility under the Charter in a crucial area, that is, the maintenance of international peace and security.

We are aware that the powerful and influential among us have shown a marked preference for relying on their own systems of regional and other security alliances and arrangements to such an extent that the collective security provisions of the Charter have largely been left unused. None the less, on the

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

very few occasions when those provisions have been called into play, even on a limited scale, they have proved their worth and effectiveness. Any truly objective and impartial look at the collective provisions of the Charter is bound to lead to the conclusion that their universal character alone should make them superior to other regional or group alliances and arrangements. While, admittedly, regional and group alliances have their own useful role to play in the maintenance of international peace and security, they cannot and should not be a substitute for our collective responsibility when the fate of the entire world is threatened and not just a part of the world. Recent tragic events in certain parts of the world should remind us all of the danger involved in bypassing the United Nations. The old adage of two heads being better than one is not yet dead.

At any rate, in this age of nuclear weapons, when we have been put on notice by some countries that they would have no qualms in resorting to their limited use, which of us can say that a dispute or conflict in one remote corner of the world may not undermine international peace and security to such an extent that it would lead to nuclear war and the total extinction of mankind? Perhaps some of us are letting our imagination run wild, but in our view it is better to err on the side of prudence by placing our faith and hope for survival in the collective security provisions of the United Nations Charter than in any other instruments to act as guarantors of international peace and security. We have unshakeable faith and confidence in the collective provisions of the Charter, on which the founding fathers of the United Nations in their far-sighted wisdom so rightly saw fit to anchor our Organization.

On the eve of the fortieth anniversary of this Organization, therefore, we are all the more conscious that those provisions need to be urgently revived and strengthened in the interest of international peace and security.

It seems to me that the key object of all our deliberations in this Committee is to achieve and assure for mankind international peace and security so that men and women in all walks of life may live their daily lives not under the threat of fear of war or, worse, of nuclear war, but in the universal peace and security which only the United Nations is equipped to ensure for us.

It is the fervent hope of my delegation that, in a spirit of accommodation and in recognition of the fact that what we are seeking to achieve goes beyond the

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

national or regional interests of any one country or group of countries, we can overcome any reservations we may still harbour and move forward at this session to set up the Ad Hoc Committee. Our view is that a compromise formula would be to set it up along the lines of the membership pattern of the Economic and Social Council in terms of its size and, therefore, it should have 54 members.

I am confident that we can all co-operate and agree on this now and not let slip away what seems a golden opportunity to strengthen the United Nations through a meticulous and impartial review of the collective security provisions of the Charter.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): I wish briefly to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.87 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

Contemporary international relations are characterized by trends which most directly threaten the already fragile basis of international security. The situation is such that no one feels safe any longer, since it is evident that not a single country would be exempt from the consequences of a nuclear war. We see these dangerous trends, first of all, in the intensification of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, in the further deterioration of the international economic crisis with its devastating effects for the developing countries and in the deepening of the bloc division.

Of particular concern is that such a situation is coupled with the impasse in multilateral negotiations, particularly within the framework of the United Nations system. Also, the system of collective security envisaged by the United Nations Charter has not been applied in practice.

The basic feature of the contemporary world is a strong interdependence so that any dispute bears the danger of turning into a conflict of the widest proportions. That is why the strengthening of international security and the maintenance of peace are the most important tasks of the United Nations.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session, is today even more important and its implementation is urgently needed. Its consistent application has become more necessary than ever.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.87, namely, Algeria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, the Congo, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and Zambia, had in their minds precisely the importance of consistent adherence to the Declaration and have therefore in the draft resolution pointed to ways and means for its implementation.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

Allow me to express the conviction of the sponsors that the draft resolution will receive the broadest support of the members of the Committee.

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

Mr. AOKI (Japan): In connection with the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union earlier this afternoon, my delegation wishes to remind the Committee of our statement in exercise of the right of reply to the similar statement made by the Soviet Union on 8 November to this Committee. As we did then, we categorically reject as untrue any suggestion that our nation together with the Republic of Korea and the United States of America is working to establish some kind of an eastern North Atlantic Treaty Organization affiliate. Our commitment to international peace and our defence and security policy based on such commitments are well known to this Committee so we will not repeat them here. We deplore the fact that one of our closest neighbours refuses to understand correctly our fundamental policy and instead continues to undertake military build-ups in proximity to our country.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): In a statement this afternoon the representative of Singapore referred to some omission in the statement of the Cuban delegation. If my delegation neglected to say something today, it seems to refer to the amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.92. It seems that the representative of Singapore would not like to condemn positions based on strength or crusades against other countries since from the outset he opposed this in the amendments that were informally circulated to the draft resolution on terrorism.

We also neglected to say that he does not seem to like the condemnation of non-interference and non-intervention in the internal or external affairs of States, the defence of the permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources. It seems that he would not like to support the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, or the condemnation of racist régimes.

I am saying this because the representative of Singapore himself said the following in his statement:

(spoke in English)

(Mr. Nunez Mosquera, Cuba)

"The amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 which I have introduced are not the only amendments that this Committee will be called upon to consider. There is another set of amendments presented by some Western developed States. We do not believe that those amendments are incompatible with our own. We believe that they are complementary ...".

(A/C.1/39/PV.59, p. 68)

(continued in Spanish)

The points I have just raised, if we take a careful look at the Western States' amendments, are precisely the ones that those amendments disregard and that the representative of Singapore claims are compatible with the amendments that he circulated.

Mr. KAUSIKAN (Singapore): I am somewhat amazed by the statement of the representative of Cuba. This was perhaps one of the few times when the representative of a country has spoken in exercise of the right of reply because another country has agreed with him.

Let me remind the Committee of what I said in my statement. First, I did not refer to any omission in his statement. I referred to an omission in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1. What I said about the statement of the representative of Cuba was that, like him, I agreed that the problem of military intervention in various regions of the world is an extremely serious one and for this reason I cannot understand the omission of any reference to military intervention and occupation in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1. The representative of Cuba has either deliberately or inadvertently misunderstood what I said, but I would suggest that when the verbatim records of the Committee are available he should check them.

My delegation's intention, and the intention of the other delegations which have joined us in sponsoring these amendments, was not to support policies based on force, not to support interventionist policies; it was precisely to reject them. It was precisely because we categorically reject such policies that we had sought to introduce language into draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 that would make it clear that the most extreme denial of self-determination is precisely military intervention and occupation. I would again advise the representative of Cuba to check the verbatim records of the Committee.

(Mr. Kausikan, Singapore)

The representative of Cuba has done me the compliment - at least, I take it to be a compliment - of quoting from my statement earlier this afternoon. I wish, however, that he had read out the entire passage. I said in my statement, and let me repeat it to refresh his memory, that we believe that the draft amendment submitted by the Western States and the amendments submitted by the non-aligned countries, including Singapore, are not incompatible. In fact, they are complementary because - and this is the portion that the representative of Cuba omitted to quote - they have as their source the same concern that fundamental international norms and principles should not be inadvertently weakened or misinterpreted.

I did not wish to take to detain the Committee because it is getting late, but I thought that I should set straight the distortions which the representative of Cuba inadvertently seems to have perpetuated. Perhaps it is a question of translation, in which case I would advise him to wait until the verbatim records are available before rushing into making rash and untrue statements.

Mr. THACH SIRAY (Democratic Kampuchea): At this late hour my delegation does not wish to take up much of the Committee's valuable time. But in response to the Soviet representative, Mr. Ovinnikov, who insistently, rudely and arrogantly falsified facts, trying in vain to cover up the aggression against and occupation of small and neighbouring countries, my delegation feels obliged to make the following comments. This afternoon Mr. Ovinnikov said:

"Outside interference has further aggravated the situation in Asia, where a policy of force is being used in the Far East and in the Indian Ocean. The increasing military co-operation between the United States, Japan and South Korea is aimed at creating a kind of eastern branch of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The provocations against Viet Nam, Kampuchea and Laos have not ceased. A meeting of the Security Council was needed for Thailand to withdraw its troops from Lao territory." (A/C.1/39/PV.59, p. 12)

On this point, I would like to ask the representative of the Soviet Union to clarify who is causing outside interference. Who is backing the Vietnamese in invading and occupying Cambodia? Who is invading and occupying Afghanistan? And who is supporting some of their friends who are occupying the north of Chad? Who is aiding friends in fighting the war in Central America?

The Soviet representatives come to this forum and keep talking about peace. But what kind of peace are they talking about? The Soviet Union comes to this forum and keeps talking about disarmament. But what kind of disarmament are they talking about? Instead, I would like to ask the same Soviet delegation to tell us whether they themselves intend to disarm.

The answer is "no". They disarm only the small countries, such as Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968, Afghanistan in 1979 and Kampuchea in 1978.

With regard to these points, we would like to request the Soviet delegation, sincerely, to stop using this forum as the place for their propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no other statements, I have some announcements to make concerning our work. I have received a letter dated 20 November 1984 from the Chairman of the Fifth Committee regarding proposed revisions to the medium-term plan from the period 1984-1989, which is reproduced in document A/C.1/39/8. The proposed revisions concerning the First Committee are contained in chapter I of the "Medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989", as set out in document A/39/6 and Corr.1, pages 2-11.

(Mr. Thach Siray, Democratic
Kampuchea)

If I hear no comments, I shall consider that the First Committee has taken note of the contents of the communication I have referred to and that there are no views that the Committee wishes to express on the matter at this stage.

Accordingly, I will transmit an appropriate communication on this subject, to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee, to that effect.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the Secretary of the Committee to make some announcements concerning sponsorship.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to announce that the following countries have become additional sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/39/L.91: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Italy and Japan.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: With regard to the organization of our work for the rest of the week, there are 15 speakers for tomorrow morning and 23 speakers for the afternoon meeting. Therefore, it is my intention to start the meeting tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. I would request those delegations which are inscribed to speak tomorrow morning, especially those which are inscribed for the first part of the list of speakers, to be present on time so we can start the meeting at 10 a.m. Tomorrow afternoon our meeting will start at the normal time of 3 p.m. It is my intention to exhaust the list of speakers at tomorrow afternoon's meeting. Therefore, the meeting tomorrow afternoon will be an extended one, into the night. Then, on Friday morning, we shall start at 10 o'clock in order to take action on the draft resolutions that have already been submitted.

As to the votes on the draft resolutions or decisions to be taken upon them, it is my intention to take up the draft resolutions in the order in which they were submitted, in the serial order of the "L" documents. I shall start with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.2/Rev.1 and then proceed to L.85, L.86, L.87, L.88, L.89 and L.90. Finally, it is my hope that we can conclude our work by noon on Friday.

The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.