



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.17
2 October 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 29 September 1987, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)
later: Mr. LEGWAILA (Botswana)
(Vice-President)

- General debate [9]: (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Papoulias (Greece)
Mr. Peres (Israel)
Mr. van Dunem (Angola)
Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien (Viet Nam)
Mr. Acevedo Peralta (El Salvador)
Mr. Kafe (Comoros)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

AGENDA ITEM 9 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. PAPOULIAS (Greece) (spoke in Greek; English text furnished by the delegation): Allow me, Sir, on behalf of the Government of Greece, to congratulate you on your election as President of the forty-second session of the General Assembly. You represent a country with which Greece maintains ties of sincere friendship. Your extensive experience in international affairs and the abilities which have distinguished you as a successful diplomat give us the certainty that the work of this session will be brought to a successful conclusion.

I should also like to avail myself of the opportunity to express to your predecessor, the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh, Mr. Humayun Rasheed Choudhury, our appreciation of the able manner and the effectiveness with which he guided the work of the forty-first session of the General Assembly.

I should like, further, to pay tribute to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for the dedication with which he devotes his services to the safeguarding of peace, in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations.

The Foreign Minister of Denmark, Mr. Uffe Ellemann-Jensen, as President of the European Community, has already presented the positions of its 12 member States on the main issues confronting us today. These positions, with which we fully concur, reflect the international activities and responsibilities of the Community, as well as the common policies developed by its member States aimed at the promotion of stability and co-operation in international relations.

I shall therefore limit myself to certain major issues of particular interest to Greece.

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

The promotion of disarmament and our efforts to consolidate security constitute fundamental objectives of my Government's policy. Within the framework of that policy, which we have pursued with consistency, we have promoted a number of initiatives at the national, regional and international level. The Prime Minister of Greece, together with the leaders of the other countries participating in the well-known initiative of the Six, are continuing their untiring efforts towards nuclear disarmament.

The momentous developments of recent days are a source of great satisfaction and of hope for the future. The agreement reached in principle between the United States and the Soviet Union for the elimination of intermediate-range nuclear weapons constitutes a big step towards the banning of all nuclear weapons. We congratulate the leaders of the two super-Powers, President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. The success of these negotiations gives us grounds for hoping that the relations between East and West will continue to improve. At the same time, we express the hope that an agreement on the reduction of strategic weapons by 50 per cent will become a reality, as will the complete cessation of all nuclear tests.

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

However, we are also concerned at the continuing rapid increase in conventional armaments. The existing imbalances constitute a serious threat to international peace. We are convinced that, given the necessary good will, it is possible to reach viable agreements regarding balanced reductions of such armaments and an effective system of verification.

I would be remiss if I did not repeat at this point, as I did last year, our apprehension regarding the continuing spread and use of chemical weapons, which constitute a flagrant violation of existing international rules and agreements. We are convinced that one of the aims of the international community should be a complete ban on the production and use of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles.

The reduction of all types of armaments is an imperative necessity in a world with limited natural and financial resources. While hundreds of millions of people on our planet are suffering from extreme poverty and are not in a position to develop their economies, the spending of vast amounts on armaments constitutes blatant provocation. That is why we attach particular importance to the result of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. The adoption by consensus of its Final Document is an encouraging indication of the international community's political will to face the problems of developing countries through substantial progress in disarmament.

My country, consistent with its policy of promoting peace and détente, has always supported the efforts of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe as a means of maintaining a constructive dialogue between East and West. We have every reason to hope that substantial progress will be achieved during the fourth phase of the Vienna meeting which has just begun. It is fortunate that this meeting comes at a time of encouraging activity in the field of conventional

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

disarmament and of the agreement reached in principle between the two super-Powers on the elimination of the intermediate-range missiles from Europe. The circumstances in which the Vienna meeting is taking place are unique, and we should exploit them as a first-rate opportunity for the maintenance of security and the promotion of co-operation in Europe.

I should like to stress at this point that a condition for the maintenance of security and the promotion of co-operation in Europe and the improvement of the political climate in that region is the creation of a feeling of confidence. Specifically, the promotion of confidence at the regional level is an imperative need. My Government is proud that after continuous efforts it was able to develop the closest possible relations with most of Greece's neighbours. The Balkans, in the past the powder-keg of Europe, are today a model of regional co-operation between countries with different political and economic systems. I wish also to underline the consistency and firmness with which my Government supports the proposal to make the Balkans a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons.

Another area on which the attention of my Government is particularly focused is that of the Mediterranean, as it is related directly to the security of Greece. We have repeatedly stated that the Mediterranean should become a sea of peace, friendship and co-operation among its peoples. We have sincerely supported all efforts to that end.

We deal with international problems and examine them simply from the viewpoint of the countries involved while tending to ignore the fact that, in the final analysis, it is the individual who is the victim of international conflicts. When some countries spend enormous amounts on armaments, instead of directing them to development projects necessary to improve the living standards of their people, in

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

the end it is the individual who suffers. If countries that have blatantly violated and disregarded decisions of the United Nations persist in policies which have been condemned, again it is the individual who suffers.

My Government is deeply concerned over the question of the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms as well as the promotion of social, economic and cultural rights. The problem transcends regional relationships. It is a problem with international repercussions. We are particularly satisfied to see that the United Nations is continuing its efforts in this field and that it has not been discouraged by the many obstacles it has encountered and by the flagrant violations of human rights.

It is our conviction that all States are bound to comply strictly with their international obligations deriving from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the relevant international instruments subsequently adopted. Compliance with these obligations is a duty, not an option. As far as we are concerned, we have always unequivocally condemned every violation of human rights, regardless of where and by whom it is committed. The Greek Government has taken an unreserved position in favour of the equality of the two sexes. It has actively participated in all regional and international efforts to ensure the complete elimination of all forms of discrimination against women. At the national level we have adopted policies in favour of a status of women equal to that of men, in all fields of economic, social and cultural life. Within the United Nations we actively support the strengthening of and an increase in the activities of the committees dealing with women's issues.

The problem of international terrorism, although it has been less acute in recent months, is still a destabilizing factor in international relations. My country has severely suffered because of terrorism. My Government has repeatedly

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

condemned and continues to condemn every terrorist act, regardless of its origin. The present session of the General Assembly will deal with this subject. We hope that it will be possible, with the co-operation of all States, to reach positive and substantive results and that the consensus reached during the fortieth session will be maintained.

Year after year the United Nations deals with a number of major international issues. These issues still appear on the agenda, which shows how little progress we have made towards their solution. However, there have been some encouraging developments.

We welcome the recent initiative of the Heads of State of the five Central American countries which led to an agreement for the implementation of a peace plan in the area. We consider this to be a notable achievement by five small countries which have decided to take their fate into their own hands and establish the forms of co-operation for their own region. My Government is convinced that the countries in Central America can peacefully resolve their problems without foreign intervention. We attach particular importance to the application of democratic procedures and to respect for human and civil rights, and we believe that proposals made for a unilateral cessation of hostilities can be of assistance in this respect. I believe that all countries should respond positively to the appeal made from this rostrum to ensure the success of the peace plan in Central America.

My country, as is well known, attaches particular importance to developments in the Middle East, an area where not only peace in the region but also international stability and security are in danger. The Arab-Israeli conflict remains unresolved, as there has been no change in the situation created by the use of force, the occupation of Arab territories since 1967 by Israel and the lack of a substantive and comprehensive peace process.

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

The fact that the idea of an international conference, which my country has supported for a long time, seems to be gaining ground, even among those that until recently categorically rejected it, gives us ground for hope. Greece has from the outset supported the idea of convening an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations for the solution of the Middle East problem in which all the directly interested parties would participate. Recent decisions of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the European Community present a satisfactory framework for starting an effective peace process.

We believe, furthermore, that the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) should participate in the conference and that the modalities of its participation concern the Arab countries and, in particular, the Palestinians themselves. This conference should have a substantive role, not be converted into a ceremonial forum. It is obvious that the modalities of the conference should be decided by the interested parties themselves, including the PLO, which is the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. We hope that the last obstacles impeding the convening of a conference may soon be overcome.

We have repeatedly stressed that the basic pre-condition of a peace settlement in the Middle East is the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories. We support the aspirations of the Palestinian people to exercise the fundamental, inalienable right to self-determination, including the right to create their own State.

At the same time, it is well known that we support the right of Israel to exist as a State within internationally recognized and secure borders. However, Israel should not deny to the Palestinian people what it rightly seeks for itself - namely, the right to exist. Nor can the international community tolerate the illegal policy of the imposition of arbitrary measures, the establishment of

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

settlements and the creation of faits accomplis in the occupied territories. Such a policy, as in the case of Cyprus, is aimed at altering the legal status of the territories in question and their geographic, natural and demographic conditions, and distorting their history and the identity of their inhabitants.

The tragic situation in Lebanon continues unabated despite some occasional faint hopes of a peace settlement, which unfortunately quickly fade. My country again calls upon the interested parties and those exercising influence to work peacefully to preserve the sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon and eliminate violence.

The war between Iran and Iraq also continues unabated despite the appeals and efforts of the international community. We have also recently witnessed an increase in tension in the vital area of the Gulf.

The tragedy of that war, which entails enormous costs to the two peoples involved, and the magnitude of the dangers created by the ever increasing escalation of tension in the Gulf make it imperative that hostilities cease and peace talks begin, in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 598 (1987). We appreciate the devotion and courage which the Secretary-General displayed in discharging his duties during his mission, for the purpose of securing respect for and full implementation of those resolutions.

I also wish to stress the importance that my Government attaches to safeguarding free and secure navigation in the area. I must insist upon this point because, unfortunately, my country has suffered from indiscriminate attacks upon Greek merchant vessels, which have caused enormous material damage and the loss of innocent lives.

The situation in southern Africa continues, regrettably, to endanger peace, security and stability. Greece is watching developments in the area with

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

particular interest. The number of victims of apartheid increases daily. The extension of the state of emergency and the continuous violations of human rights - in particular, detention of religious and trade union leaders, detention of children, torture and forced resettlement of the black population and strict press censorship - are developments that deeply preoccupy my Government.

The Greek Government has repeatedly and unequivocally condemned the abhorrent system of apartheid and its inherent violence. We call upon the Government of South Africa to engage in a national dialogue with the genuine representatives of the majority of the population, which should lead to the complete eradication of apartheid and the establishment by peaceful means of a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa.

We strongly condemn South Africa's repeated aggressive and destabilizing activities against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of neighbouring States. Greece affirms its solidarity with the front-line States, which should receive full international support in order to cope successfully with the threat against them. In 1986 a highly significant meeting took place in Lusaka between representatives of the European Community and the front-line States. I attended that meeting and remain convinced of its usefulness. I hope that those efforts will continue.

We also strongly condemn the continuation of the illegal occupation by South Africa of Namibia, whose people are being denied the right to exercise the fundamental right to self-determination and independence. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) constitutes the sole internationally accepted basis for the peaceful solution of the problem. The Greek Government categorically rejects any linkage of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) with extraneous issues, as well as delaying tactics used for this purpose. We consider the establishment in Namibia of the so-called interim administration to be null and void.

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

The Greek Government expresses its concern with regard to the dangerous situation prevailing in two areas of Asia: Afghanistan and Kampuchea. It is regrettable that diplomatic efforts towards their solution have not yet produced the hoped-for results.

We are consistent in condemning all cases of invasion and occupation as well as every effort to create faits accomplis. We therefore believe that unless all foreign troops in Afghanistan and Kampuchea are withdrawn as soon as possible in accordance with United Nations resolutions no viable solution can be reached. It is imperative that the bloodshed and suffering of the people of these two countries be brought to an end.

With regard to the situation in the Korean peninsula, we hope that a just and peaceful solution will be found, to the benefit of the entire Korean people, in accordance with the generally accepted principles of international law. We believe that the promotion of confidence-building measures in the Korean peninsula will create the appropriate conditions for the Olympic Games of 1988 to take place in an atmosphere of co-operation rather than confrontation.

The international economic situation shows signs of stress. Imbalances remain, growth rates are low and the future is uncertain. The resumption of high and stable growth rates must be secured in order to bring about solutions to the debt problems of the developing countries and an improvement in the market conditions for their primary commodities.

The third world's external debt crisis must be resolved through dialogue and greater understanding of the problem by the international community. We should not lose sight of the political dimension of this problem. The people of the over-indebted countries shouldering the unbearable burden of external debt are deprived of a dignified standard of living. As a result, phenomena of social turmoil have surfaced.

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

The low prices of primary commodities have severely curtailed the exchange earnings of a large number of developing countries. Those countries face serious difficulties in servicing their external debt while implementing strict stabilization programmes. Unfortunately, development assistance to those countries and flows of new capital from the international financial system have not yet reached the levels necessary to permit successful implementation of their stabilization policies. For that reason development efforts have fallen behind.

The final text adopted by the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) provides a framework for remedial solutions. At the same time imaginative and courageous solutions should be pursued in international forums, particularly at the International Monetary Fund, whose annual meetings begin today.

I should like to elaborate on an issue of particular concern to the Greek nation that in recent years has been repeatedly dealt with by the United Nations. I am referring to the problem of Cyprus, prolongation of which entails a serious threat to peace and security, not only in the immediate vicinity but also in the broader area of the eastern Mediterranean.

More than 13 years have passed since the Turkish army, in flagrant violation of the basic principles of international law, invaded Cyprus and occupied a large part of the territory of the Republic. After the invasion Ankara attempted as a first step to stabilize its military occupation and to drive out those remaining Greek Cypriots who had not yet fled, to become refugees in their own country, the invading Turkish army. Subsequently, Ankara attempted to alter the demographic composition of the population through a massive influx of settlers, which it organized politically in order to support an illegal government whose existence depends on the equally illegal presence of the army of occupation. Furthermore, by destroying the cultural heritage of northern Cyprus, by plundering churches and by

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

changing place-names, it is attempting to impose partition and create two separate states in an effort to avert the unity of Cyprus.

For 13 years Turkey has systematically avoided any discussion of those subjects which, by definition, are pre-eminent: namely, withdrawal of the occupation army; agreement on a system of guarantees that would preclude the presentation of pretexts such as those Ankara has raised to justify its invasion; and withdrawal of the settlers and application of elementary human rights concerning freedom of movement, freedom of settlement and the right to property.

Ankara has refused to discuss those questions, which obviously should occupy a central position in the consultations. On the contrary, through repeated statements made by Turkey or the Turkish Cypriot leadership, Ankara has made it clear that it has no intention of withdrawing its military forces from the territory of Cyprus, which it is systematically reinforcing with new modern tanks as well as through increasing military personnel. The recent report of the United Nations Secretary-General to the Security Council gives an extremely clear picture of the situation in the area and points out a number of other Turkish and Turkish Cypriot activities that aim solely at the consolidation of the illegal occupation.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus, in an attempt to help the Secretary-General in his mission of good offices, has proposed alternative procedures aiming at the examination of the aforementioned major issues, that is, either at a high-level meeting or at an international conference. The Greek Government fully supports the position of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus that, before any further discussion on other issues that have already been dealt with, the major issues should be examined - namely, withdrawal of the occupation forces and of the settlers, a new system of enlarged international guarantees

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

precluding the possibility of unilateral intervention and the three freedoms.

It should in particular be stressed that up to now Turkey has refused any discussion of those issues. That attitude is a clear indication of its ultimate aims. It wants to entrap the Government of the Republic of Cyprus into accepting a constitutional system that would serve Turkish interests solely and make no provision for the withdrawal of the occupation army or the settlers or for the restoration of the independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus. However, the position of Ankara is highly provocative when it argues that a discussion of the critical problem of Cyprus at this session constitutes a manifestation of intransigence. Indeed, I am astonished at that argument, which expresses a deeper contempt for the United Nations and for the inalienable right of every sovereign Member State to have recourse to the Organization in every case of violation of the principles of the Charter and of the resolutions of United Nations organs.

Confronted with this situation we have to decide where our duty lies. It would be distressing and dangerous were we to limit ourselves to the expression of hopes and to regrets over lack of progress. I believe it is time for all of us to face up to our responsibilities and to make it crystal clear that force cannot be accepted as a way of resolving international problems.

Greece is convinced that a just and viable solution to the Cyprus question should be sought within the framework of the United Nations and, more specifically, through the implementation of the numerous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, which clearly and unequivocally provide for ways to resolve all these major issues.

(Mr. Papoulias, Greece)

It is only natural that we look to the United Nations for a just and viable solution to the Cyprus problem. An injustice committed in any part of the world is an injustice against mankind. It is therefore the duty of mankind to restore justice.

Mr. PERES (Israel): Permit me, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the General Assembly.

I wish to take this opportunity to express our support for the relentless efforts of the emissary of peace and goodwill, the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar.

In a world grown cynical of the super-Powers' increased arms competition and fearful of the technologies it has unleashed, the people of Israel appreciate the readiness of the United States and the Soviet Union to begin a process of nuclear disarmament. This is not just a technical accord. It is a political dictum: no longer can we find military answers to political problems. What is necessary are political answers to the military menace.

(Mr. Peres, Israel)

The world remains divided. While on the global level the parties seem to edge slowly towards accommodation, on the regional level passions still endure.

Today, threatening mines in international waterways are symbols not of the modernity of warfare but of its persistence. In our region, mines of extremism lurk just beneath the surface; they may explode when least expected.

Thus, we support the attempt to introduce a durable cease-fire in the Persian Gulf. In the vicinity of the world's most significant source of oil, two flames send dark clouds that obscure the horizon: the flame of fundamentalism launched to overpower moderation, and the flame of belligerency, residue of the Arab-Israeli dispute, seemingly calm, yet hardly extinguished. Each flame may reinforce the other.

Never before was the menace of extremism so perilous; never before were the moderate forces of the Middle East, on both sides, closer to an understanding than today.

Both Arabs and Israelis can be at peace with themselves only if they reach peace with each other.

Fundamentalism threatens moderation. Belligerency consumes resources that can help contain extremism.

Arabs are troubled by the thrust of fundamentalism as they struggle with an impossibly expensive arms race and the need to address the just expectations of a rapidly growing population. Israelis are troubled by a demography wrought by war and the need to sustain a defence posture of "the few against the many". That is the heavy toll of the region's flames. They can be further fuelled; they can also be put out. Our actions today can either unleash forces of yet untold destruction, or they can launch us on a course of a new promise.

(Mr. Peres, Israel)

Israel is celebrating its fortieth anniversary: four decades studded by hostility and war. From the memories of the Holocaust we have had to build a new life, as tragic biographies merged into a history of hope. We have returned to the birthplace of our faith, to the cradle of our biblical values. The language of the Prophets now echoes with the joy of children in the mountains and valleys where it began. Deserts were turned into gardens, human talent into industries. No emergency has delayed the growth of the democratic spirit; no war has prevented the construction of a just society and a modern economy.

The historical analogy is inspiring: For 40 years our people wandered in the desert before Moses brought them to the promised land. Today again, after 40 years in the wilderness of belligerency, we stand at the gates of a new promise to our children and to the children of our neighbours: to live in understanding despite the differences; to determine their own fate without interference by armed forces triggered by hate.

Can we offer them a Middle East where the intellectual challenge is man's conquest of nature, free of man's conquest of man? In brief, can we bring peace?

We remember the last words of Moses before he parted from his people at the gates of the promised land. He admitted his inability to provide them with adequate clothing and fresh bread, and he offered them the right of choice:

"I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore, choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live". (Deuteronomy, 30:19)

I speak with a sense of urgency, as the coming few months may be crucial. During this brief period we may begin negotiations on one of the most important issues of our day, or miss the ark of hope. This brief period may produce the long-sought-after breakthrough or be absorbed by political paralysis.

(Mr. Peres, Israel)

Confidence that was built carefully, almost tacitly, among several parties in the area may evaporate. A coalition for peace held together by fragile links may fall apart with uncertain likelihood of revival.

Present crises - in the Persian Gulf or Lebanon - may take unexpected turns; disillusionment with the absence of progress may produce new coalitions of hostility. Thus, in the absence of a vibrant peace process, the political skies may become capricious again, bringing drought to a thirsty region.

Against these prospects of uncertainty stands the unprecedented if vulnerable reality whereby relevant parties to the conflict see a way to begin negotiations. Indeed, two years ago both Arabs and Israelis announced from this podium support for the current initiative for peace. Moreover, since then further progress has been made.

We have rekindled our peace with Egypt and intensified the dialogue with its leaders and its people. We have found President Mubarak to be a builder of a better life for his people and of bridges for comprehensive peace in the region.

At the cedar groves of the mountains of Ifrane, we met courageous leadership: King Hassan of Morocco calling for peace, aloud, and clearly.

Across the Jordan River, rich in history and poor in water, we hear the echo of the voice of King Hussein, an experienced leader who wishes, like us, to bring our peoples out of the darkness of old hostility into the new greenhouses of peace, security and development.

In the West Bank and Gaza, we notice an unannounced change. Many Palestinians seem to have concluded that violence leads nowhere, that dialogue should not be postponed. There is a real readiness to negotiate in a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation to solve a problem that all of us need, and would like, to solve: the Palestinian problem.

(Mr. Peres, Israel)

We have all matured politically with the repeated failure of attempts to produce peace plans for our region. We have realized that none can be acceptable as a pre-condition of negotiation, for it is the object of negotiation to produce solutions that are otherwise unattainable. Hence, over the past three years efforts have focused on the most promising plan: to begin negotiations without pre-planning their outcome.

Five months ago those efforts crystallized and found expression in a document worked out with the support of American emissaries, whose tireless and creative efforts should be credited with much of what has been accomplished. That document reflected a meeting of minds, Arab and Jewish, on the basis of eight principles.

First, the goal is peace and direct negotiations are the way to reach it. Second, an international conference is the door to direct negotiations. Once convened it should lead immediately to face-to-face bilateral negotiations. Third, the conference would not impose a settlement or veto agreements reached bilaterally. Fourth, those who would attend the conference must accept Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and renounce terrorism and violence. Fifth, negotiations would be aimed at solving the Palestinian problem in all its aspects. This would be done in negotiations between the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation and the Israeli delegation. Sixth, negotiations would be conducted independently in three bilateral-geographic committees: a Jordanian-Palestinian delegation and an Israeli delegation in one; a Syrian and an Israeli delegation in another; and a Lebanese and an Israeli delegation in the third. All delegations, as well as an Egyptian one, would be invited to participate in a fourth, multilateral, committee. Seventh, whereas the bilateral committees would be engaged in solving the conflicts of the past, the multilateral committee would deal with the charting of opportunities for the region's future. Eighth, the five permanent members of the Security Council would serve as the matchmakers, entrusted

(Mr. Peres, Israel)

with bringing the parties together and legitimizing the process whereby the parties would negotiate freely and directly, without uninvited - and occasionally divided - external involvement. This would not be a ceremonial role but an essential one in facilitating negotiations.

Israel is united in its search for peace, in our desire to negotiate directly with our neighbours. We differ over how best to move the process forward. The idea of an international conference raises opposition in some Israeli quarters, while others see it as a real opening. The Israeli Cabinet is divided on the issue and has yet to make a decision. Much depends on the nature of the conference. Unless the permanent members of the Security Council respect the current consensus, rather than insisting on their old preferences, the international conference may remain just a slogan.

We call upon the Soviet Union to credit us with the same good faith in our efforts towards peace as we credit it with in its readiness to make glasnost a way of life. The Soviet Union is not our enemy. It must be aware of our historical and family attachment to our brethren living in its land. We appeal to the new leadership in Moscow to allow the Jewish people to express their identity freely and to reunite with their destiny in the land of their ancestors.

We call upon the People's Republic of China, a great country that we respect, not to be timid or one-sided in its support for negotiations.

To both Moscow and Beijing we say candidly that diplomatic relations are not the prize for peace but a channel for communication. Those wishing to participate in bringing peace cannot confine their relations to one side in the rivalry alone.

I should like to address myself to the Palestinian people. The time for recrimination and blame is past. They have brought only violence and terror. Now is the time to turn from violence to dialogue and to travel jointly towards a different destiny. There, your children, like ours, will live in self-respect,

(Mr. Peres, Israel)

exercise self-expression and enjoy freedom and peace. We, who have experienced domination by others, do not wish to dominate others. We, who sought justice and security, do not wish to deny them to others.

For the past 40 years our ancient region has become - not by choice - a testing ground for the technology of war. Thousands of human lives, Arab and Jewish, have been tragically lost and billions of dollars have been spent to no avail.

We are unable to change the past but we can design a future in which our region will be able to develop into a testing ground for mobilizing science and technology, to offer a new source of growth; a future in which peace attracts economic investment; a future in which resources saved by restraining the arms race are invested in basic and higher education.

It is this vision of an alternative future that has given birth to the suggestion that in the wake of the opening of political negotiations an economic conference, without political strings attached, should take place. Such a conference, composed of those having a stake in regional stability and the capacity to contribute to it, could offer a most imaginative plan for regional development.

To those who preach indecision, to those who take shelter in the illusion of a tranquil status quo, we say: this is our moment of choice; decisions of today will determine the fate of our people for decades to come.

Our choice is between hatred and dialogue, suspicion and hope. Our choice is between investment in an arms race and investment in the well-being of our people, of our children. Our choice is between extremism and moderation, between fundamentalism and reason. It is our choice to prevent the next war.

It is up to us to make the months to come a time for reason.

I welcome the forthcoming visit of Secretary Shultz to our region as an opportunity to negotiate on the remaining obstacles.

(Mr. Peres, Israel)

I am convinced that there are no conflicts for which there is no hope for solution, only people who have lost hope in their search for solutions. I am convinced that the real conflict in the Middle East today is not between Jew and Moslem; Arab and Israeli; Palestinian and Zionist. The conflict is between "past-oriented" leadership and "future-oriented" leadership; between those resigned to the fatalism of belligerency and those determined to alter this fate. For the future of our children, for a better tomorrow, we must all stand up to the preachers of war.

To the advocates of destruction, united we have to say: there are no holy wars, only holy human lives.

On the very first day of our independence I learned from my mentor, David Ben-Gurion, who said this time and again, that peace is the highest degree of security; and that the moral call is the highest degree of wisdom. I shall remember it for ever.

Mr. VAN DUNEM (Angola) (interpretation from French): First of all, Sir, please allow me, on behalf of my Government, to congratulate you on your unanimous election to the office of President of the General Assembly at this session. There can be no doubt that your election is testimony to, and recognition of, your personal devotion to the struggle that is being waged by the international community to realize the rights of peoples to freedom and independence. It is likewise a well deserved tribute to the country you represent so worthily. I should like therefore to take this opportunity to convey to you our best wishes for success in carrying out your task.

Permit me to take this opportunity also to express my appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Choudhury of Bangladesh, for the outstanding, very wise and skilful way in which he was able to overcome the obstacles to his mandate and to carry out successfully his difficult mission.

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

It would be unpardonable if I were not also to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to Mr. Javier Perez de Cuéllar, the Secretary-General, for his untiring efforts in the quest for solutions to the many problems still facing mankind and for his devotion to the basic principles of the Organization, despite the limited means available to him and the political and economic circumstances which are so difficult and which characterize today's world.

Allow me also to congratulate Mr. Reed on his recent nomination to the high post of Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs.

At the same time every year, the representatives of most of the nations of the world meet in this same hall to take up the questions that afflict mankind and to try to find lasting solutions to them. Despite this, the spectres of famine, drought, underdevelopment and foreign debt continue to haunt the minds of the leaders of the least developed countries, and these factors, together with the unbridled arms race, particularly in the nuclear sphere, continue to pose a serious threat to international peace and security. Moreover, the arms race remains, we feel, a grave threat to the survival of all of mankind.

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola is convinced that a policy of dialogue and harmonization is the only assurance of a genuine policy for reducing conflicts and tensions among nations thus creating a climate of trust conducive not only to the peaceful settlement of disputes but also to disarmament. We therefore welcome the historic meeting between the leaders of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany which took place less than three weeks ago, as well as the agreement of principle reached between the Soviet Union and the United States of America several days ago to sign a treaty on the total elimination of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

The problems of development are inseparable from the problem of peace. Without peace there is no stability and without stability there will be no

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

possibility of development. The implementation of the development programmes in our country is inseparable from political and economic stability. This requires solving the so-called regional conflicts which some of our countries have faced either directly or indirectly. In our humble opinion these efforts for peace should be made by the international community as a whole. For that reason the Government of the People's Republic of Angola supports the idea of the creation of a fund for the economic and social development of the developing countries. Indeed, the problem of underdevelopment facing most of the third-world countries is widening the gap that already exists between the rich and poor nations and thus constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

In this context, we hail the holding, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. To be sure, much remains to be done: there are many gaps in the final document and it does not reflect all the hopes of the underdeveloped countries, particularly the hope for the establishment of a development fund for the developing countries. The holding of the Conference and the adoption by consensus of a final document by the Conference, despite the attempts to frustrate it, are, in any case, an important milestone in the efforts we are all making to attain our objectives of peace and security. It marks a beginning and we hope that this trend will continue and increase and that it will yield much more tangible results for the benefit of peace and development.

Moved as we are by the desire to contribute to the attainment of the objectives of the United Nations Charter, the African countries are sparing no effort to keep our continent free of nuclear weapons. The People's Republic of Angola feels that the proclamation of the southern Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation, free of nuclear arms and military pacts, is a sure way to guarantee peaceful co-existence. In this context, the independence of Namibia, on the basis

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and the elimination of apartheid would also contribute to strengthening international security and co-operation in the region in the mutual interests of the countries of the southern Atlantic region.

Allow me to express our profound gratitude for the untiring efforts of the international community and of the United Nations to find fair and lasting solutions to the problems of our times.

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

Nevertheless, I cannot fail to express my concern at the fact that there remain many unresolved issues, such as decolonization, apartheid, famine and drought.

Since its independence almost 12 years ago the Government of the People's Republic of Angola has followed a policy of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence. This policy is set down in its constitutional law, which establishes, as clearly as possible, its intention to maintain diplomatic relations with all the countries of the world on the basis of mutual respect, sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-aggression and non-interference in the internal affairs of each State, and respect for the norms of international law governing relations among independent States.

Unfortunately, in the sub-region of southern Africa, a reactionary and anachronistic régime, that of racist South Africa, continues to flout United Nations resolutions and arrogantly carries out, with impunity, acts of subversion and destabilization against the countries of the area, including my own, with the sole purpose of perpetuating its illegal occupation of Namibia and thereby delay the elimination of the odious system of apartheid.

We are a people that cherishes peace and justice, but ever since our country achieved independence we have not known a single day of peace. In an undeclared war imposed on it, Angola has been victimized by acts of armed aggression on the part of the racist régime of South Africa. Our people and our Government are thus obliged to make enormous sacrifices for the effects of the war are fraught with heavy consequences in terms of our financial, material and human resources and inevitably undermine the economic and social development of our country.

In this unjust war imposed on us by South Africa, women, children and the elderly have no defence, and our basic infrastructure, such as roads, bridges,

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

railroads, hospitals, schools and industrial plants, is not spared; these are indeed the preferred targets of the South African army and its UNITA auxiliary forces.

The damage suffered by our country as a result of the atrocities committed by the South African regular army and the UNITA puppets is estimated today at more than \$US 12 billion. That figure does not include lost earnings resulting from the fact that our young people are engaged in military service, instead of attending school or working in factories where they would be contributing to increasing production and improving the living standard of our population.

After achieving independence at the cost of great sacrifices our people aspire to life in peace and the reconstruction of their country; they wish to build a strong nation by exploiting the vast natural potential of our soil.

Contrary to what some of the media would have international public opinion believe, there is no civil war in our country. It is in fact a case of foreign invasion of a State Member of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, part of whose territory remains occupied by the racist South African troops. That is why the People's Republic of Angola continues to demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from the southern part of its territory.

South Africa is using Namibia's territory as a springboard for acts of aggression against Angolan territory. Thus South African military bases - where armed bandits and mercenaries are trained and later sent to our territory, and from where South African troops carry out incursions into our territory - are to be found in the north of occupied Namibia.

In the face of these facts, and based on the rights recognized under

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

international law and the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter, particularly Article 51, the Government of the People's Republic of Angola has appealed for assistance from friendly countries, in particular Cuba and the Soviet Union - assistance for which we wish once again to express our gratitude.

Nevertheless, aware of the complexity of the situation in southern Africa and in order to remove the impasse created by South Africa and its allies with regard to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), the Government of the People's Republic of Angola submitted an approach to global negotiations contained in its letter, dated 17 November 1984, addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, by the President of the People's Republic of Angola, Mr. Jose Eduardo Dos Santos.

Despite this gesture of understanding and goodwill on the part of the Angolan Government, the plan for the independence of Namibia still faces the intransigence of the Government of South Africa and its allies.

Once again, in a spirit of co-operation and openness, my Government very recently proposed to the parties concerned, the general framework for a comprehensive agreement on the settlement of the Namibian question, a solution taking into account not only the legitimate right of the people of Namibia - under the leadership of its sole, genuine representative, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) - to self-determination and independence, in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978), but also the right of the other countries of the region to live in peace and security. The agreement would be signed by the representatives of the Governments of Angola, Cuba and South Africa and of SWAPO, under the auspices of the Security Council or its permanent members.

Moreover, the recent talks held in Luanda between representatives of the

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

Angolan Government and the United States Administration clearly show my Government's constant readiness to seek a solution to the problems of peace and security in southern Africa. It is now up to the régime of South Africa and the United States Administration to accept or reject this new olive branch. If they persist in their obstinacy, history will judge them, for in wanting to link the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) to the withdrawal of the internationalist Cuban troops from Angola the South African régime and its allies are simply invoking a cowardly and fallacious pretext to prevent the independence of Namibia and allow South Africa to continue using its territory as a base for aggression against and the destabilization of the People's Republic of Angola and other States of southern Africa, thus interfering with our efforts for national reconstruction.

Twenty years have now elapsed since the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia. But we must note that implementation of its mandate is being obstructed by the intransigence of the apartheid régime. Such behaviour is possible only because of the support and encouragement that some Western countries continue to give it. In view of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African régime, the international community must now adopt firm measures to ensure that international legal order is restored.

In South Africa we are witnessing extremely violent confrontations between the power of the white racist minority on the one hand and the oppressed and exploited black people on the other hand. New facts, however, have recently surfaced. Some elements of the white minority are beginning to understand that only a policy of dialogue and harmony can avoid a bloodbath with unforeseeable consequences. Thus, a delegation of white South Africans met with a delegation of the African National Congress (ANC) in Senegal.

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

This is one more proof that many members of the white minority recognize the role of the ANC in the solution of the problem of South Africa. The People's Republic of Angola commends the courageous action of that group of South African citizens who have dared to defy the repressive power of apartheid. We feel that such initiatives open the way to a peaceful solution in South Africa and should be encouraged.

Unfortunately, despite these positive steps, the present political picture within South Africa remains sombre. The racist régime continues to use oppression as its main weapon against the patriots of South Africa, as was the case in the recent cruel repression of the striking miners, who were seeking fair wages and the satisfaction of their just social claims. This alarming situation in South Africa presents a greater challenge than ever before to the international community, which should without further delay tackle the root causes of these phenomena that are endangering regional and international security and stability. The total elimination of apartheid and the end of the illegal occupation of Namibia must therefore be demanded.

Consequently, the Government of the People's Republic of Angola believes that comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter should be imposed as a form of pressure on the racist South African Government.

It is disquieting to note that despite some encouraging signs the international situation continues to be darkened by the persistence of various other hotbeds of tension.

On the African continent the Western Sahara conflict continues to affect the lives of the people of the territory. We believe that the implementation of resolution AHG/104 of the 19th Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) would make a great contribution to the

settlement of the conflict. We therefore appeal to the parties concerned to continue the dialogue begun through the intermediary of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Concerning Chad, we hope that peace will be restored in that country in the interest of well-being and social progress of its people.

The Middle East, where the State of Israel continues to carry out its aggressive expansionist policies against the Arab people, is another source of serious concern for us. We reaffirm the sacred and inalienable right of the Palestinian people, under the enlightened leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), to form their own State. We thus support the idea of convening an international conference on the Palestinian problem, with the participation of the PLO, and hope that this session can take the relevant measures to bring this about as rapidly as possible.

We advocate respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon and the safeguarding of its independence, and we oppose foreign interference in the internal affairs of that State.

The war between Iran and Iraq cannot fail to concern us, too, since it is a war between two non-aligned countries that seriously threatens international peace and security. We hope for an early end to that war.

We also note with great concern that the question of East Timor remains deadlocked. We call for a dialogue between Indonesia and Portugal, with the mediation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to find a just and lasting solution that takes into account the interests and rights of the Maubere people.

The situation in the Korean peninsula is also a source of alarm for us. We welcome the initiatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea concerning the reunification of the great homeland of the Koreans and cannot support the admission of the two parties separately to the great family of the United Nations.

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

We welcome with great satisfaction the initiatives of the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea with regard to its policy of national reconciliation and are convinced that these will contribute to peace and stability in the region.

In Latin America, we welcome the positive results achieved by the Heads of State of the five Central American countries - Nicaragua, Honduras, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Guatemala - at their last meeting and hope that these results will contribute to peace and thereby reduce instances of foreign interference in the internal affairs of the countries of the region.

We condemn the policy of intimidation, aggression, blackmail and economic blockade directed against Cuba and advocate the immediate cessation of the occupation of the Guantanamo base.

We reaffirm our support for the inalienable right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination and independence, in accordance with resolution 1514 (XV) and the Declaration adopted by the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Harare, Zimbabwe, last year.

The world economic situation has hardly improved since the last session of the General Assembly, and the economic and financial crisis has become established and taken root in all the developing countries. The growing indebtedness is preventing those countries from carrying out their national recovery plans and becoming, as a result, an additional factor of instability and insecurity.

The absence of the political will on the part of some developed countries to respond to the appeals of the international community, the arms race and the political instability created in some regions have helped to make the imbalance already existing in international economic relations even worse.

The present structural crisis is also the result of the anachronistic development of the world economic system, which is shown by the fact that some

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

countries are becoming ever richer, while the overwhelming majority of countries are becoming ever poorer and lack the means with which to tackle the problems of underdevelopment.

The foreign debt is the clearest indicator of the scope and gravity of the world economic crisis. To deal with this, political effort and will are necessary not only on the part of the developing countries, which are at present the most affected, but also and above all on the part of the developed countries.

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola continues to advocate the establishment of a new international economic order as an effective tool for overcoming the crisis and restoring balance to international economic relations.

With regard to the present financial and monetary system, we feel that our action should be oriented towards its restructuring as quickly as possible so that the developing countries can participate in the taking of decisions and profit as much as possible thereby. Scrupulous respect by the developed countries, for the principles, rules and norms in force in this area would also contribute to avoiding deterioration of the situation and exacerbation of the crisis.

The proliferation of discriminatory measures imposed by the developed countries in their trade with the developing countries, protectionism and other restrictive measures are resulting in the reduction of the earnings from products exported by the developing countries and a consequent reduction in the resources and funds available for development. However, all these measures required of the developed countries should not prevent the developing countries from themselves taking steps to restructure the management of their economies in such a way as to facilitate the task of those of the rich countries that wish to help them to overcome the crisis.

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

My country has just taken various measures along those lines. In this context, the People's Republic of Angola reaffirms the importance of the ratification by both developed and developing countries of the Integrated Programme for Commodities, dealt with in resolution 93 (IV) of the fourth United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD IV), and its Fund, in order to permit its rapid entry into force. We therefore welcome the Soviet Government's decision to subscribe to the Fund.

In the context of co-operation, the People's Republic of Angola also reaffirms the role of economic co-operation between developing countries - South-South co-operation - as a means of promoting the rational and effective use of their human, material, financial and technological resources. In this context, co-operation between the States of southern Africa in the framework of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) has already yielded significant results in various sectors, as acknowledged by the regional Heads of State or Government at their last summit meeting in Lusaka.

However, we recognize that much remains to be done. The convening by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) next December of a conference of Heads of State or Government devoted to the foreign debt of the African countries reflects the importance that our countries attach to this problem and the political will to combine their efforts to redress Africa's economic situation.

In reviewing all these situations, we have tried to interpret in our own way the problems of peace and development and to express our desire for the progress and well-being of all mankind. In this context, we reaffirm our devotion to the principles of the United Nations and to multilateralism as a whole as an instrument

(Mr. van Dunem, Angola)

for seeking solutions to the complex problems of a world that is growing more and more interdependent.

The struggle continues. Victory is certain.

Mr. NGUYEN DY NIEN (Viet Nam): Comrade President, the delegation of Viet Nam wishes to express its warm congratulations to you, as representative of the fraternal German Democratic Republic, on your election to the presidency of this forty-second session of the General Assembly. We are confident that, with your talent and experience, you will guide our deliberations to a fruitful conclusion, marking a new evolution in United Nations activities in response to the demands of the present world situation. On this occasion my delegation would like, through you, to convey its warmest greetings to the fraternal people of the German Democratic Republic, whose great accomplishments in all spheres have more and more enhanced their fatherland's stature in the international arena and made their country an important factor for peace and peaceful coexistence in Europe.

As a result of the birth 70 years ago of the first socialist State in the world, international relations of a new kind have emerged, together with the objective need for peaceful coexistence among countries with different socio-political systems. World history for the past seven decades, and particularly since the Second World War, has been one of a strenuous and complex struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence in the world. In the wake of the stormy years of cold war and attempts in recent years to revive a cold war atmosphere that threaten to drive mankind to the brink of nuclear annihilation, never has the aspiration of nations to live in peace and peaceful coexistence welled up so powerfully as today.

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

Peaceful coexistence is an objective law of our times. We live today in an interdependent world where, under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution, States are confronted with a host of urgent major problems that they cannot solve on their own. In such a world, dialogue instead of confrontation, and co-operation instead of enmity, in order to achieve peaceful coexistence among countries with different socio-political systems, have become a necessary trend of our times.

We are at present witnessing a promising evolution in the world situation in the direction of dialogue and peaceful coexistence. General Secretary Gorbachev's well-known initiatives have given a strong impetus to the process of easing tensions, driving back the danger of nuclear war and strengthening world peace and security. The recent Soviet-American agreement on the elimination of medium-range missiles and on the holding this fall of the third summit meeting between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan constitutes an important step forward on the road leading to a reduced risk of nuclear extermination and an improved international political atmosphere. The meeting between President Honecker of the German Democratic Republic and Chancellor Helmut Kohl of the Federal Republic of Germany marked a new advance in the endeavour to build relations based on dialogue, mutual understanding and co-operation between the two German States, in consonance with the spirit of the 1975 Helsinki Act, which was reaffirmed at the 1986 Stockholm Conference.

In spite of those encouraging signs, which have to some extent improved the overall world outlook, factors causing tension still prevail. By intensifying the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, both on Earth and in space, in the hope of regaining their lost military superiority, those most hawkish forces which

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

hanker for an historically irretrievable past still represent a defiant challenge to humanity.

In the face of such dangerous, adventurous schemes and deeds, an imperative for each and every nation is to persevere in acting resolutely for the safeguard of peace and the establishment of peaceful coexistence.

Never before has the world been the scene of such a vast mass movement for world peace as in recent years. True to its lofty ideals, the Non-Aligned Movement has grown into a significant component of this struggle. Nor have initiatives in response to the exacting demands of the nuclear and space age, and out of a high sense of responsibility towards the fate of mankind, ever elicited such prompt and wide approval and support from the international community as today. I refer to the Harare appeal issued by the eighth summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement; the Joint Declaration by the Heads of State or Government of India, Sweden, Greece, Tanzania, Mexico and Argentina; and the New Delhi Declaration on the principles of a nuclear-free and non-violent world. I also have in mind the comprehensive programme set forth on 15 January 1986 with a view to eliminating nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction before mankind enters its third millenium, as well as ensuing initiatives aimed at making a reality of that programme; the initiative regarding a comprehensive international system of security put forth at the forty-first session of the General Assembly; General Secretary Gorbachev's 28 July 1986 Vladivostok Declaration on establishing a system of peace and security in Asia and the Pacific; the initiative for the signing of a treaty on the non-use of force or the threat of force among States of Asia and the Pacific; and the proposals for setting up nuclear-free zones in Africa, the Mediterranean, Scandinavia, the South Pacific, South-East Asia and the Korean Peninsula.

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

By dint of their tireless exertion, the forces of peace have made a decisive impact on the atmosphere of dialogue and détente in the world. The present situation calls for a new effort on the part of the world community in order to consolidate and build upon the gains achieved on the long road leading to a firm peace on our planet.

Peace is an indispensable prerequisite for development. Conversely, as long as poverty and backwardness continue to exist on earth, instability can hardly be avoided. At present the world economy, and more particularly the economies of the developing countries, are beset with extremely serious difficulties. The gap between the rich and the poor is steadily widening, with the per capita income of developed countries 12 times that of developing nations. The latter's external debt now exceeds \$US 1 trillion. Primary commodity prices have fallen to their lowest level in the last 50 years. Balances of payments are plagued by acute deficits. Several developing countries are standing on the verge of economic collapse. In our interdependent world such a collapse would affect to no small extent the whole world economic system. In view of this situation, priorities at this forty-second session have to be based on ensuring long-term objectives, namely, the reform of international economic relations so as to move towards a new international economic order and an international system of economic security, and pressing immediate demands such as the burning issues of indebtedness, money and finance, as well as trade. All this requires from the international community, and in particular from developing countries, the most united and resolute action.

While the wholesome breeze of dialogue and détente has begun to blow away the dreadful spectre of a nuclear catastrophe in various regions of the world, the efforts of nations to rally their forces in order together to settle, through dialogue, problems facing individual countries as well as whole regions have come

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

up against major obstacles. Forces that are wont to look upon various parts of the world as their "backyard" and as "areas of vital interest" to them, are increasing their aid to their surrogates and other actions such as economic blockade, embargo and political isolation aimed at undermining and countering the peoples' struggle to achieve and safeguard their independence, to the detriment of peace and stability in various regions of the world.

In southern Africa, the apartheid régime, confident in the protection of some imperialist and reactionary forces, still persists strongheadedly, while in the throes of agony, in its bloody repression of the struggle waged by the South African people under the leadership of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and by the Namibian people under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). At the same time the Pretoria régime undertakes acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring countries, especially Angola and Mozambique. Now more than ever before the world community needs to extend to the just struggle of the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and the front-line States the most resolute and powerful support in order to bring about the prompt eradication of apartheid, that stain on human civilization.

In Central America, the Republic of Cuba, the first revolutionary State in the Western hemisphere, has weathered innumerable hardships and trials resulting from the fierce opposition of its foes and has achieved many accomplishments in all spheres. The revolutions in Nicaragua and El Salvador are still standing firm on their soil and growing with every passing day. Thanks to the considerable efforts exerted by Nicaragua, the Contadora Group and the Lima Support Group, important progress has been made in the peace process in the region with the signing of the Act on the establishment of a stable and lasting peace in Central America at the

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

summit conference of the five Central American States. This is an important document reflecting the earnest aspirations to peace of the peoples of that region and the overall trend of the world situation today.

Tension continues to prevail in the Middle East as a result of Israel's policies of aggression and expansion. We condemn these policies and extend our vigorous support to the just struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples for the realization of their fundamental national rights and the recovery of occupied Arab territories. In order to reach an early, comprehensive and just solution to the regional situation, an international conference on the Middle East will have to be convened without delay with the participation on an equal footing of all parties concerned, including the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

The Iran-Iraq war, which has raged for several years now, has caused both countries heavy losses. We reiterate our wish to see that war between two member States of the Non-Aligned Movement brought to an early end through peaceful negotiations, and we endorse international efforts aimed at helping those two countries achieve a fair political solution based on respect for the legitimate interests of each country and conducive to peace and stability in the region and the world. We express our concern that some forces are taking advantage of the situation in the Gulf area to reinforce their military presence there, thus aggravating tension in the region and rendering it explosive. Such actions must be brought to an immediate end.

With the failure of the undeclared war against the Afghan people and the tireless efforts of the Afghan Government in carrying out its policy of national reconciliation and in the search for a political solution to the problems around Afghanistan, the situation there is undergoing significant developments. We fully

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

support the efforts of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan towards holding open dialogues throughout the country so as to achieve national reconciliation, as well as the Soviet-Afghan agreement on the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan within the framework of a political solution to the situation around Afghanistan based on the cessation of all interference in the internal affairs of the Afghan people and on respect for the independence and sovereignty of that country. We denounce all hostile action against this evolution.

Viet Nam supports the constructive, fair and reasonable initiative of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea aimed at achieving the peaceful and sovereign reunification of Korea, especially those regarding the reduction of existing armed forces and the holding of high-level political and military talks between the North and South of Korea.

We hold in high regard the Indo-Sri Lankan agreement and welcome India's contribution to peace and development in its region and throughout the world.

From this rostrum we reaffirm once again the Vietnamese people's staunch support for the Puerto Rican people and the peoples of other small territories struggling for independence and freedom, for the people of Western Sahara struggling for their self-determination, and for the people of Cyprus in their struggle to safeguard the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of their homeland. We endorse the initiatives aimed at convening an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations with a view to finding a political solution for the question of Cyprus.

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

Our people's deep sympathy and support goes to the people of New Caledonia who, under the leadership of the Front de libération nationale Kanak socialiste (FLNKS) are struggling for the right to live in independence and freedom. The referendum recently held under conditions known to all is an impediment to the realization of this sacred right.

For the past 40 years, while the world was enjoying the longest period of peace in this century, South-East Asia has been the theatre of the largest, longest and fiercest wars; and although these wars have now ended, that region of the world is still deprived of peace and stability. As a result, it is now more than ever an imperative need, and in their essential interest, for the peoples in the region to secure a framework of peaceful coexistence wherein confrontation would no longer prevail, problems would be settled through peaceful negotiations and good-neighbourly relations established without external interference.

The search for a political solution to the Kampuchean problem and the shaping of South-East Asia into a zone of peace, stability and co-operation constitute important objectives of Viet Nam's foreign policy. Together with the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Viet Nam has set forth numerous well-meant proposals with a view to finding promptly a fair and reasonable political solution to the Kampuchean question on the basis of the independence, sovereignty and national reconciliation of the Kampuchean people, which would ensure that the land of the brilliant Angkor civilization would never again go through the nightmare of the genocidal Pol Pot régime, and which would establish a framework for lasting peace and stability in South-East Asia. Viet Nam has declared that it would withdraw all of its forces from Kampuchea by 1990 as it did twice before, after it had sent voluntary forces to help the Kampuchean people in the common anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist struggle for the independence

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

and freedom of the two countries. We regret to say, however, that we have not yet received a response to our peace effort and our good will.

To try to settle the Kampuchean question without linking it to the solution of the larger issue of peace and stability in South-East Asia would amount to resolving only one aspect of the problem: the settlement would lack substance. The history of the struggle of the three Indochinese peoples shows that the peace of these three nations is closely linked to peace and stability in South-East Asia. In the course of the 40 years of war in Indochina, three international conferences have been held to put an end to the war, namely the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina, the 1962 Geneva Conference on Laos and the 1973 Paris Conference on Viet Nam. Following each of these conferences, however, one war would hardly be ended before a new war would begin, for the conferences only settled the war and failed to draw up a framework for peaceful coexistence in South-East Asia. If a durable and lasting peace is to be secured in the region, the settlement of the Kampuchean issue needs therefore to be linked to a solution of the issues of peace and stability in South-East Asia.

The wish to impose the position of one side on the other is hardly fair or realistic. Until now two opposite stances and approaches have prevailed with regard to the issues of Kampuchea and of peace and stability in South-East Asia. The other side demands that Viet Nam withdraw its forces from Kampuchea while the Indochinese countries insist on the removal of the genocidal Pol Pot clique. With the steady growth of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the three Indochinese countries have declared that Vietnamese forces would be totally withdrawn in 1990 if a political solution of the Kampuchean question could not be reached. Each year since 1982, Viet Nam, in consultation with the People's Republic of Kampuchea, has withdrawn part of its voluntary forces, and before the end of this year another

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

important partial withdrawal will be carried out in the presence, for the first time, of foreign observers. The Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea has made public its policy of national reconciliation whereby it is prepared to meet with the other groups of Khmers and their leaders, except the criminal Pol Pot and his close associates, in order to conduct discussions on national reconciliation based on the non-recurrence, ever, of the scourge of genocide and to join hands with the whole people in defending and rebuilding the country in peace and stability. This is a fundamental long-term policy aimed at uniting all Kampuchean in the endeavour to build an independent, peaceful, non-aligned Kampuchea that would entertain friendly relations with neighbouring countries. Meanwhile, the other side insists on demanding that Viet Nam withdraw its forces and accept the eight-point proposal, which is in fact aimed at bringing about the return of the genocidal Pol Pot régime under cover of the "Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea". A fair solution must respect the positions of both sides. Initiatives beneficial to one side but detrimental to the other and supporting one side against the other can only hinder the peaceful settlement of the issues of Kampuchea and of peace and stability in South-East Asia.

In such a situation, consistently persevering in the search for a political solution to the question of Kampuchea and for peace and stability in South-East Asia, the three Indochinese countries, together with a few other countries in the region, have tirelessly endeavoured to break the deadlock. Last July, Viet Nam and Indonesia representing respectively the Indochinese and the countries members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), agreed on the holding of a "cocktail party", on the understanding that it would be an informal meeting of the two sides of Kampuchea on an equal footing, without pre-conditions and with no political label, and that, at a later stage, Indonesia would invite other concerned

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

countries, including Viet Nam, to participate in it. They also agreed to reconvene the joint working group as soon as possible to discuss the problems of Kampuchea and of peace and stability in South-East Asia.

The People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Lao People's Democratic Republic have expressed their appreciation and endorsement of the above-mentioned agreements between Viet Nam and Indonesia. The three Indochinese countries are of the view that at the above-mentioned "cocktail party" the positions of all sides should serve as the basis for discussion. It may be said that the first rays of hope have begun to dawn.

The agreements reached between Viet Nam and Indonesia have opened up the possibility of solving the problems of Kampuchea and of peace and stability in South-East Asia on the basis of equality, respect for the interests of all parties concerned, and without pre-conditions. This is an opportunity not to be missed if a fair and reasonable solution of the problems of South-East Asia and Kampuchea is to be found in conformity with the correct resolution on South-East Asia, adopted by the seventh summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement in New Delhi and reaffirmed by its eighth summit Conference in Harare, and with the general trend of the world and regional situations.

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

That is precisely why these agreements were widely welcomed by public opinion so quickly. The People's Republic of Kampuchea declared its readiness to enter talks with opposition groups, and Prince Sihanouk's statement on 18 September last concerning a meeting between the opposing sides of Kampuchea is in keeping not only with the People's Republic of Kampuchea's policy of national reconciliation but also with the 29 July 1987 agreement between Viet Nam and Indonesia.

Viet Nam and the other Indochinese States regard the agreements between Viet Nam and Indonesia as agreements reached between the Indochinese countries and the members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) in the search for a political solution to the question of Kampuchea and of peace and stability in South-East Asia. Therefore, there should not be differing interpretations for the sake of anyone's expediency; rather, both sides concerned are duty bound to respect and implement these agreements. Otherwise it will be impossible to give credibility to any future agreement. It is regrettable that at present some forces inside and outside the region should be trying to play down the significance of these agreements, impede their implementation and prevent dialogue towards a political settlement, thus going against the legitimate aspirations of the Kampuchean people and other peoples in the region.

We should like to take this opportunity sincerely to thank those countries, organizations and individuals that have contributed to the shaping of a new conjuncture in South-East Asia propitious for dialogue in the region, and we call on them to continue doing their utmost for the promotion of substantive dialogue towards a political solution to the problem of Kampuchea and of peace and stability in South-East Asia.

We highly appreciate the considerable efforts exerted by the Secretary-General, in his personal capacity, to encourage dialogue between the two

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

groups of countries in the region, and we hope that he will persevere in his efforts in that direction.

In connection with the search for a political solution to the problems of Kampuchea and of peace and stability in South-East Asia, eventual relations of friendship and co-operation between the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the People's Republic of China would play a very important role. The Vietnamese people treasure their traditional friendship with the Chinese people. The two peoples used to unite and support each other in their respective revolutionary endeavours for national independence and socialism. The aspirations of both peoples as well as the long-term interests of both countries are not mutually exclusive. Moved by the desire to restore normal relations with China, Viet Nam has repeatedly stated its readiness to negotiate with China wherever, whenever and at whatever level it may choose so as to settle substantive matters in their mutual relations as well as questions of mutual concern, for the sake of peace, friendship and co-operation between the two peoples and among the peoples of South-East Asia and of Asia and the Pacific.

The United States has an important role to play in ensuring peace and stability in South-East Asia. The Vietnamese people are prepared to turn to a new chapter of history and to facilitate the development of relations of friendship and co-operation between the two peoples. The recent visit to Viet Nam of General John Vessey, special envoy of President Reagan, together with the understanding reached, has created an atmosphere conducive to the solution of humanitarian concerns of both the Vietnamese and the United States sides.

History confronts the men of today with a heavy responsibility that cannot be shirked - namely, how to create firm premises for development in peace, friendship and co-operation among all nations in the remaining years of this century and the early years of the twenty-first century. To discharge that lofty mission there is

(Mr. Nguyen Dy Nien, Viet Nam)

no alternative to dialogue and co-operation in good faith. Let us hope such a spirit will prevail not only in the settlement of international and regional issues, including those of South-East Asia, but also in the work of this forty-second session of the General Assembly.

Mr. ACEVEDO PERALTA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): I begin by warmly congratulating you, Mr. President, on the well-earned honour done to you in electing you to this lofty post at the forefront of the work of the General Assembly, which is now holding its forty-second session in a climate of great worldwide expectations prompted by the scale of the problems that are of concern to mankind and by the historical dynamics that particularly affect certain parts of the world where ideological, political and military confrontations have attained extremely dangerous, even dramatic, levels.

Peace is the key to the concerns we all share. The most relevant example in that respect has been set by the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, whose tireless devotion to the search for peaceful means of resolving truly difficult conflicts deserves our appreciation and respect. These are sentiments we express with admiration and gratitude.

Peace is the key to our destiny as a species and as individual nations. Indeed, at this stage in history it is no longer possible to make clear-cut distinctions between mankind as a whole and each of its components, however geographically small they may be.

For a long time, although this was not an ideal state of affairs, individuals and peoples were able to live aloof from one another, particularly with respect to more local problems and disputes. Today that is not possible. We cannot talk realistically now even about the East-West conflict or the North-South conflict. The world is so intimately interconnected that it is truer than ever before that - to paraphrase John Donne - when the bell tolls, it tolls for all. However, when

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta, El Salvador)

the bells, for some commendable reason, ring out in time, then we are entitled to share a legitimate feeling of pleasure.

In Central America, after years in which the bells have been tolling for death, fear, injustice and the lack of understanding, we now hear another sound, one which gives us the firm hope that, if the necessary efforts are made in the appropriate spirit, we shall attain that peace which would mean our survival as free nations. That is what our peoples have been clamouring for. It is what our Governments are endeavouring to attain, on the basis of their faith in authentic participatory, pluralistic and united democracy.*

* Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta,
El Salvador)

On 7 August, the five Presidents of Central America, in an audacious, deliberate and far-sighted gesture, signed an agreement that is historic not merely because of the extremely grave problems it tackles in a profound and effective fashion but also because it represents the first expression since independence was achieved in 1821 - when a similar feat was accomplished - of a united and indivisible commitment that undoubtedly constitutes the embryo of a new sense of Central Americanism. And it is not rhetorical but practical since it will, we hope, result in an indivisible consolidation of our economic, social, cultural and political future.

The document to which we refer bears a title that reflects the spirit in which it was conceived - "Procedures for establishing a firm and lasting peace in Central America". The document, known as Esquipulas II, represents a programme for peace - a firm and lasting peace, a real peace. President Duarte, who played a decisive role in shaping the spirit and scope of this document, therefore insists on talking of peace, working for peace and holding dialogues about peace. The greatness of this joint achievement of the peoples and Governments of Central America derives from the fact that we have overcome warlike mentalities - which external ideological forces imposed upon us - and have emerged with a clear concept of peace that incorporates respect, security and mutual trust.

We are not, however, naive. We understand the enormous risks and snares that the eternal enemies of democracy are laying in our path, but we cannot wrap ourselves in obstructionist pessimism. We sincerely want peace, and we are struggling to achieve it, day by day, fulfilling the provisions of Esquipulas II and, within our country, adopting all those measures that would make possible the inclusion of irregular groups in democratic life. This would not breach the constitutional provisions the Salvadoran people have provided for themselves in full

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta,
El Salvador)

freedom and in a climate of sound political life that incorporates respect, guarantees and pluralism.

Peace is at hand.

In El Salvador, we have had to fight off treacherous, systematic and implacable aggression. At first, practically alone, we fought heroically against the territorial onslaughts that threatened, and indeed continue to threaten, our institutional life and the heritage of our people built up over many decades of persistent national endeavour. The world gradually came to recognize the essentially democratic nature of our struggle. Since 1980, we have travelled a hard path strewn with obstacles, and in doing so our people and its legitimate Government have created and strengthened a series of political, economic and social structures, enabling us to ensure that democracy has taken root deep in our soil.

That is why subversion in El Salvador has lost its historical reason for being. On 1 June our Government completed an intensive exercise, and in his annual address President Duarte informed the nation of the final, definitive establishment of the institutional framework for consolidating the necessary climate of guarantees that makes possible the involvement of the insurgents in a social and legal framework that is just and truly democratic. That framework is made up of laws that strengthen the rule of law and due process and do not allow for excuses, rejection or challenge.

There is no longer a state of emergency. There is a renewed framework of justice which, supplemented by the amnesty law soon to be enacted, meets all aspirations for freedom. Agricultural reform has already been established. There is reliable and secure electoral registration. Elections are scheduled for 1988 to buttress the system and, above all, the people and Government are determined faithfully to attain its objectives.

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta,
El Salvador)

For these reasons, and because of the certainty that it only through internal reform that we can meet the requirements of peace and democracy, we undertook to respect all the commitments of Esquipulas II. And for that reason, and in that sense, the insurgents must irrevocably accept the Esquipulas plan as well and return to democracy and civilian life once and for all.

The people of El Salvador have been pioneers of freedom since 5 November 1811, when the first cry for emancipation was uttered in Central America in the city of San Salvador. At the same time, we have been pioneers of unity. In circumstances a thousand times more challenging, destiny has once again placed us in the vanguard of the defence of freedom. We accept that challenge with a sense of responsibility. We are meeting it at great cost but in the certainty that our endeavour will bear fruit not only for our own people but equally for other peoples of the area, to which we feel intimately linked.

My Government has had to fight on many fronts - national and international. The tenacity and historic endeavours of the Government, under President Jose Napoleon Duarte, have been reflected in a series of measures and achievements ranging from the struggle for respect for human rights to full freedom of political expression for all the forces included in the peaceful legal process; from a vast programme of economic and social development to benefit society's poorer majority to the promotion of a new sense of citizenship that is demanding and vigilant but at the same time altruistic and imbued with a sense of solidarity; from the progressive development of our democratic institutions to the orderly elimination of all remnants of the authoritarianism that had infiltrated various levels of the state and social systems of the country.

Human rights and freedom of expression in their fullest sense have been of particular concern to President Duarte. The improvement and strengthening of all

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta,
El Salvador)

policies to safeguard human rights reflect a trend and a commitment in El Salvador, since we consider that enjoyment of and respect for human rights underpin democracy in El Salvador.

This enormous endeavour, involving the entire people, sets us face to face with the most serious and urgent challenge of all - that of building peace, and doing so on the only possible scaffolding, that of democracy, because democracy is the key to peace. This is so clear and incontrovertible that it cannot be negotiated, belittled or distorted.

Hence, that dialogue for peace called for by President Duarte for Sunday next, 4 October, in the Apostolic Nunciature of San Salvador, with the insurgent groups, is a dialogue in accordance with Esquipulas II, a dialogue fervently desired by the Salvadoran people and supported by all the free peoples of the world. It is a dialogue within the framework of an active, serious, solid and energetic democracy, one that can accommodate all trends of thought, even those of an extreme nature, provided that they respect the rule of law and the universal rules underlying any authentic process of social coexistence.

The Government of El Salvador has put all its cards on the table. President Duarte, with the same conviction and with the same care with which, as one of its principal architects, he signed Esquipulas II, will talk with the insurgents, who have explicitly accepted the content and scope of that document. The present context of the dialogue with those groups is clear. They will talk about peace, not war. They will consolidate the democratic process, not destabilize it. That is the spirit and the letter of the document the Central American presidents signed with such hope and such realism. That is the purpose of President Duarte and his Government, and it is fully consistent with the wishes of all Salvadorans.

Peace is at hand. Within that over-all perspective, and in order to ensure that the commitments set out in Esquipulas II become a reality, my country has, from the outset, sought to ensure that the problems in our region shall be approached in an over-all, simultaneous, multilateral, verifiable and universally accepted fashion.

Such an approach must be comprehensive, because to achieve stable, effective agreements it is necessary to take into account not merely the complex roots of the conflict but also its present ramifications. What in the past might have been basically an internal matter has taken on international overtones, and it is impossible to continue to insist upon its original internal nature.

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta, El Salvador)

The agreements must be simultaneous, for if the comprehensive approach of the document is to be effective, in the light of the indivisible, global nature of the issues, the agreements must be carried out according to the schedule set by the signatory Governments or, in view of the nature of the measures to be adopted, at a basic, uniform tempo if no specific deadlines are set.

The agreements must be multilateral because all the Central American Governments, without exception or pretext, are committed to finding solutions and to fostering commitments in a responsible and sincere spirit.

They must be verifiable, because Esquipulas II is a historic agreement of mutual trust, adopted in good faith, setting in motion a process for dismantling in a peaceful and harmonious fashion all the structures and machinery of distrust, suspicion and aggression which the sickly spirit of war has unfortunately nurtured in our region.

They must be universally acceptable because the Latin American spirit that inspired the document, enshrined in the Contadora process, and the clear and determined commitment of the five nations that are calling for autonomy and a shared destiny, imply that Esquipulas II must be respected and accepted as a unique and harmonious whole by the international community and, first and foremost, by Latin America. This implies, inter alia, unqualified acceptance by all of the rejection of violence; the discrediting and unacceptability of insurgent groups, which should rather have recourse to amnesty and disarmament; the acceptance of democracy as the sole path towards legitimate power in the region; and other natural actions that must be adopted by some countries directly or indirectly involved in the peace plan.

I should like to express my Government's appreciation for the words of support received from all the Governments of Latin America and the world, which we consider to have been made in the aforementioned spirit.

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta, El Salvador)

We were recently saddened, nevertheless, to hear one dissident voice that seemed to go counter to our endeavours. I am referring to statements made by Cuba, which, in a broad series of comments, made discordant remarks that seemed to contradict its expressions of support for Esquipulas II, in particular with regard to efforts made by my Government to halt an armed conflict that no longer has any justification. Does Cuba support the clear and unobjectionable joint endeavours of the people and Government of El Salvador, who are obviously struggling for freedom and dignity in that country, out of respect for the humanistic and sacred principles of Bolivar, Marti and Juarez? Or is Cuba continuing its unconditional support - counter to the spirit and letter of Esquipulas II - for the inhuman terrorists and insurgents still operating in El Salvador, who have brought so much bloodshed and grief to our long-suffering people through their reprehensible acts, their criminal laying of mines and their irrational destruction?

We call upon Cuba to respect the sovereign will expressed in the peace agreement, to accept it unconditionally and openly, honestly and comprehensively. We call upon Cuba to stop the exporting of revolutions and to refrain from providing logistic and material support to the insurgents in El Salvador.

Similarly, we consider that there must be an adequate international response to the call from the peoples of Central America to the international community to provide the resources that can truly safeguard a firm and lasting peace. Without such assistance and material support in overcoming the social crises that are undeniable components of our conflicts, it will not be possible to realize the ideal of a life of permanent freedom and democracy to which our societies aspire.

We are realistic. We know that the eradication of the underlying causes of the crisis can be achieved only through the elimination of marginalization and underdevelopment, for tomorrow, God willing, we may achieve peace; the following day, however, a new and acute source of destabilization could arise - regional

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta, El Salvador)

destabilization caused not by the lack of peace or freedom but rooted in the hunger and critical poverty currently afflicting our peoples.

We therefore make a fervent appeal to the international community to assist us so that Esquipulas II can become a reality. That document places upon the signatory Governments the following obligations:

"9. In the climate of freedom guaranteed by democracy, the Central American countries shall adopt such agreements as will help to speed up development, in order to make their societies more egalitarian and free from misery.

"The strengthening of democracy entails creating a system of economic and social well-being and justice. To achieve these goals, the Governments shall jointly seek special economic assistance from the international community."

(A/42/521, pp. 7-8)

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta, El Salvador)

Peace is at hand.

It was not by happenstance that Central America found itself in the explosive situation that we are today defusing, with the understanding of all the nations of the world. A full-scale plan of international subversion was set in motion to take advantage of our weaknesses, shortcomings and past errors, but that plan failed to take into account two essential factors that made possible the current positive developments in the crisis: The first is the determination of our peoples - who are simple, but endowed with exemplary stoicism and age-old wisdom - to enjoy the benefits and opportunities of freedom, without sophistry or affectation. The second factor is the support of the international community in the attainment of solutions which, safeguarding democracy and the rule of law, will make possible equitable social development for all in our communities, who yearn so for progress and justice.

The lesson has been a cruel and painful one, but our hope has remained unshaken: the hope that we shall emerge from this time of trial, which has made us Central Americans fully aware that notwithstanding all the marginal disagreements we are united, not merely in our past, but also in our present and our future.

We are pacifists by calling, by loyalty and by experience. In that context of feelings and ideals, the foreign policy of El Salvador has contributed - and contributes increasingly - to the strengthening of regional and international peace and security in all spheres. That policy adheres to the principles and norms governing friendly relations among States.

As tangible proof of the principles that guide and define our foreign policy, I am pleased to note the considerable progress made with respect to the peaceful settlement of the border dispute with Honduras, both in terms of the proceedings before the International Court of Justice, to which both countries have turned in a spirit of harmony, and in terms of the technical work of demarcation in the border

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta, El Salvador)

areas delimited by the 1980 peace treaty. With respect to the Court's proceedings, my Government reaffirms its unequivocal willingness to comply with the Court's decision. That shows the commitment to peace which is the most evident example of the way we wish to see relations among Central American countries develop.

El Salvador, like the majority of countries represented here, is sometimes frustrated and concerned to see that many international incidents, far from showing signs of a peaceful solution, seem to be getting worse and more deeply rooted. But I must say that we have faith and hope that the remaining international disputes can be resolved through sincere dialogue aimed at creating conditions conducive to the political understandings necessary for peace.

El Salvador knows that the solution to today's problems and conflicts must be approached and achieved in the light of the pre-eminence of political will, tolerance, wisdom and respect. Only in that way can we make secure progress towards true international justice, guaranteeing the well-being and survival of mankind.

In that respect we welcome the mediating efforts of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, whom we fully support in his arduous task of trying to help resolve the dispute between Iran and Iraq. We appeal to the parties to the dispute to respect the resolutions of the Security Council and, as we in Central America are now doing, to engage in dialogue in a climate of reason in which mutually beneficial agreements can be adopted.

Likewise, El Salvador, with respect for and in full observance of the norms of international law, considers that the question of Korea must be resolved by peaceful means, through resumed dialogue and negotiations between South Korea and North Korea.

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta, El Salvador)

Peace is at hand.

It will be appreciated that El Salvador is a country all of whose energies are devoted to the achievement and maintenance of world and regional peace. If the little word "peace" has been uttered often in this statement it is because, for us, it is not merely a lofty aspiration; it is a spiritual commitment that supports and encourages us even in the worst circumstances. Our country is small, poor and long-suffering, but today it stands at one of the focal points of modern history. We have thus emerged from anonymity to play a leading role in one of the great battles of our time. We know that is a role we must take on with bravery and dignity.

The coming 5 November is an important multiple anniversary for Central America: 90 days after the signing of the Esquipulas II agreement, the five basic peace commitments will enter into force simultaneously in the five countries. On 5 November 1811, in the church of La Merced at San Salvador, the first cry for Central American independence was heard.

The coincidence on that great day of events associated with independence, pacifism, freedom and nationhood prompts me to invite my fellow Foreign Ministers of the Executive Committee to meet on that date at San Salvador, in keeping with the schedule of meetings, so that we can be first-hand witnesses to the crucial moment and jointly declare to the world the entry into force of these long-awaited agreements, in an act of historic responsibility and political will befitting the occasion. If this takes place, we should thus be able on 7 November to report to our regional organization, the Organization of American States, on the success of this great regional endeavour.

(Mr. Acevedo Peralta, El Salvador)

I affirm that we never have evaded and never shall shirk this enormous challenge, in which freedom and democracy are at stake. I am sure that I speak for all Salvadoreans when I say to this Assembly - from which we seek a resolution unequivocally supporting Esquipulas II - that El Salvador will continue to work for peace and harmony, with good faith and hope.

Mindful that we have made progress and that peace is at hand, we shall fully and unswervingly implement all the agreements undertaken in Esquipulas II, in the hope that the other countries will do the same, honouring their word and their dignity.

We hope our humble contribution will help the free, just and humane world we all want become an increasingly tangible reality for all the peoples of the earth.

Mr. KAFE (Comoros) (interpretation from French): I should like first to convey to Mr. Peter Florin, on behalf of my delegation, sincere congratulations on his election to the presidency of the forty-second session of the General Assembly. His qualities as an experienced diplomat, coupled with his great experience of our Organization, and the high offices that he has occupied in his country are a sure guarantee of the successful conduct of our work at a time when the Assembly must once again discuss serious problems which threaten the balance of our planet. We wish him every success in carrying out his difficult duties.

I should like also to congratulate his predecessor, Mr. Humayun Rasheed Choudhury, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bangladesh, a sister Muslim country, whose dedication, authority and ability made calm, positive work possible at the last session.

I take this opportunity also to pay a special tribute once again to the Secretary-General of our Organization, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his persistent efforts in the service of world peace. I associate in these congratulations Mr. Joseph Reed, who was recently nominated to the post of Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs. My delegation is convinced that the great qualities that distinguish that eminent diplomat will make him an effective member of the Secretary-General's new team.

Two years after the historic celebration of the fortieth anniversary of our Organization we must say that, despite the cries of alarm heard on that occasion, and despite our aspirations to a better world, the threat to international peace and security is greater than ever before. Indeed, in the light of the persistent conflicts and the sporadic wars which could at any time degenerate into a general conflagration, the peoples of the earth have never felt with such anguish the daily threat that endangers their very existence.

(Mr. Kafe, Comoros)

We are concerned at the increasing difficulties facing our Organization, given the many challenges that beset mankind. Urgent measures are necessary to ensure that the sacred principles of the Charter of our Organization are respected and applied. The United Nations is the universal symbol of justice, equality and peace. It is a moral bulwark which has frequently enabled our world to escape the worst that could happen. That is why we must understand the primary, decisive role that it must continue to play. It is time to re-establish its credibility, because millions of people pin their hopes on it. However, to ensure that the community of nations can continue to shoulder its great responsibilities effectively, a new mentality, based on mutual understanding and respect, must predominate in international relations.

Like the gloomy political situation that characterizes international relations at present, the rather poor economic situation is of great concern. This session is taking place two months after the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held in Geneva in July. The reasonably positive results that emerged from that Conference reflect a certain change in the positions until then adopted by the developed countries of the North, although by no means all obstacles have been overcome - far from it.

It goes without saying that the recovery that has started in the North has become a great problem for the developing countries of the South and proves that partial, unilateral solutions adopted by the wealthy countries to resolve structural problems are inadequate. The crisis continues, and my country, which is one of the least developed, increasingly feels the damaging effects of this. These effects include: disorganization of the international economic system; a great increase in the debt burden as compared with the developing countries' repayment capacity; a sharp fall in the prices of raw materials; the continued worsening of the already catastrophic situation of the least developed countries; and so on.

(Mr. Kafe, Comoros)

Because mine is an island country, because of our restricted national territory, part of which is still under foreign occupation, and because we lack mining resources, the development process embarked upon after our independence by the Comorian Government, under the enlightened guidance of Mr. Ahmed Abdallah Abderemane, President of the Republic, continues to face major obstacles. We would note in particular the following: the fact that the prices of our commodities, which account for more than 90 per cent of the value of our exports, have gone down; the fact that the volume of our debt servicing has increased by two and a half times in less than three years; the intransigence of our creditors with regard to the unfavorable conditions of their loans; the reduction in absolute terms of export earnings; the failure by some of our partners to respect commitments to assist our country that were undertaken at the first round table of donors, organized in Moroni, our capital, in July 1984.

Despite these many constraints, my Government continues to make great efforts to support growth and improve the living standards of our people. Thus, beginning in 1979, a restructuring programme relating particularly to production sectors has been undertaken. These efforts have been accompanied by a series of measures to improve financing in the public and para-public sectors, enabling us better to rationalize State operations and support growth by promoting private initiatives and very productive endeavours. This economic recovery policy had led to much improved performance in some areas by 1983.

(Mr. Kafe, Comoros)

In fact, thanks to the multiplying effects of this programme, throughout this period we have seen an overall growth in the economy of 6 per cent per annum and an annual increase of 1.7 per cent of real income per inhabitant. Nevertheless, the worsening of the international environment, marked by a sharp drop in commodity prices, and the great increase in debt servicing brought about by the excessive increase in interest rates in the main currencies used in the credit market have wiped out these endogenous efforts.

Our Government, for its part, is firmly committed to the spirit of enterprise and is determined to continue the battle against underdevelopment. However, without sustained increased aid from the international community, our country will not be able to reach its goals. That is why I now appeal to all people of goodwill to demonstrate, in keeping with the relevant resolutions of our Organization, their active solidarity by giving us their valuable assistance.

In the light of the complexity of the problems that confront our States, regional and subregional grouping is one of the ways to reduce these difficulties. That is certainly true for my country, and it is one of the priorities of its foreign policy. That is why my Government is committed to promoting regional and subregional co-operation. Comoros was one of the founding members of the Preferential Trade Zone, incorporating countries of eastern Africa, southern Africa and the Indian Ocean. But it is thanks to the establishment in 1984 of the Indian Ocean Commission, which includes Madagascar, Mauritius, Seychelles, Reunion Island and Comoros, that our various peoples can now pin real hopes on the advent of a common subregional market.

The Indian Ocean Commission, over which my country has the honour of presiding, gives the inhabitants of the area a chance to create a new economic area capable of providing for the harmonious, integrated, long-term development of our

(Mr. Kafe, Comoros)

subregion. But despite our determination, because of its paltry means the Indian Ocean Commission will not be able, without significant aid, to become the indispensable tool for the growth of our economies.

Apart from the generous and greatly appreciated aid given by the Commission of the European Communities, no other assistance has been forthcoming to support our subregional co-operation. Therefore, as current Chairman of the Indian Ocean Commission, I would appeal for the assistance of the international community and ask it to take an active part in financing the projects included in our programme.

Allow me now briefly to assess the international political situation.

In the Middle East, Israel continues its aggression against the Arab peoples. The Zionist entity refuses to accept the reality of the Palestinian people as a nation and seeks to flout its inalienable rights. With the assistance of its allies, Israel is pursuing an aggressive expansionist policy and has rejected the peaceful solutions proposed thus far.

We have always supported and affirmed the view that there can be no lasting, true peace in the Middle East as long as the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are not recognized, guaranteed and effectively exercised. That is why the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros supports the idea of an international peace conference on the Middle East with the participation of all parties concerned, including, of course, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the sole, authentic, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

A corollary of the Israeli-Arab conflict, the situation in Lebanon is still marked by daily violence and suffering, to which now has been added the spectre of famine and the situation is aggravated by the permanent presence of the Zionist army of occupation.

After seven years of deadly hostilities that have brought about a situation in which there can be no victors and no vanquished, the fratricidal war between Iraq

(Mr. Kafe, Comoros)

and Iraq continues its rampage in those countries. The increased risk of this conflict becoming international requires increasing vigilance by the international community. That is why we welcome the efforts of our Organization, more specifically the Secretary-General. The Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros supports Security Council resolution 598 (1987) calling for an immediate cease-fire by the two warring parties. We once again appeal to them, and particularly to Iran, strictly to abide by the Security Council resolution and all the efforts made thus far to achieve the cessation of hostilities and to put an end to this war, which is both absurd and futile.

Despite the resistance and bravery of the Afghan people, Afghanistan continues to suffer massacres and destruction in an undeclared war imposed upon it by a foreign Power. We have been following with keen interest the mediation efforts conducted under the auspices of the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General, but we remain deeply concerned about the continuance of this war that has already inflicted great losses on the people of that country. My country unreservedly supports the heroic struggle of that fraternal people, and we call for the immediate withdrawal of foreign forces in accordance with the relevant resolutions of our Organization.

Turning to Kampuchea, that country continues to be beset by foreign military occupation, notwithstanding the resolutions of the General Assembly calling for the immediate, unconditional withdrawal of foreign troops. The suffering people of Kampuchea is entitled to choose for itself, in full freedom and without any external constraints, the kind of government it wants.

The situation in the Korean peninsula remains at a standstill. Despite the statement by the two States in the North and the South on reaching an agreement, no

(Mr. Kafe, Comoros)

decisive step has yet been taken towards peaceful reunification of the country. We exhort the two parties to continue to try to find a just and lasting solution to the problem, because a united Korea would be a guarantee for peace and stability in that region. We reaffirm that the admission to membership of the two Koreas in our Organization would help to promote a speedy settlement of the problem.

In southern Africa, despite the repeated condemnations voiced by the international community, the Pretoria régime is still maintaining its inhuman policy of apartheid. This region is still the theatre of grave events that have brought about an explosive situation, thus imperilling the political stability of the countries of the region. We strongly condemn the continuing inhuman system of apartheid and sincerely call for abolition of that policy, which alone can help restore civil peace in the country and stability in that part of our continent.

We note with regret that Namibia still has not regained its independence, despite the relevant resolutions of our Organization. Faithful to the principles of peace and freedom, the Comorian Government is convinced that implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) alone will make possible a peaceful, negotiated settlement of this problem.

The situation on the Chadian-Libyan border calls for special attention. While welcoming the cease-fire, although it is fragile, between Chad and Libya, my country is very concerned about this dispute between two African countries, both members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Islamic Conference.

In our view, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the charter of the OAU require that any dispute should be resolved through dialogue and negotiation.

(Mr. Kafe, Comoros)

We therefore make a solemn appeal to the two parties concerned to embark upon the course of dialogue, mutual understanding and good-neighbourliness to resolve their conflict. The interests of their respective peoples are at stake, as well as the dignity of Africa and the unity of our pan-African organization.

Turning to Western Sahara, my country reiterates that it fully supports the resolutions adopted at the 18th and 19th summit meetings of the OAU. We are convinced that to secure a satisfactory and lasting solution to this problem a referendum must be organized to enable the people concerned to exercise their right to self-determination. We call upon the parties concerned to make use, under the auspices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the current Chairman of the OAU, of all the peaceful means at their disposal and to demonstrate wisdom and the will to attain that goal.

My country, like all the other littoral States of the Indian Ocean, is concerned by the increasing reinforcement of the military presence in that region, which has been made more serious by the explosive situation in the Arab-Persian Gulf. In its desire to preserve peace and security in that area, my country has always fought for the establishment of a zone of peace, a demilitarized, denuclearized zone in the Indian Ocean, in keeping with the Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI).

Before concluding this brief review of the international situation, I wish to refer once again to a question familiar to our Organization that is a source of serious concern for my country. I mean, of course, the question of the Comorian Island of Mayotte.

As the Assembly knows, this problem arose from an injustice and a flagrant violation of public international law, and has a permanent place on the agendas of all international and regional organizations. Unfortunately, no just, lasting

(Mr. Kafe, Comoros)

solution has been found, and this year again there will be a special discussion of this matter which will give us opportunity to go into more detail on it. For the time being, I would merely state that there have been no developments since the forty-first session of the General Assembly because nothing has happened to give the matter a fresh impetus.

Yet, after the meeting between the delegation of the OAU and the French Prime Minister, Mr. Jacques Chirac, in June 1986, and the encouraging statements by the latter, everyone felt that something positive would finally emerge. I would recall, however, that, following that meeting and the subsequent meetings between President Abderemane and the highest French authorities, the French Government decided to withdraw from the French Parliament the Bill on the organization of a referendum in Mayotte. Finally, the French Prime Minister paid a brief visit to the Comoros in October 1986. But the situation that prevails there has not lived up to the hopes raised by all these initiatives.

Nevertheless, my Government, convinced of the justice of its cause, has not ceased its efforts to continue to assert its most legitimate rights both in international forums and at the bilateral level.

Every time this question is discussed by the international community there is unanimous condemnation of this injustice and people always say that Mayotte is an integral part of the Islamic Federal Republic of Comoros.

I reaffirm once again from this rostrum that the people and Government of Comoros, because of their right and the unanimous support of the international community, are determined to fight until their just cause triumphs.

We therefore make an urgent, solemn appeal to the French Government to take a decisive step, within the framework of the friendly relations that exist between our two countries, to make possible a final solution to this distressing problem.

(Mr. Kafe, Comoros)

In conclusion, I reaffirm my Government's unswerving commitment to the United Nations system and its ideals and noble objectives.

The PRESIDENT: I call now on representatives who have asked to exercise the right of reply. I remind Members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second, and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. CISTERNAS (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The Foreign Minister of Bolivia has made a statement that strayed far from the facts about negotiations that have taken place between his Government and mine. In addition, following a practice that has become customary for the Foreign Minister of Bolivia - but which my delegation will not adopt - he made improper and churlish remarks about Chilean authorities, which we vigorously reject. Using regrettable language, he passed certain judgements that are at variance with truth and history. Those words, furthermore, only mislead the Assembly about the vital co-operation that my country has given to the Bolivian nation regarding its access to the Pacific Ocean.

We now wish to clarify the position. Contrary to what the Foreign Minister of Bolivia said about Chile having seized its coastline in a brutal war of aggression, we must state once again that the motives for that war, which took place more than 100 years ago, were the same as those that, unfortunately, led to many similar conflicts in the Americas. These were due to the imprecise borders which existed when the countries became independent. The war was the result of this lack of precision and both countries tried to defend what they thought was their own after many decades of negotiations, in which two treaties were concluded but were disregarded by Bolivia.

Today, Bolivia has no right whatsoever to Chilean territory. Our borders were established once and for all by a Treaty signed by both countries in 1904, more than 20 years after the conflict ended, and it had the support of public opinion and the Bolivian Congress.

Bolivia has tried time and again, by indirect means, to revise this Treaty. The statement by the Foreign Minister of Bolivia this morning is further proof of this. In the 1904 Treaty defining our borders Chile assumed heavy obligations for the benefit of Bolivia, such as at the construction of railroads for Bolivian use and payments in cash, and recognized that Bolivia had broad rights of free transit over its territory and to the Pacific ports. Subsequently, this arrangement was improved by further treaties and agreements. Chile incorporated in the Bolivian free-transit provision a pipeline on Chilean territory, the operation of which is the responsibility of Bolivia, and the establishment of Bolivian warehouses and customs posts in Chilean ports.

The facts show that the railroads built by Chile and the assistance with the financing in Bolivia, and the system of free transit and its constant improvement, have given Bolivia effective access to the Pacific Ocean.

(Mr. Cisternas, Chile)

Bolivia is landlocked, but it has an ideal system compared to that of any other landlocked country in the world.

Notwithstanding the facts and the clarity of the legal situation of my country under the 1904 peace Treaty, Chile was prepared, through bilateral negotiations, to meet a Bolivian requirement that it have sovereign access to the Pacific Ocean.

In recent years two sets of negotiations have taken place on this subject. In 1975 we proposed to Bolivia that it have sovereign access to the Pacific Ocean through a corridor to the north of the city of Arica. Chile's offer was essentially a kind of territorial exchange. Bolivia accepted Chile's proposal and, specifically, the territorial exchange. Subsequently, the Bolivian Government withdrew its acceptance, especially as regards the exchange of territory, which was a fundamental condition from Chile's point of view.

It was Bolivia that not only disrupted negotiations, but interrupted them once and for all when it decided to cut off diplomatic relations with Chile in March of 1978.

In February 1986, the President of Bolivia, Victor Paz Estensoro, speaking at a press conference about relations with Chile, said:

"I think we need a fresh approach to the problem."

This position served to initiate a new round of discussions, which led to a new Bolivian proposal, which could not, however, be called a fresh approach. The proposal, although it did have something to do with what was considered in 1976, did not deal with the territorial exchange. It offered compensation of a vague and empty kind, without specifications or detail. This ran counter to what Chile had requested. Neither public opinion nor the Chilean authorities were prepared to accept such a proposal.

(Mr. Cisternas, Chile)

The Government of Chile, as was its legitimate right, told Bolivia that it rejected its proposal. The exercise of its rights and compliance with the duty of all Governments to protect the interests of their people cannot justify the reaction of the Bolivian Minister. The idea that the Bolivian proposal, which adversely affects the territorial integrity of Chile and the right of self-determination of the Chilean people, should be accepted by the Government of Chile simply because it was put forward is something that could not be supported in a reasonable and serious manner and deserves to be rejected out of hand.

The verbal virulence of the Foreign Minister of Bolivia will not be used by Chile. It is not an appropriate means of building co-operation between nations.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): The Foreign Minister of Greece devoted a substantial part of his statement to the Cyprus issue. What surprised us was not the importance that the Government of Greece attaches to the problem, but his negative approach and vitriolic style. This is in obvious contrast to the statement made by my Foreign Foreign Minister, who dealt with the question in a very restrained tone - so much so that the Greek Foreign Minister could not even refer to the statement by my Foreign Minister, but preferred to attack the policies of Turkey in general, and in generalities.

It is a mistake to distort history, but an even greater mistake to distort the history for which one has oneself a great responsibility. This is exactly what the Greek Foreign Minister has done. Indeed, the tragic problem of Cyprus had its origin in the policies pursued by the Greek Government in trying to extend its sovereignty to the whole of the island. This ambition even led Greece, in 1974, to stage a coup in Cyprus against Archbishop Makarios, who was then recognized by Greece as the President of Cyprus. Archbishop Makarios barely saved his life, and he fled the island. He came to the United Nations. He spoke before the Security

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

Council and he said that Cyprus was facing an invasion by Greece. Now, when the Greek Foreign Minister refers to the Turkish intervention 13 years ago, he conveniently forgets that it was that very Greek invasion that compelled Turkey to intervene under the Treaty of Guarantee, of which Greece is also a signatory. And may I remind the Greek Foreign Minister that his Government still continues to qualify Greece as a guarantor of Cyprus.

The Greek Foreign Minister says that the Greek Cypriots, after the Turkish intervention, became refugees in their own country. But he omits to say that the Turks of Cyprus had been refugees in their own country since 1963 when the Greek Cypriots forcefully abolished the Constitution and started a massacre of the Turkish population of the island. The Minister also does not seem to remember that there has been an exchange of populations in the island and that the Greek Cypriots have accepted the premise that in any solution the Turks in Cyprus will continue to live in the north and the Greeks in the south.

Speaking of the presence of Turkish military forces in Cyprus, the Greek Foreign Minister does not, of course, mention that at one period there were 20,000 Greek troops in the island in support of the policies of oppression directed against the Turkish community. The difference between the presence of the Greek forces in the island and the Turkish forces is that our forces are there only to protect the Turkish Cypriots, not to oppress the Greek Cypriots. This is probably a mission that the Greek Foreign Minister has difficulty in comprehending.

What was particularly surprising in the statement of the Greek Foreign Minister was that he accused Turkey of systematically avoiding the discussion of issues relating to the Cyprus problem. But what about the proposals put forward by the Secretary-General in the course of his mission of good offices? The Greek Foreign Minister should, of course, know that the Turkish Cypriot side has accepted

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

these proposals, which constitute a draft framework agreement encompassing all the aspects of the Cyprus problem, including the withdrawal of non-Cypriot forces from the island. The only thing that the Turkish Cypriots do not accept is discussion of the withdrawal of non-Cypriot forces separately from other issues which constitute an integrated whole. Why? Because they want to survive. It is as simple as that. One cannot blame the Turkish Cypriots if they do not look forward to the day when they would be once again at the mercy of superior Greek power, without any safeguards.

I could not believe my eyes when I read in the Greek Foreign Minister's statement the accusation that the Government of Turkey would like

"to entrap the Government of the Republic of Cyprus into accepting a constitutional system which would serve Turkish interests solely..."

(supra, p. 18)

What is this constitutional system? It is a constitutional system whose parameters have been laid down in the draft framework agreement proposed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Therefore, this is not an accusation directed against the Government of Turkey; it is an accusation directed against the Secretary-General of the United Nations himself.

The Foreign Minister of Greece also says:

"the position of Ankara is highly provocative when it argues that a discussion of the critical problem of Cyprus at this session constitutes a manifestation of intransigence". (supra, p. 18)

(Mr. Türkmen, Turkey)

We have not said anything like that. We have said only that the debate in the General Assembly will be counter-productive, because it will hamper the Secretary-General's initiative. If they want a debate at any price, let them have it. The Greek Foreign Minister's statement is the best proof that such a debate can only be destructive.

Mr. CHAN-YOURAN (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French): For some nine years the General Assembly has grown more and more familiar with the expansionism of Viet Nam, the aggressor against our country.

In his statement today the representative of Viet Nam has just confirmed that, in order to realize their expansionist ambitions in Kampuchea and South-East Asia as a whole, through their "Indo-China Federation", the Hanoi authorities will stop at nothing, not even the most reprehensible and treacherous tricks.

Our Assembly now regards it as an established fact that Viet Nam has not the slightest intention of settling the problem of Kampuchea politically and withdrawing its forces unconditionally, as requested in the eight resolutions already adopted by the Assembly.

Viet Nam's many diplomatic manoeuvres since 1979 are aimed at justifying and continuing its occupation of Kampuchea and gaining international recognition of the puppet régime it has installed in Phnom Penh.

In his noteworthy statement in the Assembly on 21 September the Foreign Minister of Singapore, Mr. Dhanabalan, with his customary eloquence, vigour and wisdom, gave irrefutable proof of the various manoeuvres engaged in by Viet Nam, on which I shall not dwell.

My delegation much appreciates the statements made here by many eminent representatives, who have reminded Viet Nam of its duty to end its occupation of Kampuchea immediately, so that the people of Kampuchea and of Viet Nam may enjoy

(Mr. Chan-Youran (Democratic Kampuchea))

peace and live in friendship once again and the peace and security of our region will no longer be threatened.

It is more than regrettable that the Vietnamese representative has refused to heed yesterday's important message to the Assembly from His Royal Highness Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, President of Democratic Kampuchea. That refusal shows Viet Nam's scorn for our Assembly and proves that it is still firmly opposed to peaceful negotiations to find a political solution to the problem of Kampuchea.

I wish to quote some passages from that message, to remind the Vietnamese representative of the following:

"To achieve a political solution of the problem of Cambodia it is essential for the Hanoi leaders sincerely to accept reality. There is no way that they can evade the well-known fact that the problem of Cambodia is not a problem of civil war, but rather the result of the invasion and occupation of Kampuchea, an independent sovereign State Member of the United Nations, by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, the principles of non-alignment and international law. The continuance of that invasion and occupation is the principal threat to peace, security and stability in South-East Asia and Pacific Asia.

"... There can be no political solution so long as the Hanoi leaders refuse to negotiate with the representatives of those against whom they are fighting. Their proposals for negotiations are nothing but ruses and diversions to enable them to remain in Cambodia indefinitely. As evidence of our good faith and desire to arrive speedily at a political solution we have, even before the commencement of negotiations, made all the necessary concessions to enable our adversary to withdraw without losing face, in the interest of all: our interest, theirs, the region's and the world's.

(Mr. Chan-Youran, Democratic Kampuchea)

"First, we propose that Viet Nam withdraw its forces in two phases, within a definite time-frame and under United Nations supervision. Secondly, even before the total withdrawal of Vietnamese forces, we propose that those installed by Viet Nam in Phnom Penh participate in our Coalition Government, which would then become a quadripartite Coalition Government of Kampuchea, thus achieving national reconciliation and enabling all components to have the same rights as political forces. Thirdly, to Viet Nam - which claims that it is threatened by small, weak Cambodia - we offer an independent, united, peaceful, neutral, non-aligned Cambodia, with no foreign bases, with United Nations guarantees and with a United Nations presence. Fourthly, we propose also to Viet Nam that relations be established between our two countries in all fields, including even the signing of a treaty of non-aggression and peaceful coexistence.

"What more can we offer, apart from surrender? It is this that the Hanoi leaders actually want to achieve by continuing to reject our proposals and demand that we lay down our weapons and agree to dismember our Coalition Government by eliminating one of its three components or those not to Viet Nam's liking. We must remind those Hanoi leaders of the following points: first, no law of international relations authorizes them to interfere in the internal affairs of another State or impose their laws on it; secondly, the Cambodian people cannot exercise its right of self-determination and national reconciliation so long as Vietnamese forces are present; thirdly, national reconciliation is not an exclusive process, but is extended to all citizens of the country; and, fourthly, it is a sacred right and a patriotic duty for all Cambodians to fight in every way to regain and defend national independence, freedom, honour and national dignity, as was true of the Vietnamese people in

(Mr. Chan-Youran, Democratic Kampuchea)

its pre-1975 struggle and of all the peoples of the world in their struggle against warmongers during the two world wars.

"So long as Viet Nam refuses to withdraw all its forces from Cambodia, the Cambodian people and its Coalition Government have no choice but to pursue their struggle resolutely and call upon all countries that cherish peace and justice to continue to support that struggle and exert pressure on Viet Nam. If we stray from that path or lack resolve we shall lose for ever our motherland, our freedom and our national identity.

"It is for the Hanoi leaders to decide whether they will continue the occupation of Cambodia, in the framework of their policy of an Indo-China Federation and in keeping with their strategy of regional expansion, and maintain their hostility towards the countries of the region and the rest of the world or agree to heed the international community's repeated calls to reason urging them to withdraw all their forces from Cambodia, abandon their expansionist policy, re-establish good relations with all the countries of the region and once again become a part of the family of nations."

(A/42/PV.15, pp.13-15)

Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I feel obliged to reply to the representative of Chile, who referred to the statement made by my country's Foreign Minister today.

The Bolivian delegation does not intend to engage in polemics on the problem. Every year Foreign Ministers of Bolivia have spoken of the problem of the unjust war and Bolivia's landlocked status, and my country has appealed frankly and sincerely for negotiations. That is not surprising, but it is surprising that Chile wishes to raise the problem in the Assembly to indulge in polemics, no doubt

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

because it can use problems with weaker neighbouring countries to assist it in internal politics, to try to legitimize a plebiscite in which the Chilean people cannot vote or exercise their rights.

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

We are accustomed to hearing the Chilean delegation justify continued violations of human rights. Today it has come to attack my country in an attempt to distort history and accuse our Foreign Minister of using gross language. Our Foreign Minister expressed himself in a vigorous, clear and sincere manner. It is up to the Assembly to decide whether his language was vigorous or not. It most certainly was not gross; and it was perfectly clear. Of course, usurpers never like to be reminded here in the Assembly about the question of usurpation.

Obviously, in Latin America borders between countries were not always clearly delineated, and Bolivia's borders are perhaps unclear with all its neighbours, except Chile.

I would refer to a distinguished Chilean Ambassador, Mr. Jose Miguel Barros, who said that the border between Bolivia and Chile was clearly delimited, but that there had been a treaty, disregarded by Chile, providing for the defence of a British-Chilean commercial enterprise which to this day brings benefits to the Edwards family.

In 1904 there was no treaty signed by a Government that had won the elections, as Chile claims, or that enjoyed national support. The fact is that Bolivia was invaded in 1879. Bolivia suffered an invasion and a military occupation. Regrettably, at that time the United Nations did not exist. But today the Organization of American States (OAS) has made itself a party to this problem. The Non-Aligned Movement has also become a party to it. So one wonders: Can 150 countries be mistaken when they express their solidarity with the wish of Bolivia to gain access to the Pacific Ocean through peaceful means, in keeping with the Charters of the United Nations and the OAS.

This question has been under discussion in the OAS since 1979, where we have received support and where we have been repeatedly invited to hold talks between

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

both countries. Systematically, Chile has sometimes said that it was in favour, and at other times against.

In 1983, in the OAS, Chile committed itself to negotiations, but then it reversed itself after voting in favour of the resolution. Subsequently Chile said that it would insist on bilateral dialogue because it could not accept multilateral machinery. Bolivia, presided over by the new democratic government of President Paz, taking a fresh approach, changed the policy that it had maintained the previous few years and agreed to take a new approach in negotiations.

Hence a number of meetings took place, as the Bolivian Foreign Minister said this morning. We went to Montevideo, invited by the Government of Uruguay and with the support of all members of the OAS, which in 1986 in Guatemala had approved the start of negotiations.

These negotiations began auspiciously and everything went well until Admiral Merino, playing domestic politics in Chile, wanted to use Bolivia as an instrument to divide and rule domestically, given the struggles and internal divisions of the junta oppressing Chile.

The Chilean people accepted and supported negotiations. All democratic parties - from the Christian Democrats to the Communist Party - accepted a solution for Bolivia's regaining access to the sea.

The great internationalists in Chile, including Ambassadors Jerez and Oscar Pinochet de la Barra, also accepted the idea that this dispute should be resolved.

Bolivia is prepared to negotiate. It went to Montevideo in good faith, but there it met verbal aggression launched by Admiral Merino and certain power groups that tried to drive into a corner the Chilean Government, which was negotiating with Bolivia, taking advantage of that Government's problem with regard to the lack of free elections in Chile, except for the imposition of a plebiscite of doubtful legality and legitimacy.

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

That is why my country has had to exercise the right of reply to make it clear to international opinion that Bolivia remains constant in its acceptance of the continued support it is receiving from 150 countries, with their votes and encouragement. Bolivia also thanks the Foreign Ministers of neighbouring countries who, in this Assembly, have referred to the problem and stated that negotiations should be resumed.

The great problems of mankind today are being resolved in this Hall or elsewhere in regional organizations. Bolivia once again in a generous, imaginative spirit would like to join with northern Chile and southern Peru. Bolivia has always been prepared to do this.

In the course of earlier negotiations in 1975 Bolivia accepted international negotiations. We had not accepted territorial exchange as such. And it was not Bolivia that broke off negotiations, but Chile, which refused to accept an interesting and imaginative proposal by Peru, which also wished to contribute to a solution of the problem. In the end history will show that northern Chile, southern Peru and western Bolivia will have to unite in integration with Bolivia towards the Pacific Ocean.

Chile's great figures of the past, its experienced diplomats like Barros Jarpa, or its politicians, like President Frei, and nowadays the leader Mr. Gabriel Valdes, have all accepted a negotiated solution. Only the military junta does not wish to negotiate in order to make use of the problem with Bolivia for domestic ends.

Chile is no longer a valid negotiator in this matter. Yet we are confident that when the Chilean people have a voice and a say in their own destiny, we will be able to negotiate and to resolve our differences.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Chile. May I remind him that his statement will now be limited to five minutes.

Mr. CISTERNAS (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): I thought I had been clear in my statement when I referred to the words of the President of Bolivia, and I said that we needed a fresh approach to the problem. I pointed out then and explained that there was no fresh approach and that, unfortunately, it was for that reason that negotiations had failed.

In addition I should like to point out that the Bolivian delegation is completely mistaken. It is said that politics is the art of the possible, and a fortiori that would apply to a country's foreign policy. If the people and the Government of Bolivia believe that they would be able to divide Chile and in that way satisfy Bolivia's wish for access to the sea, they are quite mistaken. Chile does not want any territory but its own, but at the same time it demands that its territorial integrity and sovereignty over its own territory be respected.

No matter what Chilean Government happens to be in power - in the past, now, or in future - whatever the philosophy of any of them or of its various leaders or their qualifications may be, those Governments have always and will always faithfully reflect the wishes of the Chilean people, namely, complete sovereignty over Chilean territory.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Bolivia. His statement is limited to five minutes.

Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to offer a clarification for the Hall. When the Bolivian Government took a fresh approach, we bore in mind what was possible; we took an imaginative approach. Bolivia wanted to offer gas and water in exchange for territory, and to use all these resources in a shared way with binational or trinational companies of the countries in the region.

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

That was the fresh approach to which I referred.

Now, obviously, Chile has resisted negotiations which, in principle, it had accepted.

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

In all negotiations we have put forward our proposals; received questions; and answered them. But no Chilean counter-proposals have come forward. In 1975 Peru made a positive contribution but Chile most emphatically cancelled negotiations, closing off any possibility of a settlement.

We are not the ones who are talking about internal divisions in Chile. This is in all the newspapers. We can easily distribute editorials from democratic organs that have criticized the Chilean Government for using the Bolivian problem for internal politics in Chile and criticized its international policy roundly, to levels never before seen in that country. We simply want the international community, especially the General Assembly, not to be misled, and for this reason my delegation will distribute the editorials from the main magazines and newspapers published in Chile or abroad, by Chileans, which clearly show the positive, progressive thinking of certain sectors in Chile that on many occasions are not allowed to speak out in their own country.

The PRESIDENT: The Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) has asked to be allowed to reply to the statement made by one of the speakers in the general debate. I intend to call on him to make a statement in reply on the basis of resolution 3237 (XXIX) of 22 November 1974, taking duly into account the ruling made by the President of the thirty-first session and the precedents established under similar circumstances during subsequent sessions of the General Assembly. I call on the Observer of the PLO.

Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)): In his statement this afternoon Mr. Shimon Peres said "no longer can we find military answers to political problems" (supra, pp. 19-20). Certainly Israel must have realized this after the crushing defeats of the Israeli military machinery, particularly in 1982. Israel must have realized this when faced with the defeat of its iron-fist policies against our people in the occupied Palestinian towns and villages - in

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

Jerusalem, Nablus, Bethlehem, and in Bir Zeit. This failure proved to the occupying power, Israel, that its tanks and the designs of its generals could not overcome the determination of our people. These generals are now reaffirming their policy of mass evacuation of the Palestinians. Now they call it a transfer of the Palestinian people from their homes in Palestine to the wilderness, the desert across the Jordan river. After 40 years the Palestinian human being has shown beyond any doubt his true nature and his attachment to the soil of his fatherland, to Palestine. He has shown as well his determination to live in freedom, in peace in his own home, and in his homeland. Mr. Peres also said that Arabs and Israelis can be at peace with themselves only if they reach peace with each other.

(supra, p.21) Well, to Mr. Peres I should like to say that Palestinians are also Arabs. I wonder whether Mr. Peres could be reminded that in 1925 - he was not in Palestine then - he should have listened to and heeded Robert Weltsch who said: "Palestine can only prosper if a relationship of mutual trust is established between the two peoples". Mr. Buber, another Zionist spiritually and morally, but not politically and aggressively, said: "The requisite political altruism assumes mutual trust and thus, as the interlopers, the intruding invading party, the burden of creating this trust is none the less on the Zionist movement". So Mr. Peres who did not live in Palestine then did not know the need for such wise statements. Where was Mr. Peres when young Palestinians in Palestine - Jews, Christians, Arabs, and Muslims - lived in peace together? Where was he when Palestine was economically self-sufficient and prospering? Where was he in 1947 when almost 2 million Palestinians - again Jews, Christians and Muslims - were prosperous within their own means and needs in Palestine?

Mr. Peres speaks of the growth of the democratic spirit as if that had never existed in Palestine. Perhaps it did not under the British Mandate, but definitely

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

it was not brought in by the Zionists. I am sure he is not aware of the decision of his Government revoking the residence of Mubarak Awad, Director of the Jerusalem-based Palestine Centre for the Study of Non-Violence. That information appeared in The New York Times this morning. Are Mr. Peres and his colleagues allergic to non-violence, and more so if it is advocated by a Palestinian American? Mr. Peres talks about renouncing violence, yet here is a man who speaks about non-violence and he is almost expelled.

This disease of "hate the Palestinians" and "hate the truth" is contagious. The United States Administration in a move to overbid its ally Israel has even decided to order the closure of the Palestine Information Office in Washington, D.C., thus further violating the cherished freedom of speech and association of United States citizens. Democracy in Israel is a farce, for how can we explain legislation that considers peace promoters in Israel as criminals. Those peace promoters are extending their hands to the Palestinians through the PLO. Furthermore, Mr. Peres tells us that he represents a group in disarray. He says the Cabinet is divided so it is a group in disarray. So whom does he speak on behalf of? I remember a few months ago the "escapists" - a word used as a pretext to avoid joining the peace process - asked who the PLO represented and what about its credibility. That was only an escapist form to avoid joining the peace process. But then the eighteenth session of the PLO National Council held in Algiers - and we wish to thank our Algerian brothers for facilitating that meeting for us - in April 1987 consolidated our unity. I think Mr. Peres comes here to use this platform for an election campaign. He says: "Please have pity on us. My Government is in disarray. I am split. Please support me." Support him in what? This place is a sacred place. It is not a forum for campaigning. Support him in what? After 40 years of dispersion of the Palestinians, after 40 years of life for

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

the Israelis in a garrison State, would we not think that it had become incumbent upon all of us to seek and follow the peace process? That is why we in the PLO and at our National Council in April, endorsed fully and unanimously the call for convening the international peace conference provided for in the resolution adopted almost unanimously by this Assembly. I refer to resolution 38/58 C. I refer to all the provisions of that resolution. I refer to the guidelines in that resolution. I refer also to the participants mentioned in that resolution. I refer to the mechanism in that resolution. I am not being selective.

We have heard scores of statements in this Assembly. We note with great appreciation the overwhelming support given to the call, the plan, and the endorsement of the need to convene the international peace conference. Apparently, Mr. Peres is not aware of what goes on in this Assembly or, as a sign of disarray, perhaps his aides do not report to him but report to somebody else in the Cabinet. Who knows?

(Mr. Terzi, PLO)

He speaks of the need to negotiate without pre-conditions and without pre-planning. But, at the same time, he tells us that this should be on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). There is a contradiction here - unless my English is poor. And we ask: What about the fate of the other resolutions adopted by the Security Council in relation to the situation in the Middle East and the question of Palestine? Do we have to apply a policy of discrimination? This is not a racist campaign. We are talking about Security Council resolutions. They all have the same validity; they all have the same power; they all have to be adhered to.

Let me recall that from the rostrum of the General Assembly the Government of the United States declared unequivocally that resolution 242 (1967) does not address the political dimension of the Palestinian problem. Since we are seeking a political solution, how does anyone dare to tell us that we should resort to a resolution that does not address the political dimension? That is absurd, if not hypocritical.

I wish to reassure everyone here that the Palestinians are not a myth. We are a fact; we are a fact of life. That is why we sit here. We represent a people. We are a principal party to the conflict. That is what the General Assembly has declared. Again, that is a fact. We are the principal victim of the conflict. That is why we tell Mr. Peres and those who support him that without the Palestinian people, without the Palestine Liberation Organization and its representation, there will be no negotiations, there will be no peace.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 477 (V) of 1 November 1950, I now call on the Observer of the League of Arab States.

Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): I have asked to be allowed to speak in order to respond to the statement made today by Mr. Peres. The tone and the language of that statement were intended to make rebuttal appear out of touch, a sort of redundancy in the face of emerging new "facts" and conditions.

As usual, Mr. Peres used palatable platitudes. This was an attempt - a rather clever attempt - to obscure the realities, to avoid specific commitments. It was an attempt to obscure the Israeli practices in the various occupied territories; in South Lebanon, where Israel maintains a vicarious, illegal militia, logistically, financially and militarily equipped, supported and sustained by Israeli occupation; the annexation of Jerusalem - ex cathedra and unilateral; and the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights. I shall not mention the unresolved problem of Taba, which was part and parcel of Egyptian territory. In other words, there is a level of belligerency which Mr. Peres apparently is against in terms of platitudes. But parallel with that are the various nuclear warheads, the Leopard II missiles and the continued ridiculous denial that the Israelis have any nuclear and atomic bombs.

Mr. Peres spoke of Israel's fortieth anniversary. He said: "We have returned to the birthplace of our faith" (supra, p.22). But the birthplace of various other faiths happened to be Palestine too. If everyone wanted to return to the birthplace of his religion, many countries would cease to exist and many other countries would have demographic explosions. What about the birthplace of the Christians? Are they to return to the birthplace of their faith, and are we to have further settlements in that area?

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

Mr. Peres said that

"in the absence of a vibrant peace process, the political skies may become capricious again". (supra, pp.23-25)

What does that mean? We are in favour of a genuine peace process. That is why we have supported the international conference sponsored by the United Nations - not as a ceremonial event, but as a seriously structured mechanism designed to bring about a comprehensive peace in accordance with the two pillars of the United Nations jurisprudence in this matter: withdrawal from all the occupied territories and the right of the Palestinians to self-determination.

Mr. Peres stated that the object of negotiation is to produce solutions. That is correct. But then he used this phrase: "to begin negotiations without pre-planning their outcome" (supra, p.26). What does that mean? Indeed, this is the core of the problem. Negotiations for what? On what basis?

In the history of diplomacy, negotiation has always meant negotiating the modalities, the timetable of a defined outcome. During the Algerian revolution, the subject of the negotiations with France was not whether Algeria had a right to independence, but how to bring about independence. India and the other Commonwealth countries negotiated a credible outcome with their colonial Powers. Negotiation was the mechanism by which the desired outcome would be structured, would be construed, would be achieved.

But, when Mr. Peres says "to begin negotiations without pre-planning their outcome", what he has in mind is a fishing expedition; he has in mind negotiation for its own sake, negotiation as a time-killer, and, in regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict, negotiation as a ratification of conquest, annexation and occupation.

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

Mr. Peres said that many Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank "seem to have concluded that violence leads nowhere" (supra, p.26). Well, the Palestinian people in the occupied territories have never thought that violence leads somewhere. It is the occupation authorities in whom violence is inherent. Violence is a present danger on the part of the occupation authorities; the threat is to use violence against liberation and resistance movements. Violence on their part is designed to sustain occupation, whereas for those resisting occupation and seeking their freedom and independence, violence is the option of last resort.

Then Mr. Peres appealed to the Soviet Union to

"allow the Jewish people to express their identity and...to reunite with their destiny in the land of their ancestors". (supra, p.27).

Where are these Jewish people bound to settle - these people whom he calls "our brethren" and whom he is asking the Soviet Union to allow to leave? What about the Palestinians who are living in refugee camps? The General Assembly and the entire United Nations have recognized the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homeland. Are they are not to be the object of human rights? Are they not to be allowed to return to their homeland?

(Mr. Maksoud, League of Arab States)

What is the criterion for people to return to their homeland? Is their homeland the place of origin of their faith? What kind of ideology is that? What about subsequent generations? People of Jewish persuasion in the United States - do they also want to be reunited with the land of their ancestors? What are we saying? These are potent and unsettling ideologies that carry within themselves the seeds of expansionism but have been sugar-coated with language that will make them palatable to this General Assembly.

They are potent ideologies of expansionism and annexation. Then the Israeli representative said that those wishing to participate in bringing peace cannot confine their relations to one side. This was while he was talking about the Soviet Union and China. What about the United States not recognizing the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), even closing its information office in Washington at a time when the PLO is recognized by more countries than is Israel itself?

This is not a conflict, as he states, between past orientation and future orientation. His whole claim to statehood is a reference to 2000 years of history, and he calls this future-oriented. The claim of the Palestinian people who have been uprooted and disenfranchised in the past 40 years is contemporary history, while ancient history is invoked as a forward-looking approach.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.