



General Assembly

UN LIBRARY

SEP 22

UN/54 COLLECTION

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.4
21 September 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 21 September 1987, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)

- Opening of the general debate [9]

Statement made by:

Mr. de Abreu Sodre (Brazil)

- Address by Mr. Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America
- General debate [9] (continued)

Address by Mr. Yasuhiro Nakasone, Prime Minister of Japan

Statement made by:

Mr. Dhanabalan (Singapore)

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 10.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 9

GENERAL DEBATE

The PRESIDENT: I should like to remind representatives that, in accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 3rd plenary meeting, the list of speakers will be closed on Wednesday, 23 September, at 6 p.m. I request delegations to be good enough to provide the estimated speaking times as accurately as possible so that we can plan our meetings in an orderly way.

Mr. de ABREU SODRE (Brazil) (spoke in Portuguese; English text furnished by the delegation): It is with a renewed feeling of confidence in the United Nations and a keen perception of its vital role in the strengthening of peace and co-operation amongst peoples that for the third time I come to this podium.

Nearly all the nations of the world are represented here, protagonists in the universal and egalitarian communion that this General Assembly propitiates every year. Here the nations, large and small, raise free and sovereign voices in a discussion of important items on the international agenda.

Brazil has the privilege of opening this debate, which allows me to be the first to compliment you, Sir, upon your election to the presidency of this General Assembly and to convey to you our best wishes for your complete success in that capacity. I would like also to express my appreciation to Mr. Choudhury, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bangladesh, for the able way in which he presided over the work of the General Assembly at its forty-first session.

(Mr. de Abreu Sodre, Brazil)

I bear responsibility for carrying out the foreign policy of a Brazil reborn into the practice of democracy, strengthened in its commitment to the interests and aspirations of its people and open to candid dialogue at the international level.

I speak on behalf of a country which is absolutely loyal to its diplomatic traditions, one that is building its future with determination, without being intimidated by the obstacles raised by the reality of the modern world. This reality, unfortunately, is independent of the will and aspirations of most of the peoples of the world and is not always in tune with the lofty purposes of this Organization.

The so-called crisis of multilateralism undermines the attempt at juridical regulation of international life and saps the foundations of co-operation among States.

The world will no longer tolerate structures based on the supremacy of the few and the submission of the many. Attempts to impose oligarchical schemes on the organization of international society meet with increasing discredit. There is no place any more for rigid and exclusive formulas, Manichean dualisms, or theories that arbitrarily divide up world power - theories often inspired by geometrical figures. The world will come upon better days only when the international order is made effectively democratic; and, to achieve that goal, the United Nations has an essential role to play.

No nation or group of nations has the right to impose its own conceptions and solutions on the increasingly complex picture of international relations. No one nation should seek to isolate itself or fail to take into consideration the universal aspirations of the community of nations.

(Mr. de Abreu Sodre, Brazil)

I view with satisfaction the fact that the two super-Powers - by means of direct dialogue between their leaders, President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev - are seeking more fertile understanding and mutual confidence which, we trust, will result to the benefit of all countries.

Along the same optimistic lines, it should also be recorded here that there was a recent important meeting between the leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic - Chancellor Helmut Kohl and President Erich Honecker - an historic event that may well lead to positive developments for a mature and constructive relationship.

In multilateral diplomacy there are perceptible signs of encouraging vitality. One of those signs was the decision to create a zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic - a decision of undeniable significance for the fulfilment of the principles and purposes of this Organization. There is still hope for a peaceful settlement of the conflict that for over a decade now has been raging in Central America.

The United Nations represents the awareness of mankind that only by dialogue and persuasion can differences between States be resolved amicably. In unanimously adopting its resolution 598 (1987) on the conflict between Iran and Iraq, the Security Council showed its capacity to act in a constructive way to arrive at the peaceful and negotiated settlement of disputes. This action to restore peace, in accordance with the terms of the Charter, leads us to believe that in other cases it will be possible to have recourse to the authority of the Security Council, in the same conciliatory spirit. I am persuaded that the Council's diplomatic potential should be used to the fullest extent.

It was in the light of this conviction that Brazil decided to present its candidature for one of the seats allocated to Latin America on the Security

(Mr. de Abreu Sodre, Brazil)

Council. Brazil believes that it is in a position to make a constructive contribution during the coming biennium in reactivating the Council's role and in settling problems that affect or can affect international peace and security. Having been honoured with the unanimous endorsement of the Latin American Group, we hope to be equally worthy of a vote of confidence from this General Assembly.

[The latest signs of a break in the clouds that darken the international political situation are in direct contrast to the indefinitely prolonged economic crisis. The magnitude of the challenges facing the developing nations and the total lack of progress in restructuring the international economic order are the two sides of the coin of the same deeply disturbing panorama.

There is no raising of consciousness about the drama and concerns of the nations of the third world and their right to a destiny of achievement and progress which is under constant threat. I am from a developing country that will never surrender this right and is not only convinced of the justice and legitimacy of its claims but also of the viability of its objectives in the economic and social fields.]

An additional cause for concern in the international community is the persistence of political crises that have been aggravated by the resort to force in violation of the United Nations Charter. Only last year I remarked to this Assembly that, where force is present nowadays, stalemates are more frequent than either victories or defeats. The use of force or the threat of the use of force is not only illegal but is proving itself to be ineffective as well.

(Mr. de Abreu Sodre, Brazil)

This holds true in the Gulf region, where the machinery of violence is out of control. It is also true in southern Africa, with the persistence of the tense climate provoked by the apartheid régime, the unjustifiable delay in bringing about the independence of Namibia and the acts of hostility and aggression perpetrated by South Africa against its neighbours. Only the intolerance, short-sightedness and unreasonableness of the racist policies of South Africa can explain the continuing existence of this situation, which is an offence against human dignity and violates the principles governing relations between States.

On the other hand, it is becoming more and more urgent to give new impetus to attempts to achieve a lasting, comprehensive and just peace in the Middle East. Brazil believes that the need to convene an international peace conference, under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of all interested parties, is becoming increasingly pressing. In this context, I reiterate our concern over the suffering inflicted upon the people of Lebanon, a country whose integrity should be respected.

We are hopeful that understandings arrived at between the parties involved, with the participation of the United Nations, will quickly lead to the withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and the cessation of all forms of outside interference, so that the Afghan people may exercise their sovereign right to self-determination.

We also view with concern the continuing impasse in the case of the Malvinas. Brazil, which recognizes the sovereign rights of Argentina, hopes that the parties involved will heed the appeal repeatedly addressed to them by the General Assembly to attempt to reach through dialogue a negotiated settlement of all aspects of the dispute.

(Mr. de Abreu Sodre, Brazil)

I am pleased to note that the proposals on the subject of the South Atlantic made from this rostrum in 1985 by Mr. Jose Sarney, the President of my country, were successfully made a reality in the initiative culminating in the General Assembly's approval of resolution 41/11, of 27 October 1986. The establishment of a zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic signified the international community's recognition of the determination of the South American and African countries of the region to maintain their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and to promote co-operation for economic and social development in conditions of peace and freedom.

For that decision to be implemented properly, other States must co-operate in good faith. This is indispensable. The militarily more significant States are called upon in particular scrupulously to respect the peaceful statute governing the region, and to avoid extending into the region rivalries and conflicts that are foreign to it. I cannot fail to point out that serious focuses of tension continue to exist there and that they are detrimental to the full realization of the objectives and principles of the decision adopted by the General Assembly.

From the rostrum of this peace forum I wish also to register the satisfaction with which Brazil views the possibility of the conclusion in the near future of the first agreement in history on nuclear disarmament. If, as we all wish, the United States and the Soviet Union come to a successful understanding on medium-range atomic weapons, we shall have the first real disarmament measure, in contrast with previous agreements, which amounted to nothing more than a palliative management of the arms race.

It is obvious that the more heavily armed countries bear the primary responsibility for the disarmament process. But it is equally indisputable that

(Mr. de Abreu Sodre, Brazil)

other States have the right to participate in the decision-making process on problems that, although caused by some, affect all, without exception. We therefore consider it indispensable for the negotiations between the super-Powers to be linked with the efforts made in multilateral disarmament forums, especially the Conference on Disarmament, which is entrusted with a specific mandate.

As I stressed in my statement at the Seventh United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the developing world has been plunged into a deep crisis, and the efforts we are making to resume economic growth are confronted with an adverse international reality, with structures that accentuate the differences instead of reducing them. I also affirmed then that the attempt to shape the new by using the models of the past impeded the resumption of growth and development on a world-wide basis and the formation of a more just and more equitable international system.

The understanding arrived at on the problem of the foreign debt, as set forth in General Assembly resolution 41/202, is an indication of the promising headway which has been made, progress which should now be consolidated. I repeat here the firm and clear position of my country: we acknowledge our international financial obligations; we will settle our foreign debt under fair and reasonable terms and conditions. No one can claim that Brazil has not itself made every effort to overcome its difficulties. Brazil cannot, however, jeopardize its development.

In their efforts to seize increased economic opportunities, the developing countries encounter the severest restrictions imposed by their industrialized partners in the fields of finance, trade in goods and services, and, especially, the absorption of state-of-the-art technologies.

(Mr. de Abreu Sodre, Brazil)

This is a tendency that undermines the heroic struggles of developing countries to assure their peoples a dignified and prosperous future. It is a tendency that dashes those nations' expectations of more just and equitable participation in the international economy - and more than their expectations: their irrefutable right.

Brazil has no alternative but to grow. We must meet the crucial needs of a vast population which, in many strata, has known nothing but poverty and suffering. Development is not an option for us; it is an imperative.

The efforts undertaken by the developing countries to create a new international economic order will produce results only if they are accompanied by effective action to offset the distortions that exist in the policy of transfer of scientific and technological knowledge. In this regard a vigorous endeavour can be noted on the part of some developed countries to seek to create a new international division of labour, but a division that would be more inequitable and prejudicial to our interests since it would thwart our legitimate right to have access to the latest scientific advances and mastery of state-of-the-art technologies. As President Sarney stated on 4 September, when he announced Brazil's mastery of the technology for enriching uranium, Brazil cannot forgo broad and unrestricted access to the entire range of available scientific knowledge and its practical applications.

In this connection I wish to reiterate my country's commitment to use nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes. This commitment not only is beyond dispute but also is supported by the positive effects which Brazil's technological advances in this field, together with those of its sister nations, are producing, to the enhancement of increased co-operation and mutual trust in Latin America. The initiatives of collaboration which are being implemented between Brazil and

(Mr. de Abreu Sodre, Brazil)

Argentina, in particular, will assure the mastering of the nuclear cycle without the development of atomic weapons in our continent. This common purpose was highlighted in the exchange of correspondence between Presidents José Sarney and Raul Alfonsín when the announcement of Brazil's mastery of the technology for enriching uranium was made public.

The fact that Latin America is showing its ability to find practical and creative answers to its own problems is most encouraging. In this regard I should like to cite the example of the dynamic action which the Contadora Group has been taking, with the political backing of the Support Group of which Brazil is a member, in its quest for a genuinely Latin American solution to the conflict in Central America.

On behalf of my Government I wish to praise the important understandings arrived at on 7 August last in Guatemala. On that occasion the Heads of State of the five Central American nations gave a clear and historic demonstration of political will to resolve the conflict. Brazil deems the accord signed then to be one which offers a unique opportunity to guarantee peace in the region. To that end it has lent its active and interested contribution to the understandings which resulted in the decision, adopted on 22 August in Caracas, to set up an international commission for the purposes of verification and surveillance.

In Brazil's judgement the results of the recent steps taken in the quest for a peaceful solution to the Central American crisis indicate that the countries of the region are themselves in a position to find ways to put an end to the conflict which concerns and affects all of Latin America. To accomplish this it is essential that all other countries with ties or interests in the region avoid displaying any attitude that might render such solutions non-viable.

(Mr. de Abreu Sodre, Brazil)

The same ability of Latin America to find its own solutions to the problems of the continent is corroborated by the creation of the Permanent Mechanism for Consultation and Political Co-ordination, instituted as a result of the fruitful experience acquired over more than two years of successive contacts among the eight countries which make up the Contadora and Support Groups.

The decision of those countries, arrived at last month in the city of Sao Paulo, to begin to hold periodic meetings at the presidential level is an indication that the process of regional co-ordination begun in Rio de Janeiro has rapidly matured. In fact the Group of Eight is an integral part of a process of broader regional understanding, another of whose multiple facets is to be found in the renewed efforts towards the integration of Latin America, which Brazil, as well as other countries of the region, has been fostering in various forums such as the Latin American Association for Integration, the Latin American Economic System, the Latin American Energy Organization and the Cartagena Consensus.

I wish to reaffirm before this world forum the importance my country attributes to the agreements for integration and economic co-operation concluded with Argentina and Uruguay at the beginning of last year. These are instruments of truly historical significance which attest to our fraternal determination to grow together, to strengthen our democratic institutions and to contribute to the success of the greater undertaking, which is today closer to realization than it was yesterday: the integration of Latin America as a whole.

My words here today have expressed greater optimism and hope than I voiced in this forum last year. This attitude can be explained in the light of some positive aspects of the current international panorama.

(Mr. de Abreu Sodre, Brazil)

Along with this optimism and hope, however, I cannot disguise my disappointment and even indignation at the imbalances and inequities which persist on the international economic scene. Recent progress in the political field is not being accompanied by advances in the struggle against misery and poverty. On the contrary, the insensitivity and unyielding attitude of the developed countries are increasingly evident on issues of trade, finance and the transfer of technology.

My country is currently experiencing a time of crucial importance for the definition of its political and institutional directions. We are about to approve a new constitution within the framework of perfecting our democratic way of life.

Brazil is ready to continue along the road to peace and construction. This is the road that will lead to progress and prosperity for our people, in growing harmony and closer co-operation with all friendly nations.

The meeting was suspended at 10.45 a.m. and resumed at 11 a.m.

ADDRESS BY MR. RONALD REAGAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear an address by the President of the United States of America.

Mr. Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, was escorted into the General Assembly Hall.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations General Assembly the President of the United States of America, His Excellency Mr. Ronald Reagan, and to invite him to address the General Assembly.

President REAGAN: Let me first welcome the Secretary-General back from his pilgrimage for peace in the Middle East. Hundreds of thousands have already fallen in the bloody conflict between Iran and Iraq. All men and women of goodwill pray that the carnage can soon be stopped, and we pray that the Secretary-General proves to be not only a pilgrim but also the architect of a lasting peace between those two nations. Mr. Secretary-General, the United States supports you, and may God guide you in your labours ahead.

Like the Secretary-General, all of us here today are on a kind of pilgrimage. We come from every continent, every race and most religions to this great Hall of hope where, in the name of peace, we practise diplomacy. Now diplomacy, of course, is a subtle and nuanced craft - so much so that it is said that when one of the most wily diplomats of the nineteenth century passed away, other diplomats asked, on reports of his death, "What do you suppose the old fox meant by that?"

But true statesmanship requires not merely skill but something greater, something we call vision, a grasp of the present and of the possibilities of the future. I have come here today to map out for you my own vision of the world's future - one, I believe, that, in its essential elements, is shared by

(President Reagan)

all Americans. And I hope those who see things differently will not mind if I say that we in the United States believe that the place to look first for the shape of the future is not in continental masses and sea lanes, although geography is, obviously, of great importance. Neither is it in national reserves of blood and iron or, on the other hand, of money and industrial capacity, although military and economic strength are also, of course, crucial. We begin with something that is far simpler and yet far more profound - the human heart.

All over the world today, the yearnings of the human heart are redirecting the course of international affairs, putting the lie to the myth of materialism and historical determinism. We have only to open our eyes to see the simple aspirations of ordinary people writ large on the record of our times.

Last year in the Philippines, ordinary people rekindled the spirit of democracy and restored the electoral process. Some said they had performed a miracle, and, if so, a similar miracle - a transition to democracy - is taking place in the Republic of Korea. Haiti, too, is making a transition. Some despair when these new young democracies face conflicts or challenges, but growing pains are normal in democracies. The United States had them - as has every other democracy on earth.

In Latin America, too, one can hear the voices of freedom echo from the peaks and across the plains. It is the song of ordinary people marching, not in uniforms and not in military file, but, rather, one by one in simple, everyday working clothes - marching to the polls. Ten years ago, only a third of the people in Latin America and the Caribbean lived in democracies or in countries that were turning to democracy. Today over 90 per cent do.

But this world-wide movement to democracy is not the only way in which simple, ordinary people are leading us in this room - we who are said to be the makers of

(President Reagan)

history - leading us into the future. Around the world, new businesses, new economic growth, new technologies are emerging from the workshops of ordinary people with extraordinary dreams.

Here in the United States, entrepreneurial energy - reinvigorated when we cut taxes and regulations - has fuelled the current economic expansion. According to scholars at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, three quarters of the more than 13.5 million new jobs that we have created in this country since the beginning of our expansion came from businesses with fewer than 100 employees - businesses started by ordinary people who dared to take a chance. And many of our new high technologies were first developed in the garages of fledgling entrepreneurs. Yet America is not the only or perhaps even the best example of the dynamism and dreams that the freeing of markets set free.

In India and China, freer markets for farmers have led to an explosion in production. In Africa, Governments are rethinking their policies, and where they are allowing greater economic freedom to farmers, crop production has improved. Meanwhile, in the newly industrialized countries of the Pacific Rim, free markets in services and manufacturing as well as agriculture have led to a soaring of growth and standards of living. The nations of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), Japan, Korea and Taiwan have created the true economic miracle of the last two decades, and in each of them much of the magic came from ordinary people who succeeded as entrepreneurs.

In Latin America, this same lesson of free markets, greater opportunity and growth is being studied and acted on. President Sarney of Brazil spoke for many others when he said that "Private initiative is the engine of economic development. In Brazil we have learned that every time the State's penetration in the economy increases, our liberty decreases." Yes, policies that release to

(President Reagan)

flight ordinary people's dreams are spreading around the world. From Colombia to Turkey to Indonesia, Governments are cutting taxes, reviewing their regulations, and opening opportunities for initiative.

There has been much talk in the halls of this building about the "right to development". But more and more the evidence is clear that development is not itself a right. It is the product of rights: the right to own property; the right to buy and sell freely; the right to contract; the right to be free of excessive taxation and regulation, of burdensome government. There have been studies that determine that countries with low tax rates have greater growth than those with high rates.

We are all familiar with the phenomenon of the "underground economy". The scholar Hernando de Soto and his colleagues have examined the situation of one country - Peru - and described an economy of the poor that bypasses crushing taxation and stifling regulation. This "informal economy", as the researchers call it, is the principal supplier of many goods and services, and often the only ladder for upward mobility.

(President Reagan)

In the capital city it accounts for almost all public transportation and most street markets. And the researchers concluded that, thanks to the informal economy, "The poor can work, travel, and have a roof over their heads". They might have added that, by becoming underground entrepreneurs themselves or by working for them, the poor have become less poor and the nation itself richer.

Those who advocate statist solutions to development should take note - the free market is the other path to development and the one true path. And, unlike many other paths, it leads somewhere. It works.

So this is where I believe we can find the map to the world's future - in the hearts of ordinary people; in their hopes for themselves and their children; and in their prayers as they lay themselves and their families to rest each night. These simple people are the giants of the Earth, the true builders of the world and shapers of the centuries to come. And if indeed they triumph, as I believe they will, we will at last know a world of peace and freedom, opportunity and hope, and, yes, of democracy - a world in which the spirit of mankind at last conquers the old, familiar enemies of famine, disease, tyranny, and war.

This is my vision - America's vision. I recognize that some Governments represented in this Hall have other ideas. Some do not believe in democracy or in political, economic, or religious freedom. Some believe in dictatorship - whether by one man, one party, one class, one race, or one vanguard. To those Governments I would only say that the price of oppression is clear. Your economies will fall farther and farther behind. Your people will become more restless. Is it not better to listen to the people's hopes now, rather than their curses later?

And yet, despite our differences, there is one common hope that brought us all to make this common pilgrimage - the hope that mankind will one day beat its swords into plowshares; the hope of peace.

(President Reagan)

In no place on Earth today is peace more in need of friends than in the Middle East. Its people's yearning for peace is growing. The United States will continue to be an active partner in the efforts of the parties to come together to settle their differences and build a just and lasting peace.

This month marks the beginning of the eighth year of the Iran-Iraq war. Two months ago the Security Council adopted a mandatory resolution demanding a cease-fire, withdrawal, and negotiations to end the war. The United States fully supports implementation of Security Council resolution 598 (1987), as we support the Secretary-General's recent mission. We welcomed Iraq's acceptance of that resolution, and remain disappointed at Iran's unwillingness to accept it.

In that regard, I know that the President of Iran will be addressing representatives tomorrow. I take this opportunity to call upon him clearly and unequivocally to state whether Iran accepts Security Council resolution 598 (1987) or not. If the answer is positive, it would be a welcome step and a major breakthrough. If it is negative, the Council has no choice but rapidly to adopt enforcement measures.

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

We do not seek confrontation or trouble with Iran or anyone else. Our objective is now, and has been at every stage, finding a means to end the war with no victor and no vanquished. The increase in our naval presence in the Gulf does not favour one side or the other. It is a response to heightened tensions and followed consultations with our friends in the region. When the tension diminishes, so will our presence.

(President Reagan)

The United States is gratified by many recent diplomatic developments - the unanimous adoption of Security Council resolution 598 (1987), the Arab League's statement at its recent meeting in Tunis, and the Secretary-General's visit. Yet problems remain.

The Soviet Union helped in drafting and reaching an agreement on Security Council resolution 598 (1987). But outside the Security Council, the Soviets have acted differently. They called for removal of our navy from the Gulf, where it has been for 40 years. They made the false accusation that somehow the United States - rather than the war itself - is the source of tension in the Gulf. Such statements are not helpful. They divert attention from the challenge facing us all - a just end to the war.

The United States hopes the Soviets will join the other members of the Security Council in vigorously seeking an end to a conflict that should never have begun, should have ended long ago, and has become one of the great tragedies of the post-war era.

Elsewhere in the region, we see the continuing Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. After nearly eight years, a million casualties, nearly 4 million others driven into exile, and more intense fighting than ever, it is time for the Soviet Union to leave.

The Afghan people must have the right to determine their own future free of foreign coercion. There is no excuse for prolonging a brutal war or propping up a régime whose days are clearly numbered. That régime offers political proposals that pretend compromise, but really would ensure the perpetuation of the régime's power. Those proposals have failed the only significant test: they have been rejected by the Afghan people. Every day the resistance grows in strength. It is an indispensable party in the quest for a negotiated solution.

(President Reagan)

The world community must continue to insist on genuine self-determination; prompt and full Soviet withdrawal; and the return of the refugees to their homes in safety and honour. The attempt may be made to pressure a few countries to change their vote this year, but this body, I know, will vote overwhelmingly, as every year before, for Afghan independence and freedom.

We have noted General Secretary Gorbachev's statement of readiness to withdraw. In April I asked the Soviet Union to set a date this year when this withdrawal would begin. I repeat that request now, in this forum for peace. I pledge that, once the Soviet Union shows convincingly that it is ready for a genuine political settlement, the United States is ready to be helpful.

Let me add one final note on this matter. Pakistan, in the face of enormous pressure and intimidation, has given sanctuary to Afghan refugees. We salute the courage of Pakistan and the Pakistani people. They deserve strong support from all of us.

Another regional conflict we all know is taking place in Central America - in Nicaragua.

To the Sandinista delegation here today I say: Your people know the true nature of your régime. They have seen their liberties suppressed. They have seen the promises of 1979 go unfulfilled. They have seen their real wages and personal income fall by half - yes, half - since 1979, while your Party élite live lives of privilege and luxury.

This is why, despite a billion dollars in Soviet-bloc aid last year alone, despite the largest and best equipped army in Central America, you face a popular revolution at home. It is why the democratic resistance is able to operate freely deep in your heartland. But this revolution should come as no surprise to you. It is only the revolution you promised the people, and that you then betrayed.

(President Reagan)

The goal of United States policy towards Nicaragua is simple. It is the goal of the Nicaraguan people and the freedom fighters as well: it is democracy - real, free, pluralistic, constitutional democracy. Understand this: we will not, and the world community will not, accept phoney "democratization" designed to mask the perpetuation of dictatorship.

(President Reagan)

In this 200th year of our own Constitution, we know that real democracy depends on the safeguards of an institutional structure that prevents a concentration of power. It is that which makes rights secure. The temporary relaxation of controls - which can later be tightened - is not democratization.

Again, to the Sandinistas, I say: we continue to hope that Nicaragua will become part of the genuine democratic transformation that we have seen throughout Central America in this decade. We applaud the principles embodied in the Guatemala agreement, which links the security of the Central American democracies to democratic reform in Nicaragua. Now is the time for you to shut down the military machine that threatens your neighbours and assaults your own people. You must end your stranglehold on internal political activity. You must hold free and fair national elections. The media must be truly free - not censored or intimidated or crippled by indirect measures such as the denial of newsprint or threats against journalists or their families. Exiles must be allowed to return, to minister, to live, to work, and to organize politically. Then, when persecution of religion has ended and the jails no longer contain political prisoners, national reconciliation and democracy will be possible.

Unless this happens, democratization will be a fraud. And until it happens, we will press for true democracy by supporting those fighting for it.

Freedom in Nicaragua, or Angola, or Afghanistan, or Cambodia, or Eastern Europe, or South Africa or anyplace else on the globe is not just an internal matter. Some time ago the Czech dissident writer, Vaclav Havel, warned the world that

"respect for human rights is the fundamental condition and the sole genuine guarantee of true peace".

And Andrei Sakharov, in his Nobel Lecture, said:

(President Reagan)

"I am convinced that international confidence, mutual understanding, disarmament, and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish, and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live."

Freedom serves peace. The quest for peace must serve the cause of freedom. Patient diplomacy can contribute to a world in which both can flourish. We are heartened by new prospects for improvement in East-West and, particularly, United States-Soviet relations.

Last week Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze visited Washington for talks with me and with Secretary of State Shultz. We discussed the full range of issues, including my long-standing efforts to achieve, for the first time, deep reductions in United States and Soviet nuclear arms. It was six years ago, for example, that I proposed the zero option for United States and Soviet longer-range intermediate-range nuclear missiles. I am pleased that we have now agreed in principle to a truly historic treaty that will eliminate an entire class of United States and Soviet nuclear weapons. We have also agreed to intensify our diplomatic efforts in all areas of mutual interest.

Towards that end, Secretary Shultz and the Foreign Minister will meet again, a month from now, in Moscow, and I will meet again with General Secretary Gorbachev later this fall.

We continue to have our differences and probably always will. But that puts a special responsibility on us to find ways - realistic ways - to bring greater stability to our competition and to show the world a constructive example of the value of communication and of the possibility of peaceful solutions to political problems.

(President Reagan)

Here let me add that we seek, through our strategic defence initiative, to find a way to keep the peace through relying on defence - not offence - for deterrence and for eventually rendering ballistic missiles obsolete. The strategic defence initiative has greatly enhanced the prospects for real arms reduction. It is a crucial part of our efforts to ensure a safer world and a more stable strategic balance.

We will continue to pursue the goal of arms reduction, particularly the goal that the General Secretary and I agreed upon: a 50 per cent reduction in our respective strategic nuclear arms. We will continue to press the Soviets for more constructive conduct in the settling of regional conflicts. We look to the Soviets to honour the Helsinki accords. We look for greater freedom for the Soviet peoples within their country, more people-to-people exchanges with our country and Soviet recognition in practice of the right of freedom of movement.

We look forward to a time when things we now regard as sources of friction and even danger can become examples of co-operation between ourselves and the Soviet Union. For instance, I have proposed a collaboration to reduce the barriers between East and West in Berlin, and more broadly in Europe as a whole. Let us work together for a Europe in which force or the threat of force, whether in the form of walls or of guns, is no longer an obstacle to free choice by individuals and whole nations. I have also called for more openness in the flow of information from the Soviet Union about its military forces, policies and programmes so that our negotiations about arms reduction can proceed with greater confidence.

We hear much about changes in the Soviet Union. We are intensely interested in these changes. We hear the word glasnost which is translated as "openness" in English. Openness is a broad term, It means the free, unfettered flow of information, ideas and people. It means political and intellectual liberty in all its dimensions. We hope, for the sake of the peoples of the USSR, that such

(President Reagan)

changes will come. And we hope, for the sake of peace, that it will include a foreign policy that respects the freedom and independence of other peoples.

No place should be better suited for discussions of peace than this Hall. The first Secretary-General, Trygve Lie, said of the United Nations:

"With the danger of fire, and in the absence of an organized fire department, it is only common sense for the neighbours to join in setting up their own fire brigades."

Joining together to drown the flames of war - this, together with a universal declaration of human rights, was the founding ideal of the United Nations. It is our continuing challenge to ensure that the United Nations lives up to these hopes.

As the Secretary-General noted some time ago, the risk of anarchy in the world has increased because the fundamental rules of the United Nations Charter have been violated. The General Assembly has repeatedly acknowledged this with regard to the occupation of Afghanistan. The Charter has a concrete practical meaning today because it touches on all the dimensions of human aspiration that I mentioned earlier: the yearning for democracy and freedom, for global peace and for prosperity.

That is why we must protect the Universal Declaration of Human Rights from being debased as it was through the infamous "Zionism is racism" resolution. We cannot permit attempts to control the media and promote censorship under the ruse of a so-called new world information order. We must work against efforts to introduce contentious and non-relevant issues into the work of the specialized and technical agencies where we seek progress on urgent problems, from terrorism to drug trafficking to nuclear proliferation, which threaten us all. Such efforts corrupt the Charter and weaken this Organization.

There have been important administrative and budget reforms. They have helped. The United States is committed to restoring its contribution as reforms

(President Reagan)

progress. But there is still much to do. The United Nations was built on great dreams and great ideals. Sometimes it has strayed. It is time for it to come home.

It was Dag Hammarskjöld who said:

"The end of all political effort must be the well-being of the individual in a life of safety and freedom."

Should this not be our credo in the years ahead?

(President Reagan)

I have spoken today of a vision and of the obstacles to its realization. More than a century ago a young Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, visited America. After that visit he predicted that the two great Powers of the future world would be, on the one hand, the United States, which would be built, as he said, "by the plowshare"; and, on the other hand, Russia, which would go forward, again as he said, "by the sword". Yet, need it be so? Cannot swords be turned to plowshares? Can we and all nations not live in peace?

In our obsession with antagonisms of the moment, we often forget how much unites all the members of humanity. Perhaps we need some outside, universal threat to make us recognize this common bond. I occasionally think how quickly our differences worldwide would vanish if we were facing an alien threat from outside this world. And yet, I ask, is not an alien force already among us? What could be more alien to the universal aspirations of our peoples than war and the threat of war?

Two centuries ago, in a hall much smaller than this one, in Philadelphia, Americans met to draft a constitution. In the course of their debates, one of them said that the new Government, if it was to rise high, must be built on the broadest base - the will and consent of the people. And so it was. And so it has been.

My message today is that the dreams of ordinary people reach to astonishing heights. If we diplomatic pilgrims are to achieve equal altitudes, we must build all we do on the full breadth of humanity's will and consent and the full expanse of the human heart.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the President of the United States of America for the important statement he has just made.

Mr. Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, was escorted from the General Assembly Hall.

AGENDA ITEM 9 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

ADDRESS BY MR. YASUHIRO NAKASONE, PRIME MINISTER OF JAPAN

The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear an address by the Prime Minister of Japan.

Mr. Yasuhiro Nakasone, Prime Minister of Japan, was escorted to the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT: I have great pleasure in welcoming the Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Yasuhiro Nakasone. I invite him to address the General Assembly.

Mr. Nakasone (Japan) (spoke in Japanese; English text furnished by the delegation): I should like first to express my sincere congratulations to Your Excellency on your election as President of the General Assembly at its forty-second session. I am confident that, with the wealth of your experience in the conduct of United Nations affairs, your superior wisdom and able leadership, you will guide this session to a successful and fruitful conclusion.

At the same time I wish to express my sincere appreciation to His Excellency Mr. Humayun Rasheed Choudhury for his excellent work as President of the Assembly at its forty-first session, and especially for the co-ordinating efforts he made in launching the administrative and financial reform of the United Nations.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express my profound respect to the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for the painstaking efforts he has been making to resolve difficult international problems, in particular the Iran-Iraq conflict.

At the outset I should like to welcome most heartily the agreement that was reached in principle last week between the United States and the Soviet Union on the total elimination of intermediate-range nuclear forces and on holding a third summit meeting between the two leaders this autumn. I wish to pay a high tribute to them for the political determination that has made this possible.

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

Speaking from this same podium nearly two years ago, at the meeting for the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, I stressed that a new global ethic, together with the systems to support it, is necessary if we are to save the earth from the gravest perils of destruction it has ever faced and ensure mankind's very survival. To that end, I expressed the need for an attitude whereby we acknowledge the diversity and value of the world's cultures and civilizations, as well as mutually appreciate and respect them. I argued that the United Nations must become a vehicle for creating, on the basis of that attitude, a global civilization for all mankind.

Encouraged by the favourable response to my remarks, I should like today to share with you some of my thoughts about the practical means for pursuing my ideas, as well as Japan's position and the role it can play in this regard.

We are now little more than a decade away from the twenty-first century. And as we look back, the twentieth century has been a tumultuous age, full of dramatic events and upheavals, unprecedented in human history.

In the first half of the century, mankind endured two world wars and experienced the tragic explosion of nuclear weapons. Since then, we have suffered and agonized over the existence of growing stockpiles of nuclear weapons. The two nuclear super-Powers have each now deployed an enormous number of intercontinental ballistic missiles, to the extent of overkill, which could strike directly at the other's vital areas. While both sides recognize the paradox that, inherent in their quest for security through deterrence, is the danger of catastrophe, they have not yet been able to agree fully on arrangements for the reduction and elimination of nuclear arms.

On the economic front, less than three decades into the century the world gave way to a rampant protectionism, inviting the disastrous Great Depression that

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

preceded the outbreak of the Second World War. The world economy recovered from the ravages and impoverishment caused by the war, and subsequently attained unparalleled growth and prosperity. However, it was again thrown into turmoil by two oil crises - turmoil from which it has yet to fully emerge. The global economic problems we continue to face, particularly the disparities between North and South, global trade imbalances and instability in international finance, are extremely serious.

On the other hand, the scientific and technological advances of this century truly dwarf those of the Industrial Revolution in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and have ushered in a new historical era. From the vast outer limits of the universe to the microscopic matter from which life itself originates, advances in human knowledge in many fields have contributed greatly to improving mankind's material well-being. Applied wisely, this knowledge can dramatically advance the information age and tremendously benefit human society. Applied unwisely, and not properly controlled, it could imperil the dignity of human life or irreversibly destroy the earth's environment, upon which all mankind depends.

This century has also witnessed the birth of many independent countries as peoples everywhere, and particularly in Asia and Africa, have sought to exercise their inherent rights and freedom. One after another, these new nations joined the United Nations. The number of independent countries world-wide doubled almost overnight, imbuing international politics with new vitality and marking in world history a new era in which the ideals of freedom, equality and universal brotherhood are pursued. Mankind has not, however, eliminated poverty and hunger in some of those new countries, nor has it done away with regional conflicts.

Meanwhile, as telecommunications and the means of transport continue to develop, the nations of the world are becoming ever more interdependent, and world unity is growing ever stronger.

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

As this eventful century of tragedy and of hope draws to a close, and we look ahead to a new century, we must ask ourselves what we have learned from the traumas of the Great Depression and the two world wars, as well as subsequent experiences, and what are the lessons we should pass down to succeeding generations.

Has humanity no choice but to live constantly under the threat of nuclear weapons - a sword of Damocles suspended by a single, slender thread? Have we no choice but to bequeath to posterity a planet that, in an increasing number of regions, is being stripped of its precious air and its verdant foliage, which have evolved over the course of four billion years? Can we really do no better than to pass along to the next generation a world with a burgeoning population and with countries of extreme poverty, untouched by science, technology and modern industry?

If we are to resolve these fateful issues confronting mankind, I believe it is necessary for all of us, all the countries and peoples represented here today, to reaffirm basic principles for joint action in three priority areas.

Our first priority must be to secure and strengthen world peace. The State must not only serve its own people but, more important, must strive to respect and protect universal human values which transcend national boundaries. This means respecting life and human rights, protecting the irreplaceable natural environment, and preserving those cultural traditions that are the product of human wisdom and labour over the course of many centuries. These values must be respected under any system of government or ideology. This does not of course imply that a State may unjustly expand its power beyond its own borders.

Our second priority must be to provide vastly expanded guarantees for the free flow of people, information and culture across national borders. I have speculated elsewhere that the Second World War would probably not have occurred had there been satellite television broadcasts that were freely received, so that peoples

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

everywhere could have identified with each other as members of the same human race. Indeed, I believe that the guaranteed freer movement of people and information would provide an important safeguard against a third world war, for avoiding a repetition of atrocities, and for enabling peoples everywhere to share in the joy of living together, amid the rich cultural diversity the world offers.

Our third priority must be to rectify regional disparities and protect the global environment. For this purpose, each State must refrain from exercising its sovereignty merely for its own self-interests, and must strive to strengthen a framework of international co-operation centred on the United Nations. As we approach the twenty-first century, we must find new ways to enhance the capacity of a global authority.

H. G. Wells once said that "our true nationality is mankind". As members of the global village that transcends national boundaries, each of us should be challenged by our conscience to apply all the wisdom we have reaped during this century to find solutions to the problems facing us.

In my statement here two years ago, I called for a "global ethic". And just now, I referred to the "global village". These are terms that will surely come into common world-wide use in the twenty-first century, for it is clear, on the one hand, that exchanges and interdependence among countries and peoples will increase dramatically, and, on the other, that all mankind will increasingly face the danger of total annihilation, should the fruits of modern civilization be misused. Men and women of the twenty-first century will simply have to think of themselves as citizens of the global village.

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

A basic principle of life in the village is mutual help. In my home village, if someone did not have a bowl of rice, others would share their rice with him. The same philosophy holds true for the global village. John and Ivan belong to the same village, where there are no distinctions. It is precisely for this reason that the United Nations Charter admonishes us

"to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours"

as a first step towards realizing its lofty purposes.

Thus far I have stressed the goals that we should pursue, as well as some rather idealistic principles to guide us as we cross the threshold of the 21st century. I should now like to discuss some issues posed by the harsh realities of today's world.

First of all, it is essential to strive to build the confidence needed for the eventual total elimination of nuclear weapons and realization of peaceful coexistence. The agreement reached in principle by the United States and the Soviet Union last week to conclude a treaty on the total elimination of intermediate nuclear forces constitutes the first accord in history for the reduction of nuclear weapons and is a major step forward in this field. As one who has been strongly advocating the complete global elimination of intermediate nuclear forces, I sincerely welcome this good news. I hope that the United States and the Soviet Union will, as a next step, realize promptly and steadily the plan to reduce strategic nuclear weapons drastically, by 50 per cent, while maintaining a balance of deterrence.

The success of such efforts will engender feelings of affinity among the peoples of both nations and win universal support for those efforts. Further progress can then be made on disarmament and nuclear and conventional weapons, as well as chemical and other weapons, and on strengthening the régime of the Treaty

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This in turn will surely lead to progress in resolving regional problems and open up new avenues towards world peace. I believe that a world truly at peace is the greatest gift we can bequeath to posterity.

I have taken every opportunity to urge both the United States and the Soviet Union to make genuine progress towards nuclear disarmament as quickly as possible. For my part, I shall continue to co-operate towards the success of those efforts.

It is very likely that in the final stages of the negotiations on these difficult issues a range of obstacles will arise as details are scrutinized and the formal texts of agreements drafted. It is precisely at this point that the solution to problems should not be left to bureaucrats or military personnel, but must be entrusted to the political wisdom of statesmen who have a far-sighted sense of responsibility to mankind. I sincerely hope that the leaders of both countries, as true statesmen, will make wise political decisions that will long be remembered.

I should like on this occasion to express the strong hope that the Soviet leadership will take a constructive stance in its policy towards Asia and, with regard to Japan in particular, will work with determination to settle the territorial problem and other pending issues, acting in such a way as to build a genuine relationship of trust.

The problems that have been created in the 20th century are our responsibility; we must not pass them on unresolved to the 21st century.

The second urgent issue is the need to mount concerted efforts to resolve the grave problems confronting the world economy. In order to promote world economic growth and prosperity, it is essential that the policies of all countries be harmonized and, in particular, that protectionism be resisted. The Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) has been launched as a means

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

of combating protectionism, and we must work diligently to ensure that its goals are achieved.

We must not regard the many difficulties confronting the countries of the South simply as the fate of mankind and become resigned to them. While self-help efforts by their leaders and their peoples are obviously essential for the solution of their problems, certain problems, such as recent debt accumulation and export difficulties, are due in part to changes in the world economic and industrial structure for which the countries of the South cannot be held solely responsible.

Whenever economic failure occurs in any part of the world it is incumbent upon all of us, for the sake of the people in the region as well as of world economic stability, to address the problem and promptly devise all possible means of co-operation in order to avert a crisis. Such co-operation is already evident in the activities of international financial organizations and in various joint efforts among many countries. We should reaffirm our determination to promote these effective efforts even more clearly. Only in this way will all the peoples of the world be able truly to consider themselves members of one human race joined together in a solidarity that transcends national boundaries. At the same time, the nations of the South will be greatly encouraged in their self-help efforts.

Recognizing that there can be no prosperity for Japan without world prosperity, my country is making every effort to revitalize the world economy and provide assistance to developing countries, while at the same time promoting the internationalization of its own economy. Deeply aware of its tremendous responsibilities, Japan is determined to make even greater contributions to the international community.

Since last year Japan has been pursuing a programme to recycle up to \$30 billion and has been implementing a plan to provide \$500 million in grant

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

assistance to sub-Saharan and other African countries over three years. I look forward to discussing the further implementation of these projects with the countries concerned. On the question of economic co-operation, I believe that it is especially important to promote exchanges among young people and among young business managers, together with the concomitant transfer of technology. At the same time, looking ahead to the 21st century, we believe that human resources development and human interaction are all-important in order to achieve progress in public administration and education, and Japan is fully co-operating towards this end.

A third issue concerns the settlement of regional problems.

The most urgent of the tasks facing us today is to end the conflict between Iran and Iraq which is entering its eighth year, and to re-establish peace in the land that is the cradle of world civilization and return calm to the waters of the Gulf.

Recently, the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 598 (1987). This resolution was drafted paying the greatest possible attention in the circumstances to the positions of the parties concerned. The Council expects the Secretary-General, who enjoys the trust of both parties, to play a key role in its implementation. In the belief that there is no other way to resolve this issue, I strongly urge both parties to put an end to the conflict as soon as possible and establish lasting peace, as called for by the resolution. For its part, Japan has been working to the best of its ability for the restoration of peace, and now, in the context of its membership of the Security Council as well, is making every effort in good faith towards that end. At the same time, my country intends to continue to support the vigorous efforts of the Secretary-General. The people of the world earnestly desire to see the Iran-Iraq conflict ended, and I am steadfast

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

in my hope that both countries will respond to that desire and act with sound judgement.

Moreover, I must emphasize that as a general principle it is of utmost importance for the termination of any conflict and the establishment of peace that all countries strictly refrain from providing weapons to either party.

Elsewhere, it is most regrettable that no concrete progress has been made towards a satisfactory solution to the problems in Afghanistan and Kampuchea. All foreign military forces should be withdrawn completely and without delay from both regions. Japan strongly supports the establishment there of sovereign States that are truly democratic, independent, non-aligned and neutral.

The apartheid policy of the Government of South Africa flagrantly violates the principle of racial equality and respect for human rights and must be abolished promptly and completely.

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

On the Korean Peninsula, parties from the south and the north should, through direct negotiations, seek to ease tensions and achieve peaceful reunification. I support, as one step towards reunification, the admission of both the south and the north to the United Nations. I fervently hope that at next year's Seoul Olympics all the nations of the world will join together in full participation to make the Games once more a truly global festival and that through sports East-West friendship will be promoted and, in particular, tensions on the Korean Peninsula eased.

Further, mankind has not been able to escape from the fear of conflicts and wars resulting from human rivalry; nor has it been able to avoid the devastation of major natural disasters. On this occasion, I should like to stress the need for the United Nations to improve and strengthen its capacity to help expeditiously and effectively to prevent natural disasters and render rescue services.

Next, I should like to say a few words about how we can brighten the prospects for the world as it approaches the 21st century and how Japan can co-operate in realizing these aspirations.

Very briefly, I feel that we will see emerging a world-wide trend in which people free themselves from the fetters of the dogmatic ideologies of the 19th century. In part this will happen because the earnest desire of people everywhere to escape swiftly from the persistent threat of nuclear weapons transcends all ideologies. Also, people everywhere, regardless of the political and social systems under which they live, are increasingly aware that fundamental economic logic, which is based on freedom and creativity, is stronger than ideology.

This trend is manifested in the strong global support for the prompt holding of a United States-Soviet summit meeting and the fight against excessive central

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

control and protectionism in the economic policies of East and West. As this emerging trend comes to fruition in both democratic and socialist countries and becomes universal, the influence of rigid ideologies will inevitably decline and the world will move from confrontation to reconciliation, from conflict to co-operation. Then the potential will become apparent for nurturing the creation of a harmonious world order of a new dimension in which a realistic and practical approach is valued.

Now I should like to say a little more about my views on overcoming the East-West impasse. The present East-West confrontation is, unfortunately, largely rooted in the structural constraints of the international community, which consists of sovereign States. When we talk to one another face to face we find that people of every country belong to the same human race and are basically of good will. Yet, once within the framework of a State, it seems that people often change as they are manipulated by State institutions and stand in the front lines of confrontation and rivalry between States. In this sense, one cannot but conclude that in today's international community confrontation and discord between the State and the individual will never be completely overcome.

It is by no means easy for those entrusted with the actual responsibilities of national government to escape this reality. Inherent in nuclear weapons is the dilemma that, although they have the potential for catastrophic destruction, one side feels it must possess them as long as the other side does in order to maintain mutual deterrence. We must find a way out of this impasse so that we can free ourselves from suspicion and fear and return to a world of security and trust. Indeed, would this not once again make our conscience our central guide?

The convening of the United States-Soviet summit in Reykjavik in 1986 and the progress achieved there towards an agreement were, so to speak, bright rays of hope

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

for escape from the karma that has prevailed ever since the end of the Second World War. This historic collaboration on disarmament has stirred a fresh breeze of harmony and co-operation world wide, and I am hopeful that it will help generate energy that can be directed in particular to assisting the poorest countries, the developing countries and those with accumulated debts, as well as to preserving the global environment. As the history of Indo-China and the present situation of Afghanistan both so graphically testify, war does not solve problems; on the contrary, it destabilizes the societies of the countries concerned. But have we not reached a crossroads in international politics where through the wisdom of statesmen from every country the course of history can be redirected?

It has been about half a century since the systems of the East and West blocs emerged. People in both camps have had pride and confidence in their own systems, but there must also have been times when they experienced doubt. It is high time that we made a greater effort to get to know the realities of the different societies that our fellow men have created. Given the fact that it is now possible to use satellite telecommunications for real-time exchanges of information, should not both sides frankly and honestly open their hearts and show each other the realities of their own countries?

In this sense I am convinced that, if President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, as responsible individuals belonging to the same human race, can through their third meeting establish a genuine relationship of trust, it will pave the way for all mankind to enter a new era of peaceful dialogue and competitive coexistence throughout the four corners of the globe.

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

Moreover, a phenomenon that transcends the East-West confrontation is now emerging in the economic management of many countries throughout the world. I am referring to the fact that the trend, for example, towards liberalization and the strengthening of market economy principles is spreading. The fact that these terms are gaining common currency everywhere demonstrates that economic logic is being applied increasingly all over the globe. Recently, in developing regions throughout the world and particularly in the Asia-Pacific area near Japan, newly industrialized countries with spectacular growth rates have been emerging. I believe that this has been possible because the countries there have taken advantage of these economic principles and are pursuing policies that tap the energies of their peoples. I am thus most interested in seeing what will be the actual changes in the foreign and domestic policies of the Soviet Union as a result of the perestroika and glasnost it is undertaking, and of China as a result of its policy of opening up to the outside world.

It is our mission to make this planet Earth, the only home mankind has, a verdant place of peace and freedom. While it is incumbent upon all international organizations to serve this goal, the United Nations is the only global forum that is active in maintaining peace, protecting human rights and enhancing the well-being of all peoples. The responsibilities of the United Nations are tremendous and its continued existence is crucial.

It is unfortunately true that the United Nations has not fully lived up to the expectations of it at its founding; it is thus easy to criticize the Organization. Yet, were there no United Nations, how could we possibly maintain order and enhance our common well-being in today's complex international arena? Where else could we find a forum for reflecting the opinions of States all over the world, for bridging the gaps between East and West, North and South?

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

It is precisely at these times of difficulty for the United Nations that we should consider what would happen if it did not exist, and devote ourselves to defending, strengthening and improving the Organization. The United Nations must become a true united nations. Above all is the need to strengthen its peace-keeping functions. For its part, my country has been making active efforts to support United Nations peace-keeping operations, mainly through financial assistance. Japan intends to study further how it can contribute even more to strengthening them in the future.

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

Ever since its admission, Japan has made the United Nations a central pillar of its foreign policy, and has been making earnest efforts to strengthen and improve the Organization. However, enormous changes have taken place in the international situation and in the United Nations in the years since it was founded. The number of Member States is now far greater than was envisaged at the time of the Organization's founding, and this has not only resulted in making it a colourful mosaic of distinctive characteristics, but is also presenting new and unforeseen issues for its agenda as we enter a new era of civilization. If the United Nations is to be able to respond expeditiously to these changes, it must constantly be reformed. I also believe that in specialized fields, such as economics, the tendency unduly to politicize issues should be corrected.

I hope all Member States will join together to consider these problems with a view to determining the kind of organization the United Nations should become in the future.

If the twentieth century has been an age of destruction, with two world wars and the tragedy of the first nuclear explosions, the next century must be one bathed in the radiant sunshine of peace. Until now peace has prevailed only intermittently, between successive wars. Maintaining and managing peace, and ensuring that it is lasting, will of course be an extremely complex and difficult task. But is it not the obligation of today's statesmen to confront squarely such epochal challenges? The United Nations is, after all, a hall of peace, where statesmen gather and, with the establishment of lasting peace as their common goal, work together with determination and tolerance to nurture and preserve diverse values and cultures, and to enhance the dignity of mankind.

(Mr. Nakasone, Japan)

On this occasion I pledge that, together with representatives here, I shall shoulder the grave responsibilities placed upon me as one of the statesmen gathered here at the United Nations.

The current session of the General Assembly, in anticipation of the United States-Soviet summit for the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons, is filled with hope for the future of mankind. Indeed, this is the most significant session in the history of the Organization for ensuring peace and coexistence. Let us work together in the earnest hope that rich blessings will be bestowed upon our children and upon the Earth in the twenty-first century.

(spoke in English)

The American poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, taught us in his poem, "A Psalm of Life", to act so that each tomorrow finds us farther along the road than today. I should like to conclude my remarks with the closing stanza of that poem:

"Let us, then, be up and doing,
With a heart for any fate;
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labor and to wait."

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of Japan for the important statement he has just made.

Mr. Yasuhiro Nakasone, Prime Minister of Japan, was escorted from the rostrum

Mr. DHANABALAN (Singapore): Please allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your unanimous election. We are confident that, with your sensitive understanding of the complexities of the international situation and your considerable diplomatic experience, you will guide our deliberations fairly and wisely in the coming months. I should also like to welcome Ambassador Joseph Reed to the podium and congratulate him on his assumption of the post of Under-Secretary-General for

(Mr. Dhanabalan, Singapore)

Political and General Assembly Affairs. The Secretary-General could have found no better person for the job. Last, but not least, please allow me to place on record our appreciation of the good work done by your predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Humayun Rasheed Choudhury.

This session of the Assembly is being held at a time when profound changes are under way in the basic structures and processes of international politics. A summit meeting between President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev will be held towards the end of the year. The two super-Powers are on the verge of concluding important arms control agreements. At the same time, relations between China and the Soviet Union now include an increasingly important co-operative dimension.

These developments do not concern only the three great Powers directly involved. When these Powers reorder their relationships, the ripples spread to the farthest corners of the international system. None of us can escape their consequences. We must all also adapt to these changes. Readjustment is never easy. Cherished habits of thought, ingrained patterns of behaviour and comfortably familiar policies must be ruthlessly and dispassionately examined in the light of the new situation and, if necessary, discarded. Human nature being what it is, this is necessarily a painful process. But it has to be done.

I was reminded of this simple fact by a recent statement made by an important international leader. At a meeting of disarmament experts organized by the United Nations, held in June this year, he said:

"... we had to review analytically the traditional approaches to, and established notions about, peace and security. In other words, we had to apply new thinking to that major issue of our times. In the process of sorting out outdated dogmas and stereotypes, we made at least two fundamental conclusions. First, in terms of the supreme interests of survival, the world

(Mr. Dhanabalan, Singapore)

is one, notwithstanding its diversity. ... Second, the security of any State would be greater if it abandoned the attempts to diminish the security of the other side."

I wish to emphasize that last sentence. That statement was made by the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Alexander Bessmertnykh. If a super-Power recognizes the need for change, no other country should deceive itself with the illusion that it can keep to the well-trodden path. History is littered with the rubble of States that tried to do so.

(Mr. Dhanabalan, Singapore)

The United Nations is itself the consequence of a similar period of international readjustment that occurred after the Second World War. It was intended to reorder the manner in which the international system worked and the way in which States dealt with each other. If its purposes and promise have not been entirely fulfilled we should nevertheless ask ourselves what role the United Nations can play in helping the vast majority of its Members adapt to the profound transformations that are now under way. We, the small States of the third world, make up that majority.

I believe that the United Nations has an important role to play. To dismiss it as irrelevant is easy, cheap, cynical and a serious mistake. Few, if any, of us present here are privy to the private discussions of the great Powers. Few, if any, of us have the ability to influence directly the recalculations of national interests that are occurring as the great Powers slowly but inexorably reorder their relationships. Only in the United Nations can we meet as formal equals.

The United Nations, for all its obvious imperfections, is still the only Organization that has at least the potential to protect the rights and interests of small States. Great Powers may be able to do without international institutions, but to Namibians and Palestinians fighting for their homelands, to the South Africans battling against the evil system of apartheid and to all oppressed peoples struggling against foreign invasion and occupation only the United Nations offers some hope that their interests will not be cast into oblivion as the great Powers reposition themselves.

The United Nations is thus uniquely situated to help the smaller States adapt to changing patterns of international politics. Only in the United Nations are our interests protected; and only the United Nations can define issues in a manner that helps to ease the painful process of readjustment. It does so because when the

(Mr. Dhanabalan, Singapore)

international community speaks through the adoption of United Nations resolutions by overwhelming majorities no State, even if it does not wholly support a particular resolution, should feel threatened. Every State, whatever its particular interest, is also part of that same international community. The United Nations compels States, even against their will, to recognize what is ultimately in their own best interest. It would be a mistake to regard the United Nations merely as a reflection of national interests. The United Nations speaks for all, and in upholding universal principles of law and justice the United Nations transcends the national and specific by speaking also to that irreducible core of common interests that bind us together, whatever else may divide us.

It is an axiom that States act in their own interest, but the United Nations acts in the interest of all. No State, however intransigent, however indifferent, therefore, can indefinitely ignore the United Nations. A case in point is an issue of vital importance to my country's region: the issue of Kampuchea. As a study of how the United Nations has influenced the definition of Member States' interests, Kampuchea is an issue of more than parochial significance.

When the United Nations Security Council first met to discuss the invasion and occupation of Kampuchea, in January 1979, Viet Nam at first denied that it had sent any of its forces into Kampuchea. Later it claimed that it had only sent in volunteers. Finally, under pressure from the United Nations, Viet Nam admitted that it had sent its armed forces into Kampuchea, but it insisted that they had entered at the invitation of the régime it had installed in Phnom Penh after the invasion, which was really an attempt to suggest that the cart had pulled the horse into Kampuchea.

(Mr. Dhanabalan, Singapore)

United Nations pressure has also changed Viet Nam's position on the crucial issue of whether a political settlement is necessary in Kampuchea. On 5 January 1980 the Vietnamese Foreign Minister and some of his Indo-chinese colleagues signed a communiqué which dealt with Kampuchea. He said, "The situation in Kampuchea is irreversible." He also affirmed that efforts to "find a political solution for Kampuchea were in vain and useless". Six and a half years later, after successive General Assembly resolutions had enjoined his country to agree to a political solution, the Vietnamese Foreign Minister, at a similar meeting, signed a communiqué acknowledging that he had to work with other countries "to reach a political solution on the Kampuchean question". The move from a denial that a problem even exists to an admission that there is a problem that can be solved only by political means is a very significant first step.

The United Nations can take credit for this important first step; but it is only a first step. For Viet Nam to take the next step of actually commencing negotiations to find a political solution, the United Nations must persuade Viet Nam by continuing to take a firm position on the issue. For a political solution to be durable, it must be just. It must address the common concerns of the parties involved and not merely be a cover under which to impose one State's will over another by duplicitous means.

This simple truth was stated with clarity and brevity by Mr. Gorbachev when he said

"The ultimate wisdom lies in not thinking solely of oneself or, worse still, to the detriment of the other side. All must feel that they have the same degree of security."

We hope that Mr. Gorbachev's friends and allies will share his insight and take his advice.

(Mr. Dhanabalan, Singapore)

In formulating proposals that embody this principle, the United Nations also has a vital role to play. The resolutions of the General Assembly on the situation in Kampuchea that have been adopted, time and again, by overwhelming majorities sketch out the framework for such a solution. They take into consideration the interests of all the parties concerned, not least of which are Viet Nam's interests. And because they reflect the voice of the international community, United Nations resolutions should not be regarded as a victory for one State or one party over another but rather as a triumph of our common humanity. There should be no dishonour or disadvantage in complying with United Nations resolutions.

One recent proposal which is fully in accordance with the United Nations spirit is that made by my Indonesian colleague, Professor Mochtar Kusumaatmadja, who has proposed that an informal meeting of all the Kampuchean parties be convened. Such a meeting would take into account the fact that the Kampuchean problem also has to be resolved between the different Khmer factions, a point that Viet Nam has maintained ever since the Kampuchean issue was first considered by the United Nations Security Council in January 1979. But it is obvious that Viet Nam, as the State whose military forces and civilian administrators are in occupation of Kampuchea, holds in its hands the unique ability to determine whether such a meeting among the Khmers would be meaningful or a mere charade. Professor Kusumaatmadja's proposal therefore envisaged that Viet Nam would respond to our consideration in good faith of its interests by participating in the meeting of the Khmers, though not necessarily in the initial stages. Unfortunately, Viet Nam has refused to acknowledge that it holds the key to the solution of the Kampuchean problem and has not agreed to participate in such talks.

(Mr. Dhanabalan, Singapore)

Instead Viet Nam has tried to distort the nature of the understanding that was reached. It has loudly claimed that some kind of agreement was reached between the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Indo-chinese States and that the international community could best help by refusing to take a position that would support one side or the other. The bald and simple fact is that Viet Nam has not agreed to participate in any discussion that will lead to the withdrawal of its military forces from Kampuchea and enable Kampuchea to re-emerge as a free and independent nation.

(Mr. Dhanabalan, Singapore)

It would be a tragedy for the Kampuchean, for the South-East Asians and for the international community if the United Nations did not continue to take a clear and principled stand on the issue. It was the pressure of the United Nations that forced Viet Nam to accept the fact that a Kampuchean problem existed and that it required a political solution. It will also be the continued pressure from the international community that will force Viet Nam to accept a solution based on the principles of the United Nations Charter.

The efforts of the international community and the efforts of the South-East Asian States to find a solution are mutually complementary and not mutually exclusive. The ASEAN States will continue with their good faith efforts to find a solution. We will stay in close touch with Prince Norodom Sihanouk, who has sent a valuable political signal to Viet Nam by deciding to take leave for a year to make himself available for discussion with any party in order to move towards a solution of the Kampuchean problem. Prince Norodom Sihanouk remains the only Kampuchean leader who is widely respected both inside and outside Kampuchea. No viable solution can be found without Prince Norodom Sihanouk's participation. The international community should urge the Vietnamese leaders to talk direct to Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

History has demonstrated that all attempts to deny international change must ultimately be futile. Reality has an inconvenient habit of imposing itself even on the most ostrich-like. As the major Powers make the recalculations that will shape the international politics of the next century, our participation in the United Nations helps to ensure that we adapt to the new situation without too long a delay and without too much pain. But even as we acknowledge the necessity of adaptation, we must not lose sight of certain constant and fixed points of reference. The United Nations Charter embodies such points of reference and contains the basic moral principles that it is our duty to cleave to even as we adapt to survive.

(Mr. Dhanabalan, Singapore)

Herein lies the uniqueness of the United Nations; it is a vehicle for steadfastness as well as a vehicle for change; a means of ensuring that the necessary and inevitable adaptations will be purposeful rather than random or cynical. It is for this reason that, despite the inevitability of disappointments along the way, I continue to believe that with the perseverance and dedication of this body, just solutions to the questions of Kampuchea, the Middle East, South Africa, and the many other troubled regions of the world are still possible. The United Nations is a sophisticated instrument that enables its Members to navigate safely the treacherous shoals of international politics to reach the safe harbour of international order. It remains the duty of us, its Members, to find the will to use the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.