

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FORTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records\*



FIRST COMMITTEE  
55th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 24 November 1987  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

## VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 55th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADETTO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

### CONTENTS

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

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

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/42/PV.55  
11 December 1987  
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

**AGENDA ITEMS 71, 72 AND 73 (continued)**

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

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The Committee will continue its debate on the agenda items relating to international security; items 71, 72 and 73.

Mr. NOGUEIRA BATISTA (Brazil) : The draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, contained in document A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1, deals with a question of great complexity: how to make collective security, the fundamental concept round which the United Nations Charter was conceived, effective.

The Soviet initiative can be seen as a very positive contribution to our constant endeavours to strengthen the ability of the United Nations to promote peace and security. It is indeed gratifying to see one of the permanent members of the Security Council taking such an initiative and doing so in the framework of the General Assembly, the main body of the United Nations in terms of the scope of its responsibilities and the universality of its membership.

It is no doubt encouraging to the cause of multilateralism and of the United Nations as the centre-piece of multilateral 'diplomacy to take note of the Soviet initiative, which we interpret as a sign of the vigorous dedication of a great Power to this institution.

Although we appreciate the spirit in which the proposal was made, and would be prepared to give sympathetic consideration to it, it is our view that the complexities of the subject would seem to recommend its consideration in more depth and over a longer period of time. In any case, the importance of the issue and its centrality to the sovereignty of Member States appear to indicate that it should be taken up in an intergovernmental context.

(Mr. Nogueira Batista, Brazil)

It seems to us that the important dialogue j started in this Committee should be carried forward in a manner which would give Governments ample opportunity for careful examination of the issues before decisions are taken on how to conduct a joint study and on the specific framework in which such a study should be carried out.

One way of moving the debate prompted by the Swiet initiative into its next stage could be a decision by the General Assembly to ask the Secretary-General to invite comments by Governments, which, when available, would serve as a basis for further consideration of this mention.

We offer these brief general comments and observations as a contribution to the Committee's deliberations on this very important, and perhaps most 'difficult and delicate, item on the agenda of the General Assembly at its present session.

Mr. OUDOVKNKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Following the Second World War, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of world war, established a mechanism for international security, which has played and continues to play an irreplaceable role in the maintenance of peace.

But after the war the policies of certain States came to be determined more by a belief in the value of strength as a guarantee of security, the arms race and deterrence, than by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. This led to the present unsatisfactory situation in the world. The arms race and nuclear deterrence cannot guarantee peace; they promise mankind only guaranteed self-destruction. Outstanding conflicts and enormous stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction have made it vitally necessary to find a new and unconventional, but thoroughly reliable, way of achieving a secure, democratic and just world in which Peaceful coexistence and co-operation can be guaranteed for all States.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

As we approach the **twenty-first** century, two factors in particular draw our attention **first**, the **global nature** of the threat to the existence of mankind and **civilization posed by weapons of mass destruction**, and **secondly**, mankind's emerging awareness of **its unity** - the **conversion of a group of States into an increasingly interdependent world community**. At the time of the founding of the **United Nations** we had to take into account the **existence of a group of "enemy States"**, but in the world community of **today**, thinking in **terms of enemy or hostile States** does not coincide with **this new stage in the development of mankind**.

The solution of global and general **human problems** requires a general human effort. The involvement **of the United Nations** in this process **helps the Organization fulfil its functions** under the Charter. In arguing in favour of a **comprehensive system of security**, we are trying to direct all the efforts of the **Members of the United Nations** towards the development of co-operation rather than towards **fruitless confrontation**.

Speaking on 19 November **on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Economic Community**, the representative of Denmark, **Ambassador Ole Bierring, said** "The **Twelve** are ready to collaborate on ways and means of implementing the **security system provided for in the Charter**. The **Twelve** see no need for any other **comprehensive system**. We are of the opinion **that** the Charter of the **United Nations** is sufficient for this **purpose** and that a reformulation or **redefinition, directly or by implication, must be avoided**". (A/C.1/42/PV. 49, p. 48)

As the representative of a **State Member of the United Nations** which throughout the existence of the **Organization has defended, and continues to defend, the unshakeable nature of the Charter** - I repeat: the unshakeable nature of the Charter - I cannot but agree with the statement of the **Twelve** with respect to **scrupulous adherence to its provisions**.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

As one of the 10 delegations that initiated United Nations consideration of the idea of a comprehensive system of international security, I emphasize once again that nothing could be further from the truth than the direct or oblique hints that our initiative is some sort of attempt to reformulate or amend the United Nations Charter. No one has found and no one will find in our draft resolution the least attempt to undermine the Charter and its principles and purposes.

Quite the contrary, our entire initiative is based upon the Charter and is aimed first and foremost at the total implementation of its purposes through maximal mobilization of all its potential resources. Comprehensive security must be achieved on the basis of the United Nations Charter and within the framework of the Organization, which should in fact and not merely in principle be fulfilling its fundamental role as guarantor of international security.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The universal approach we ~~have~~ proposed ~~requires~~ that the United Nations, the world's principal security organization, be enabled to ~~ensure~~ the reliable maintenance of international security. It calls for the United Nations to carry out fully its Charter function as the centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends. I state authoritatively and unequivocally that there is no foundation to the assertion that our joint initiative purports to juxtapose itself to the United Nations system or the Charter. We would refer anyone who doubts this to the highest authority: in his article "Reality and Safeguards for a Secure World", Mikhail Sergiyevich Gorbachev writes that

"A prerequisite for universal security is unconditional respect for the Charter of the United Nations". (A/42/574, p. 6)

In institutional terms, a comprehensive system of international peace and security requires that the United Nations act to the fullest extent of its resources. We are deeply convinced that the effectiveness of comprehensive security will depend directly on the extent to which the United Nations and its Security Council, as well as other international institutions and machinery, function effectively. The authority of the United Nations will need to be increased; the Organization will have to play a larger role in striking a balance among the varied interests of all the large and small States that make up the international community.

Our purpose is to achieve a non-nuclear, non-violent world of co-operation; that purpose is furthered by such multilateral and unilateral actions as the Declaration on refraining from the use of force, and declarations by States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In our view, the most important thing is to hasten the formation of sound, comprehensive security and to make a decisive choice in favour of a future guaranteed by disarmament, trust and the effective functioning of the United Nations machinery with full utilization of the Charter's

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

potential for guaranteeing international security. Whatever mankind's present problems, past **experience** convinces **us** that there are none it cannot resolve through united effort, given good will and a **spirit** of co-operation in international **relations** .

The **extensive** dialogue on the concept and apacific of a comprehensive **system** of **security** in keeping with the **realities** of our **nuclear space** age **has** been pursued at the present **session** of the General **Assembly**. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet  **Socialist Republic** wishes to set out **its** understanding of this new **political** thinking. In our view, it **is** not poaeihle at **present** to **strangthen** either national or international security at the cost of developing and deploying new **systems** Of **armaments**; even the most perfect technology **is** no protection against nuclear **weapons**. For that **reason**, the problem of security is a political problem that should be **resolved** by political **means**.

In discussing a **system** of security we cannot ignore the political, military, economic, humanitarian or ecological spheres: a reliable **system** of security **must** be **comprehensive**; it **must** apply to all **fields** of **international** relations.

Moreover , in **terms** of international **relations** as a whole, security **must** be **equal** for all countries if it **is** to be **comprehensive**. At **its** **basis** shou14 be complete understanding of the **unques:ionable** fact that, despite all **their** contradictions and differences among **States** and nations, we are all **allies** in the attempt to ensure **mankind's** survival and **progress**.

My delegation **believes** that the creation of such a **system** of security would make it **possible** to **strengthen** peace in actual practice. The world would be free of political force and the threat of nuclear eelf-destruction. There would be a just, democratic and humane peace, with **guarantees** of every **individual's** right to a life in **dignity** and of the right of all peoples to choose their own development

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

path. It would be a world of law and order and morality, where free development for all peoples will result in the secure, free development and prosperity of mankind as a whole.

The way towards such a peace lies through practical steps to build confidence among States, to prevent nuclear and conventional war, to eliminate confrontation, to affirm the norms of civilized behaviour and to create an atmosphere of openness.

There is no doubt that the foundation of security is the limitation Of weapons, both conventional and, especially, nuclear. Nuclear weapons cannot guarantee security. We are convinced that the more nuclear weapons there are in the arsenals of States the less security we enjoy.

Common sense dictates that as we approach a new millenium States should cast aside their nuclear burdens. An important step in that direction could be taken at the summit meeting between the Soviet and United States leaders, to be held early in December: the conclusion of a treaty on two types of nuclear weapons, intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. There is a chance to reach agreement on a whole series of questions, including on 50 per cent reductions in strategic missiles and on maintenance of the anti-ballistic missile Treaty and non-withdrawal from it within a stated period.

Gradual movement towards the reduction and total elimination of nuclear weapons, along with other disarmament measures, could make it possible quickly to achieve strengthened security. Such measures would free vast material and intellectual resources for development and the solution of global problems.

Of importance for the establishment of reliable and equal security for all countries and peoples are elements such as the following: the complete implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security; progress in resolving conflicts; and elimination of hotbeds of tension, such as the



(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

smouldering Middle East crisis, the protracted Iran-Iraq conflict, the situation in the Mediterranean, the explosive situations in Central America and southern Africa, the unresolved tension in Cyprus and elsewhere, and problems in the Asian and Pacific regions.

Of course, there is not and there cannot be a simple recipe to deal with all of this. But the principal requirements are unequivocal respect for the right of every people freely to choose its own development path, the establishment of effective guarantees against attacks from abroad, and the inviolability of State borders. In that connection, nothing can justify violating provisions of the United Nations Charter and universally recognised norms of international law. Scrupulous compliance with international law and the obligations assumed under international treaties must be guiding principles of international relations.

It is impossible to conceive of reliable security without strict compliance with and respect for the rights of peoples, promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and fostering the development of peoples in the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

States should seek genuine co-operation to put an end for ever to racism and apartheid and to trampling upon the honour and dignity of mankind, as well as to all forms of political or religious persecution.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The implementation of the idea of comprehensive security will not eliminate all the contradictions and complexities in relations between States. International relations will continue to be created out of the combination of conflict and on-operation, but the system of comprehensive security is intended to establish an atmosphere of confidence and co-operation, which should make it possible to resolve by peaceful means any problems as they arise.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1 are calling for the formulation, on the basis of the United Nations Charter, of the international rule of law, which should effectively ensure the security and progress of all mankind. This presupposes the enhancing of the authority and effectiveness of the United Nations and its organs, above all the Security Council. Full use must be made of the resources built into the United Nations Charter, in all of its provisions without exception. Conversely, in supporting such an approach, the United Nations will be confirmed in its role as the principal guarantor of a secure international community.

In the course of the discussion in our Committee, many delegations expressed their views with regard to the organizational form to be used in examining the question of comprehensive international security in the future and some expressed constructive ideas. There were also those who either deliberately or through ignorance distorted the very essence of our approach to this question. Thus, in his statement this morning the representative of the United States said:

(spoke in English)

"That concept is nothing less than an attempt to remove consideration of the organization and future of the United Nations from the agenda of its rightful owners, the General Assembly, and place it in the hands of an anonymous group removed from national control." (A/C.1/42/PV.54, p. 63)

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

(continued in Russian)

Nothing could be further from the truth than this assertion. A careful examination of the formulation of paragraph 13 of revised draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1 leaves no doubt that the question must and will be examined and decided on by the General Assembly and by none other. Moreover, the sponsors are quite happy to support other forms of international dialogue on this question. They have stated as much on numerous occasions.

In this connection, we would like to draw the attention of delegations to the proposal of the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Murin, that consideration should be given to the possibility of holding a special session of the General Assembly on the question of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. The proposal for the holding of a dialogue at the appropriate political level would always be supported by the sponsors of the draft resolution. However, it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to satisfy those who reject any concrete proposals on our part and do not offer anything in exchange.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic calls on all Members of the United Nations actively to pursue the dialogue on the comprehensive system of security so that it may be possible in the near future to take decisions on concrete measures for the establishment of material, political, legal, organizational, moral and psychological guarantees for peace and the establishment of security for all.

We are convinced of the need for a solution, that would guide States towards a realistic approach to the problem of comprehensive security in keeping with the realities of our times.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The sponsors have attempted to take in to account, as far as possible, the comments and proposals of the delegations concerned. They dare to hope that the draft resolution will meet with general approval at the forty-second session of the General Assembly.

Mr. JACOBOWITS DE SZEGED (Netherlands): Earlier today the representative of Denmark, in his statement on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community, made some comments on the proposals put forward in this Committee by a number of Eastern European delegations on the idea of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. I fully share the views he expressed. In my statement today, I merely wish to make a few additional remarks on those proposals and I will comment also on some of the arguments just put forward by the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. Oudovenko.

The United Nations is not an Organization that functions in a vacuum. While it contributes to the shaping of international relations, it also reflects, to a certain extent, the state of those relations. With the gradual relaxation of tension between East and West, the general atmosphere within this Organization has also improved. During this session of the General Assembly, polemics receded and gave way to a more compromising mood. This was shown in this very Committee when it concluded its work early last week on disarmament matters on a, generally-speaking, conciliatory note. An improved international climate also enables the United Nations to reassert its role, for instance in the area of regional conflicts. We have the distinct feeling that now, more than has been the case for a long time, the United Nations is being allowed to play the role it was originally intended to play. We firmly believe that the United Nations and the document on which it is based, the Charter, are full of still unused potential.

(Mr. Jacobovits De Szeged,  
Netherlands)

The United Nations would fare far better if only Member States would allow this potential to be tapped.

Regardless of what the representative of the Ukrainian SSR has just said, the originators of the idea of comprehensive security seem to set out from a different point of view. They seem to have doubts regarding the capacity of the Charter of the United Nations to Pace, in the words of the Soviet Vice-Minister, Ambassador Petrovsky, in his speech before this Committee on 19 November. "the rapidly changing realities of the dynamic era in which we live" (A/C. 1/42/PV.49, 31). The Charter, so he maintained, is "not calculated at all to take account of the existence of nuclear weapons" (A/C. 1/42/PV.49, p. 32). Thus, what is needed, in the view of those delegations that have for some time now been advocating those ideas, is a new concept: comprehensive or, as they sometimes call it, universal security.

(Mr. Jacobovits De Sneged,  
Nether lands)

We very much doubt the validity of this line of thought. We are convinced that the purposes and principles of the Charter are as valid today as they were 10, 20, or even 40 years ago, at the time the Charter was drafted. No matter how much modern weaponry has increased in size and gained in destructiveness, the prohibition of the use of force or of the threat of the use of force prescribed in the Charter remains as valid now as ever. Nor do we see nowadays any reason that did not exist before that could justifiably detract States from their obligation to settle their disputes by peaceful means. The value of the United Nations Charter cannot be overestimated. It is still the best instrument we have for the maintenance of international peace and security. It should not be made subject to perestroika, either directly or indirectly, nor do we favour pristroika, additional structures attached to the Charter. Its principles should be implemented by Member States. Furthermore, inasmuch as the proposals now before us would in all likelihood open up discussions on elements already contained in the Charter, this would easily throw doubt on the Charter itself, at the serious risk of undermining the very document to which the overwhelming majority of States in today's world have subscribed. Rather than following this path, we wish to stress once more the fundamental importance of abiding by the Charter.

While, therefore, we have strong reservations about the alleged need for a new concept, comprehensive security - which would, as Mr. Petrwsky stated this morning, be in the "spirit of the United Nations, only in the "spirit" - we also find it hard to understand what exactly it was that its proponents had in mind when they came forward with this notion. Thus far, the concept of comprehensive security as it has been presented to us in statements of delegations or texts that have been circulated informally or formally, remain vague and ambiguous. Its

(Mr. Jacobovits De Szeged,  
Netherlands)

authors apparently think that it is applicable to all spheres of international activity, be it in the political, the military, the economic, the environmental or the human rights fields. Of course, we favour discussing concrete proposals for improving the implementation of the Charter or any of the other issues just mentioned as long as the discussions take place in the appropriate bodies of the United Nations for dealing with those particular issues. Proposals for the improvement of peace-keeping operations, for example, could be placed on the agenda of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, which has been dormant far too long. Discussion of concrete proposals in the ecological field could be further dealt with by the United Nations Environment Programme and so on. But let us deal with concrete proposals.

We welcome the increased interest shown by the Soviet Union in matters of international co-operation, as we welcome some of its proposals. In many cases, increased international co-operation is indeed the key to the solution of problems that we have in common. But we are not in need of other systems or of the creation of new forums. We have no sympathy for the setting up of a group of experts or for involving outstanding personalities, as the first revision of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89 now requests. How can they study an ill-defined concept and deal with matters as varied as nuclear disarmament, the strengthening of the authority of the International Court of Justice and the debt crisis, all of which would be part of the concept of comprehensive security? The elimination of poverty and underdevelopment, respect for human rights, and curbing the arms build-up would indeed help to make this world a better and safer place to live in. But then, rather than putting our faith in a vaguely defined "catch-all" formula, we should sit down and discuss, in the forums we have created over the years for these objectives, how to give fresh impetus, where needed, to our work.

(Mr. Jacobovita De Szeged,  
Netherlands)

In sum up, we do not share the view that the Charter has not kept pace with developments in the second half of this century for the simple reason that it did not need to; its principles remain valid, they remain universally applicable, and their potential remains vast. The Charter can fulfil its role only if States are willing to abide by it. Moreover, as we look back at the years, we are impressed at how well the United Nations system has been able to adapt itself to the demands of the changing world. Nowadays, there is practically no sphere of international activity in which the United Nations is absent, whether in the field of development aid, population activities, health, children, air, sea, even space traffic, communication, environment or human rights. Certainly there is always room for improvement. But in all these different spheres of action the United Nations can do no more than its Members allow it to do. It is the common responsibility of Member States to make this Organisation work. No Member State should side-step that responsibility.

Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): As we all know, the international community has worked unrelentingly to bring about the strict and full implementation, by all States Members of the United Nations, of the lofty purposes and principles enshrined in the Organisation's Charter. It is interesting to stress here that the fundamental purposes to which Member States solemnly declared they subscribed were obviously the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security. The continuance and aggravation of situations of crisis and tension, as well as bloody regional conflicts, to which the international community is witness, but powerless to stop, clearly show that certain States have violated and continue flagrantly to violate international law, the fundamental purposes and principles of the Charter of our Organization, as well



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

as a number of relevant ~~declara~~ tions of the General Assembly, including the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

Since its establishment in December 1975, the Democratic People's Republic of Lao has made the lofty purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and the provisions of the relevant ~~declara~~ tions adopted to date by the General Assembly the corner-stone of its foreign policy. It ~~welcomes~~ the adoption, at the current session, of the Declaration on the Enhancement of the Effectiveness of the Principle of ~~Refraining~~ from the Threat or Use of Force in International Relations. We are ~~convinced~~ that scrupulous implementation by all States of a declaration such as the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace will be a positive contribution to the ~~elaboration~~ and ~~implemen~~ tation of a general system of international peace and security, a ~~system~~ on which my ~~delegation~~ would now wish to comment.

We ~~welcome~~ the series of politico-philosophical reflections and concrete and constructive proposals put forward by Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in his recent article entitled "Realities and Guarantees of a Safe World". One should never forget that in today's world, which has ~~become~~ increasingly interdependent, and in which the nuclear threat holds the very survival of mankind implacably hostage, it is extremely dangerous to seek to ensure security through military and technological development. It is rather to political means that States should have recourse in order to settle their security problems.

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

My country, like the rest of the international community and, in particular, the ~~countr ies members~~ of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countr ies, rejects any ~~dangerous~~, anachronistic military ~~doctr~~ ines based on nuclear ~~deterrence~~ and the balance of terror. We fully share the opinion that, ~~in~~ the nuclear and space era, security can ~~only~~ be canprehensive and equal for all States and peoples, regardless of their ~~size~~, their political and social systems or their level of economic development. Issues of peace and security should not be the exclusive preserve of the great Powers, and even less of the nuclear Powers. The democratization of international relation5 ~~demands~~ that small and vulnerable States also have a voice in negotiations and discussions on arms-reduction measures and on both nuclear and conventional disarmament. Moreover, it is real istic that, ~~inasmuch~~ as the concept of peace mean5 more than the mere absence of war, the comprehensive system of international peace and security should encompass economic, social, human1 tar tan and ecological questions, as well as those of a political and military nature. one should honestly ~~recognize~~ that, in order to set up such a system, States must ~~adopt~~ new ways of thinking and new political views. They must demonstrate greater poll tical will and must do away wi th ~~preconceived~~ ideas, clichés and ~~pernicious~~ ~~anachronistic~~ stereotypes, which hold that those whose internal and external policies are not to their 1 iking are per force their enemies. This is the key problem - or, if you prefer, the Gordian knot - that must be solved.

It is because it has not yet been possible to ~~untie~~ the Gordian knot that our world does not en joy true peace and security. Thus, the peoples of Latin and Central America, and in particular the people of Nicaragua, are still valiantly fighting against acts of intervention and foreign aggression in order to preserve their independence, sov reignty and territorial integrity, as well as to promote democracy and social progress in th eir respective countries. In southern Africa,

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

It is regrettable that certain States continue to support the criminal system of apartheid that is victimizing the majority black population in that country, as well as Namibia and the front-line States, including Angola, which CR currently being subjected to more of Pretoria's typical acts of aggression. In the Middle East, the Palestinian and other Arab peoples in the occupied territories are victims of Zionist acts of occupation.

My Government, like the whole of the international community, is following with great concern the evolution of events in the Persian Gulf. That situation was exacerbated by the imperialist policy of intervention. In the eastern Mediterranean, a hotbed of crisis and tension still exists because of the failure to settle the question of Cyprus. A just, comprehensive and lasting solution can be found only within the context of an international conference guaranteeing scrupulous respect for the independence, territorial integrity, unity and non-aligned character of Cyprus.

In South-West Asia, the Afghan people are still the victims of an undeclared war imposed upon them by the imperialist reactionary international and region coalition. In Asia, in the Pacific and in South-East Asia, a situation of tension and crisis still prevails. The establishment and guarantee of a lasting peace and effective system of security in the strategic areas of the world have become imperative needs. Thus, Laos wishes to reaffirm its total support for the important proposals put forward by the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, at Vladivostok in July of last year. With respect to South-East Asia specifically, it is obvious that Laos and the other countries of Indo-China, together with other countries in the region, have redoubled their efforts to find a just and lasting solution to the problems of peace, stability and co-operation in that strategic part of the world, as well as to the problem of the Kampuchean issue. We reaffirm

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

our Government's **sincere** support for any **constructive** proposal aimed at changing South-East **Asia** and other **regions** of the world into nuclear-weapon-free zones of peace.

The negative elements of the international **situation** I have just listed must be eliminated if we want actively to **contribute** to the elaboration and **establishment** of a **comprehensive system** of international peace and security.

During the **bilateral** and **multilateral** negotiations on questions of arms reduction and disarmament, the nuclear States **must** give proof of the **required** political will in order to achieve substantial concrete **agreements**, particularly with **respect to** the **cessation** and reversal of the nuclear-arms race and other **weapons** of mass **destruction**, as well as to the prohibition of the **extension** of the arms race to outer space. In that connection, my country, like the entire **international community**, places considerable hope in the forthcoming **summit** meeting **between** President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev to be held in Washington, D.C. **Global** peace and security necessarily imply an effort towards a profound **restructuring** of international economic relations, for, in our time, as everyone knows, the overwhelming majority of mankind **is** living with poverty, disease and ignorance. The elimination of that dire situation **has become** an imperative need. In order to achieve it, the developed and wealthy States must co-operate **sincerely** in the overall implementation of the **objectives set forth** in the Programme of Action and the Declaration on the **Establishment** of a New International Economic Order and in the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of **States**. In that **spirit**, my Government joins with the international **community** in expressing the hope that the **Final Document** of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was held in New York two months **ago**, may be fully implemented and that an **international** financial mechanism created as **soon**

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

as possible, in order to reallocate the resources freed by disarmament measures to meet the needs of economic and social development in the developing countries.

During the debate on this crucial question, my delegation has noted a certain amount of reluctance, a certain skepticism, not to say obstructionism, on the part of some delegations that fear that the sponsors of the draft resolution in question, as well as their supporters, may somehow be attempting to affect the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter. We believe that such fears and suspicions are totally unjust if led because, as is clear from the contents of the draft resolution in question, to which my delegation fully subscribes, the authors forcefully advocate the enhancement of the authority and role of the universal Organization and its principal bodies in establishing and implementing a comprehensive system of international peace and security. Let us not forget that the establishment of such a system is, in the last analysis, no more than a supreme guarantee of the proper functioning of a world that will be better and safer, because it will be exempt from violence and nuclear weapons, a world in which all mankind ardently aspires to live.

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): An in-depth consideration of the various issues involved in the question of international security requires, first, a comprehensive review of the international situation in all its aspects. It is a grave error to focus on a single aspect of international security and ignore the others. Since we live in an interdependent world, we cannot deny that peace is an indivisible whole and that international security cannot be realized unless every country enjoys equal security. This obviously means that the security of some cannot be guaranteed at the expense of the security of others.

Genuine security requires the elimination of every factor that could compromise world security. Foremost among those factors are colonialism, foreign hegemony, foreign occupation, racism, apartheid and the inability of oppressed peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and to enjoy their national rights. The current international situation is extremely difficult and complex. It is further exacerbated by political, economic and social tensions in the world as a result of the imbalance and disequilibrium in international relations, as well as by an increasing recourse to the use or threat of force. The proliferation of nuclear weapons, especially their acquisition by the racist régime, and the continued occupation of the territories of others by force, the oppression of popular liberation movements on one pretext or another the widening of the gap between the industrial and the developing countries - all these factors, together with other underlying elements, heighten international tension and create destabilization and a lack of security in the world.

It is, therefore, imperative for us to consider, responsibly and seriously, the various problems that beset the world's peoples and to find appropriate and just solutions for them within the context of the international Organization and in accordance with the principles and purposes of its Charter. We are aware of the

(Mr. Al-Maer i, Syrian Arab Republic)

problems our Organization is facing, problems that hinder it from fulfilling its primary responsibility in all aspects of international relations. We are fully confident that, unless the role of the United Nations can be strengthened in the maintenance of international peace and security and in resolving the problems that beset the world, the establishment of a secure international community, free from all fear, anxiety, instability and tension, will be impossible.

Since we attach special importance to the question of international peace and security, we consider the initiative of the socialist countries with regard to the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security a positive and constructive step towards the realization of a secure and stable international community. We note that there is broad international support for the noble aim it sets forth.

It is natural that the draft resolution focuses on the elimination of all means of mass destruction. The establishment of international security cannot take place unless that is achieved.

Perhaps the special importance of the initiative resides in the fact that it establishes a comprehensive system of international peace and security on the basis of the United Nations Charter and within the context of the Organization. In our view, that has lent it international effectiveness and given it wide support. The fact that the comprehensive system is based on the Charter and grows out of the context of the Organization means that its realization requires, of necessity, the liquidation of imperialism in both its old and new forms, the elimination of foreign domination and occupation, together with the eradication of all forms of aggression, racism and apartheid. It also requires that all peoples that have not yet acceded to the enjoyment of national rights be enabled to do so in complete freedom and to accede to independence and organize their affairs and create their own social systems as they see fit. This also implies the elimination of foreign

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

military bases and the return of foreign troops to their own countries. The total and unconditional commitment to the Charter of the United Nations and the right of peoples to self-determination and to live in security free from foreign intervention is the sine qua non for achieving comprehensive security.

An in-depth consideration of the international situation leads to conclusions that are not cause for optimism. During the last 40 years, the small countries that have cast off the yoke of invidious imperialism have assumed independence. Those nascent countries require support in order to build themselves.



(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

The world is witness to such destruction because small countries are pushed into regional conflicts, made victim to foreign occupation, aggression, interference, or are deprived of the right of self-determination. Moreover, economic coercion and political blackmail are used against them.

My delegation believes that the main obstacle to the establishment of genuine, stable international security is the increasing militarization of the very concept of security and attempts by certain States to achieve security at the expense of the security of others. That carries with it continuous intentional violation of the norms of international law and increasing resort to pressure to impose foreign interests on the countries of the third world.

Wide interest has been shown in the question of international peace and security, and my delegation believes that the question of comprehensive security should be placed in the framework of genuine international co-operation in a United Nations context with complete observance of the Charter. There must, in short, be tireless efforts to solve the problem facing the world and to eliminate the causes of international tension.

Unquestionably, the United Nations deserves the principal credit in the effort to eliminate imperialism and to enable peoples once under foreign hegemony to liberate themselves from imperialism; it has also been central in laying the foundations of a new international economic order through its useful efforts to help developing countries to develop their natural, social and human resources. In short, the international Organization has been able, in the face of difficulties, to add to the profundity of the concept of security in international relations. It has helped inform the international community about the dangers of racism and apartheid and about the destructive role played by the régimes in occupied

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab Republic)

Palestine and South Africa in attempting to destroy all opportunities and block all efforts to create a stable, permanent international security based on full respect for national rights.

The Middle East and southern African regions remain in a high state of tension owing to the entrenchment of the apartheid régime in Pretoria and the Zionist régime in occupied Palestine, and to their policies of aggression and their fascist practices, not to mention the collaboration between those two régimes in the military, nuclear and economic spheres. All this is aimed against the interests of the peoples of South Africa, Namibia and Palestine, and those of the front-line States in both regions. There can be no international peace and security without international co-operation to eliminate those two dire phenomena which threaten the security and stability of the world, and its very future.

The same is true in the Mediterranean basin, where foreign military fleets ply the waves. Foreign military bases in the region possess arsenals bristle with conventional and nuclear weapons of mass destruction. Those fleets and bases are often used against States of the region, as they were in the United States aggression against Libya and the Israeli aggression against Tunisia. Military manoeuvres are carried out off the coast of these States to pressure, threaten and intimidate them, all with the full collaboration of Israel. Forces in the waters of the region threaten States of the area and have turned the Mediterranean into one of the world's most dangerous hot spots.

Much has been said of the creation of conditions appropriate for ensuring security in Europe and easing tension there. How can we reach that goal, which is shared by so many countries and peoples that witnessed two world wars? It cannot

(Mr. Al-Masri, Syrian Arab  
Republic)

be **reached** without the achievement of security in the Mediterranean, **which** in turn can **come** about only with the withdrawal of foreign fleets) the **elimination of** foreign **bases**; an end to all forms of Israeli **aggression** and occupation in **Palestinian** and other occupied Arab territories, including Holy Jerusalem and the Syrian **Golan**; and exercise by the Arab Palestinian people of its national rights, including the right to **return to its** homeland, Palestine, and to self-determination, including the establishment of an independent State of **its** own in its territory. It is pointless to speak of **European** security while ignoring security in the Mediterranean in view of the organic link between the two.

(Mr. Al-Maer i, Syrian Arab Republic)

A logical **assessment** of the **issues** and the **facts** confirms that, to achieve **security** either in **Europe** or in the Mediterranean security must be achieved in both regions.

We **reiterate** that the United Nations is the international body qualified to establish peace and **security** in the world. Strengthening the role of the United Nations in that respect is indispensable for the establishment of a secure international community free from all forms of colonialism, aggression, hegemony, foreign occupation, racism and racial discrimination.

Mr. DOST (Afghanistan): Questions related to international security have been considered at length by the First Committee for decades. That is because the **issue** of security is the most acute and pressing of the numerous complex problems facing humanity on the **threshold** of the twenty-first century. The issue cannot be **resolved** without the resolution of the question of the **arms** race, which has been whipped up on an unprecedented scale by militarist policies, thus creating a real danger to all life on our planet, and without, in particular, the liquidation of nuclear weapons.

With the level and nature of **present-day** armaments, international security has acquired new connotations. No country can hope to gain security only by military means, even if it creates the most powerful of defences. The continuation of the **arms** race on earth and its spread to outer space, rather than **strengthening** any country's security, has caused further threats to international peace and security. That is why it is becoming increasingly clear that safeguarding security is a political problem that can be resolved only by political means.

Thus, the question of setting up a comprehensive system of international peace and security has today become an urgent **issue**, the solution of which requires an all-embracing approach. The question has reached a turning-point today: mankind

(Mr. Dost, Afghan istan)

must make a historic choice, between allowing the grim legacy of the perverse logic Of Confrontation and force to push the world over the precipice of nuclear self-annihilation, and proceeding in our activities in accordance with new thinking, which demands a political solution to the problems of the nuclear space age. That dilemma confronts every people and every country, irrespective Of political orientation.

The choice can only be in favour of co-operation to rebinquiah outdated dangerous notions that the build-up of armaments can be the basis of national security. The old approach must give way to a realistic awareness of the common destiny of States and peoples as passengers on a single small and fragile space-ship, the planet Earth, whose safety everyone should make his main concern. These realities of our present-day nuclear age leave no option but recognition of the fact that national security is a fiction unless it fits into a comprehensive system of international peace and security, and that even the mightiest of Powers can safeguard its security only in w-operation with other countries and only by peaceful political means. We are of the opinion that security in the area of international relations as a whole can only be universal. That requires purposeful and sustained collective effort by all nations, small and large.

That consideration was realistically reflected in the joint proposals presented by the socialist countries to the General Assembly at its forty-first session. Those proposals can generate constructive dialogue on the whole range of questions pertaining to peace and security. We continue to think that comprehensive international security ould he an aggregate of practical measures and specific commitments by States within the framework of the United Nations Charter. This univerual international Organization can play an active role both in evolving and in shaping a canprehensive international security system.

(Hr. Dost, Afghanistan)

The **Democratic Republic** of Afghanistan considers the peace **proposals** presented by the Delhi Six, the **Movement** of Non-Aligned Countries and the **Harare** non-aligned **summit**, and the peace initiatives of the **socialist** community, especially that **put** forward by General Secretary **Mikhail** Gorbachev, as significant and very **important**. They are all in full conformity with the **United Nations Charter** and are based on universally accepted principles of peaceful **coexistence** and international co-operation.

It **is obvious** that **disarmament** must be the centre-piece of a comprehensive international security system. **But** the task of bringing about a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world **demands** specific and immediate measures. Such a world can be brought into being **only** through **immediate** agreements on the complete destruction of nuclear **arsenals** before the end of the **century**; on banning the **spread** of weapons of any kind to outer space, which is the common heritage of mankind) on banning all nuclear-weapon **tests**, which **should result** in the prohibition of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction) on banning chemical **weapons** and destroying the stockpiles of such **weapons**; as well as on reducing the **levels** of **conventional** armaments and armed **forces**.

The problema of strengthening security are universal, and are not confined to **one continent** or one geographical region. **For** that **reason**, my country calls for applying confidence-building measures and **improving** the situation in all **parts** of the world, including Asia.

Asia is not only the **world's** largest and most highly populated continent, but a region in which many of **today's contradictions** are particularly evident and acute. **Since** the Second World War, **Asia** has **been**, more than other continents, the theatre of destructive armed conflicts. **Unfortunately** the situation **remains** highly explosive to **this** day.

(Mr. Dost, Afghanistan)

Attempts have been made by the United States to establish new military blocs and revive old alliances in Asia. At the same time it is stubbornly opposing proposals on converting the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. Nuclear weapons have already been introduced into the region, which increases the threat to security in Asia. That threat is becoming more acute at a time when, close to our borders, the drive to acquire a nuclear weapon continues.

The establishment of security and peace is threatened by the conflict situation in southern Africa. A reliable basis for the solution of this situation is provided by Security Council and General Assembly resolutions envisaging a political solution to the Namibian problem, and by Security Council resolutions condemning the provocative attempts by the Pretoria régime to aggravate the conflict in the southern part of the continent and thereby to preserve the shameful system of apartheid.

We are convinced that the implementation of the series of Soviet peace proposals regarding European security and other proposals to declare northern Europe and the Balkans nuclear-free zones and to establish a nuclear-free corridor and a chemical-weapon-free zone in Central Europe could greatly help rid Europe of nuclear arms, thus establishing a strong security system. We furthermore consider the peace movement in Mediterranean countries to declare that region a nuclear-free zone yet another significant and positive action towards the establishment of peace and security.

(Mr. Dost, Afghanistan)

Strict adherence to the fundamental principles of international law constitutes another important component of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. If our world is to be safe and secure, every State must strictly abide by the principles of respect for the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of States, non-interference in internal affairs and co-operation among States. All States are also required to refrain from the threat or use of force in international relations and to settle disputes peacefully through negotiation and conciliation. We are of the opinion that strict respect in international practice for the sovereign right of every nation to choose its own way and forms of development is highly important for the establishment of a comprehensive system of peace and security.

However, the Western Powers, especially the United States, refuse to recognize that national right. In its latest doctrines, such as neo-globalism, the present United States Administration arbitrarily assumes the role of telling other countries which system they must choose. That attitude has created great problems in our region and around our country.

The undeclared war against Afghanistan continues with ever-increasing intensity and is taking on new dimensions. Billions of dollars are being poured into fuelling the war by well-known circles. Our people and Government have given logical answers to the present state of affairs. This has been reflected in our various peace proposals and, more recently, in the proclamation of the policy of national reconciliation, a policy which is in total conformity with the principles of humanism, Islam, the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The policy of national reconciliation, which is enjoying wide support inside the country and among the peace-loving forces of the world, has contributed to ensuring peace inside the country and to the political settlement of the situation



(Mr. Dost, Afghanistan)

around Afghanistan. Afghanistan considers that the policy of national reconciliation and the proximity talks between the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and Pakistan at Geneva are two parallel processes positively affecting each other and leading to the single goal of peace in Afghanistan and in the region. The result of the talks is demonstrative of the fact that the gap between our position and that of the other side has considerably narrowed. For a fair and just solution it is imperative that the other side should act on the basis of the interest of its people and of peace and security.

In conclusion, let me point out that the root causes of present disputes - which lie in confrontation, the threat and use of force, the search for military superiority, the fanning of hotbeds of tension, aggression and interference in the internal affairs of other countries - all must be taken seriously into consideration if we are to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security and enable today's and tomorrow's generations to live in a peaceful and non-violent world.

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French) a The restored dialogue between the two super-Powers, whose results are already perceptible, undoubtedly constitutes the long-awaited event that can usher in a new era of lasting stability in international relations.

It is indeed significant that after a decade dominated by confrontational rhetoric that has kept the world frozen in fear of the confrontation that would inevitably come, this dialogue today, by reason of its inherent virtues, is already seen as a prelude to the largely unexploited opportunities for making a concerted effort to promote the concept of a security that would be pursued no longer through attempts to harm an adversary but through work to gain a benefit equally shared by both parties.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

We must not underestimate the numerous and real difficulties confronting us when several decades of mutual mistrust have deeply marked the political thinking, ideological convictions and military doctrines of each side. However difficult, that course still remains in truth the only one open to us, given the lack of any alternative to coexistence in conditions of active co-operation, mutual confidence and shared security. Unless we want to risk the worst, we cannot envisage any other concept of international relations between differing political systems.

The difficulties, and the uncertainty they can cast on a process barely begun, must be even clearer to the non-aligned countries, which, in lending their support to the current dialogue, cannot be accused of escapism or excessive optimism. They are, in fact, more naturally inclined towards realism, since they are well aware that although détente between the two super-Powers creates the necessary favourable international environment, it does not necessarily imply that security for all is just around the corner. They give close attention to the real difficulties and to ways of overcoming them, and they constantly stress the need for taking due account of their security concerns with a view to ensuring that true and lasting collective international security for the benefit of all will be established.

Thus, while welcoming the fact that the agenda for the bilateral negotiations provides for the discussion not only of disarmament questions but also of regional conflicts, they remain particularly desirous of having regional conflicts considered solely within their own terms and dimensions.

For although the relations between the super-Powers have set the general trend in international relations - and in this connection we applaud the recently resumed in-depth negotiations - we cannot fail to note that there are still many threats to international peace and security, demonstrating the restricted scope of those areas of the world that enjoy any comprehensive security. A frightening escalation of

(Mr. Moudi, Algeria)

dangers ~~poses~~ a particular threat to some regions in which solidarity with the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries is prevalent and in which the right of peoples to self-determination, the sovereignty and independence of States and their right freely to pursue their economic and social development within the context of the political system of their sovereign choice have been challenged. Although it is a practice prohibited under the Charter and thus incompatible with membership in the United Nations community, recourse to the use or threat of force continues to underlie or aggravate tension in many places.

At the same time, the international economic crisis continues to wreak its havoc on the developing countries, whose situation in ~~at~~ cases is already desperate, thus demonstrating once again that the present international order, unsuitable for guaranteeing the security of each, is also incapable of ensuring prosperity for all.

From this point of view, while it has been rightly said that the extraordinary technological changes occurring in the world have in a sense, reduced the dimensions of our planet by making nations more interdependent, we cannot fail to emphasize the failure of the present international order to take due account of this reality and the resultant need for solidarity. As is abundantly attested by current events, a continuing and long-lasting conflict is an overt threat to peace and security in the world; similarly the injustice done the vast majority of people by denying them their rights, sometimes even the elementary right to survival, is intolerable when access to the means of prosperity is the exclusive privilege of the members of closed economic clubs. Thus, the very concept of peripheral conflict is a challenge to the principle of the indivisibility of world security, just as the economic marginalization of the third world is a denial of international solidarity.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Since the end of the second World War, the third world has been the arena of all the regional conflict<sup>8</sup> that have overtly threatened - through the pending menace of an ever-growing arms build-up and their ever-increasing scope - international peace and security.

This is particularly true of the conflict<sup>@</sup> in the Middle East and southern Africa, both of which have persisted and worsened since the inception Of Our Organization. This is also true of the more recent conflicts in Central America and the Gulf.

All those conflicts demand resolute efforts, they require just, comprehensive and definitive solutions for which the United Nations is the most suitable forum; the great Powers, because of their status as permanent members of the Security Council, have a duty to contribute effectively to that end. This presupposes their setting an example through their rigorous respect for the principles contained in the Charter.

Indeed, an impartial analysis of the typology of the conflicts shows that, without denying the local origins of certain of them involving regional groups and even members of the Non-Aligned Movement, most owe their continuation to the persistence or legacy of colonialism, particularly in Africa, and to foreign meddling and interference. In fact, where the principle of non-interference is fully respected, regional initiatives in Africa and Central America have clearly shown that they have an unlimited potential to calm crises. Therefore, the elimination of conflicts calls for the great Powers to conduct themselves better in international relations.

The present situation in the world calls for bold and decisive actions to promote the ideal that presided over the creation of our Organization, one to which the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have contributed so much by laying down indispensable prerequisites. A new pattern of international relations marked by

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

widespread international security and equitable co-operation must patiently and resolutely be established. It requires concerted effort and a mobilization of effective solidarity. It demands that we take into account the marginalization of the third world, which is as much a vestige of the past as decolonization, and the fact that a lasting order cannot be conceived without them and even less so against them.

Prompted by this belief, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, a main protagonist in international relations, has continually sought to strengthen its capacity for action and initiative, desirous as it is to achieve the optimum degree of solidarity among its members. That is an undertaking to which it attaches great importance on the regional, interregional and subregional levels.

Algeria, an the African, Arab and Mediterranean country closest to Europe geographically, is also a country confronting typical problems in economic development and is assuming the commitments inherent in its participation in the Non-Aligned Movement, which it views as the only guarantee for the preservation of its independence and sovereignty. As such, Algeria participates in all joint initiatives aimed at promoting equitable economic co-operation and shared security by all States, both north and south of the Mediterranean.

Thus, since anything that affects the security of Europe can affect its own security, Algeria closely follows the development of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) and remains more than ever convinced that it cannot continue without taking into account the security concerns of the non-aligned countries south of the Mediterranean.

The regional approach will have lasting and real effect to the advantage of the security of all only if it refrains from following an intrinsically exclusive approach. Thus, it is significant that the agreement on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles in Europe, which we regard as highly important, has left

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

unresolved the problem posed by the immense concentration of forces and nuclear and naval weapons in the Mediterranean.

In the context of that continued concern, the meeting of the non-aligned Mediterranean countries at Brioni, Yugoslavia, in June at this year, promoted new initiatives of dialogue and concerted efforts among the non-aligned Mediterranean countries and the participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Thus, once again assuming its role as an autonomous force for the promotion of dialogue and co-operation, that meeting reiterated the conviction that the Mediterranean is a prime example of the elements required for a global dialogue between the North and South on security, disarmament and development. That conviction is accompanied by the desire to live as good neighbours with all the countries of the Mediterranean region.

With the ongoing series of in-depth negotiations between the two main military Powers and the holding of the recent International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, and looking forward to the approaching third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, a fertile debate has begun on the means of ensuring the optimal international security for the benefit of all. Thus, any new Initiative should be viewed in that perspective. It is now up to the Committee to draw the best lessons it can from such examples.

Although the present state of affairs in the world, marked by the persistence of many conflicts that pose threats to international security, has been created by the failure to implement the collective security system provided for in the Charter, it is nevertheless desirable that there be a debate to analyse a situation in which the Security Council, the principal organ entrusted with the maintenance of International peace and security, finds itself immobilized when confronted, as in South Africa, with the need to put into effect the means expressly provided in

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Chapter VII of the Charter. The reasons for that immobility are well known, since they were clearly enunciated by the Secretary-General in his 1985 report on the activities of the Organization. Nevertheless, we must consider measures whereby the Council might at least do better than it has in the past - in other words, control crises - and finally make use of the means given it under the Charter to carry out its primary role of maintaining international peace and security. In this connection we note that, in the report he submitted this year, the Secretary-General emphasizes the urgent need for the United Nations to make full use of its capability for preventive intervention before the emergence and aggravation of conflicts, and he states that it would be extremely dangerous to continue to refrain in the future from employing to the maximum the preventive capability of multilateral bodies.

This complex and demanding International situation presents the United Nations with many and varied challenges. The Organization remains the only tool available to the international community for overcoming, through collective will, these problems by joint and common action. For its part, Algeria is prepared to contribute in the consideration of ways and means of strengthening United Nations action in order to raise the Organization to the level of these new demands.\*

---

\*Mr. Nashashibi (Jordan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

Mr. ADENYEMI (Nigeria): In its statement in the First Committee on 24 November 1986, on the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Nigerian delegation described the unfortunate situation in which the General Assembly had come to regard the implementation of that Declaration as one of its recurring items on its agenda. We stated that this was unfortunate for two main reasons; I should like to read out an extract from what we said at that time:

"First, the situation with respect to international security has deteriorated since 1970. A glance at the preoccupations of the plenary meetings of the current session and at the views expressed in this Committee during consideration of the items on disarmament confirm that view.

"Secondly, . . . the crisis in multilateralism, which has become a subject of concern, is an ominous portent that the instrument for the enhancement of global peace and security is being downgraded. Yet no viable alternative can be seen on the horizon. The multifaceted problems of the world today are so complex that no single country, or even a combination of some countries, . . . can presume to be able to dictate solutions. We see the United Nations as the great hope, notwithstanding its shortcomings - or should I say the shortcomings of its membership." (A/C.1/41/PV.55, p. 29-31)

That was last year, and the international reality, now near the end of 1987, still confirms that depressing trend. This is why we are again deliberating on agenda items 71, 72 and 73, which all deal with important questions of international security.

Of course, my delegation is aware of the positive steps and modest efforts undertaken to improve super-power relations over the past year since the October 1986 Reykjavik meeting between the United States Head of State, Ronald Reagan, and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev of the USSR. The recent agreement to eliminate medium-range and shorter-range missiles in the European theatre, even though it



(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

affect only a small percentage of the total number of missiles in the arsenal of the super-Powers, is nevertheless a welcome sign that portends a silver lining in the dark cloud of United Nations initiatives in the field of disarmament. The proposed December summit between the two leaders of the world's most heavily armed nations, ideological opponents, should further contribute to the relaxation of international tension and enhance the prospects for global peace and security.

As elated as my delegation might have felt at these positive developments in the international climate, especially as we prepare for the convening next year of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the trend in the deliberations and decisions on various disarmament items so far in the current session indicates that we should temper our optimism with caution. The leaders of the two most powerful States, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having the preponderance of nuclear weapons, have publicly stated that a nuclear war can never be won and therefore must never be fought. But even then, some of us in this Committee still voted against draft resolutions concerning the prevention of nuclear war and the elimination of nuclear weapons. In those circumstances we cannot claim to be moving forward. When some members of this Committee still define their security in terms of narrow, selfish national interests and are not prepared to support or even consider ideas or views that point towards a less heavily armed world and a collective international security system that would take care of the general interests of mankind as a whole, then we cannot truly claim to be reducing international tension or enhancing global security.

It is now 42 years since the United Nations was established. Article 1 of the Charter clearly listed the elements of the maintenance of international peace and security: effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression; peaceful settlement of

(Mr. Adeyemi, Niger ia)

disputes; the development of friendly relations among nations based on respect for the right of self-determination and for the sovereign equality of States; promotion of respect for human rights; and - no less important - co-operation in solving international economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems.

Although over two thirds of the present Member States of the United Nations, including my country, Nigeria, were not independent or free to join this world body at that time, we nevertheless take delight in the great foresight demonstrated by the founding fathers, which makes the United Nations and its Charter as relevant and valid today with respect to the collective hopes and aspirations of mankind as they were in 1945.

It is thus paradoxical that as the membership of the United Nations has grown over the years since 1945 and as the advancement of mankind in the social, economic, scientific and technological spheres has seen a phenomenal leap forward, there has also been a corresponding increase in the regrettable manufacture and acquisition of sophisticated deadly weaponry and an ever-increasing breakdown in collective international security as envisaged under the Charter.

In my part of the world, there is a proverb that people do not gather together in great numbers to commit collective suicide. But that seemingly universal truth appears not to hold in the disarmament sphere of the United Nations, where all of us, nuclear and non-nuclear States alike, seem to be consciously setting ourselves up as it were to be consumed in the senseless conflagration of a nuclear holocaust. Expert studies on nuclear war, on "nuclear winter" and on the effects of atomic radiation all confirm this horrifying scenario, on which some people base their so-called security.

Although the United Nations came into being in 1945 as an edifice for saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in a lifetime had caused untold sorrow to mankind, 150 wars have taken place world-wide since then,

(Mr. Adeyemi, Niger la)

with 20 million caeualtiee, cumulatively exceeding all the military casualties of the Second World War. At this very time, some of the most ferccioua wars in history are taking place, aometimee with the active support or indirect connivance of the major Powere, in contravention of their solemn ohligatione under the Charter.

Regrettably, all thoe 150 ware occurred, and some of them are still being fought, in developing countries only. To others in the developed world, which mainly supplies the weapone to conduct them, these wars are local conflicts and, as such, are not considered to threaten world peace and security, because they are not fought in Europe or any other part of the developed world. Thus, the appalling assumption, gradually being accepted as the norm, is that wars in developing countries are tolerable so long as they do not epread to the developed countries or affect the latter's vital intereete.

In an interdependent world, where the Charter envisages collective efforts to solve glohal problems, the auestions of eecurity in developed and developing countries should reinforce one another. When this is juxtapoeed with the fact that some of these ware occur ae a result of the vestiges of cclonialiem and are actually fuelled by outside interference and weapons supplied to the contending partiee, then the developed world, both West and East, cannot escape grave responsibilit, in this connection. What is more, the generally held notion that ware or any breakdown in the eecurity in developing countries cannot affect the security of the developed countries of the North is spurious. The volat ile aituation in the Gulf, the continuing crisis in the Middle East, and the tense racial situation in apartheid South Africa, to mention only a few, are potential flaehtpoints which illustrate that the West and the East cannot but feel the reverberations if and when security situations deteriorate.

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

It is now 17 years since resolution 2734 (XXV), entitled the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, was adopted at the twenty-fifth session in 1970. Since then, interrelated resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly, inter alia, on non-interference in the internal affairs of States (resolution 31/91), the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States (resolution 36/103), on the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States (resolution 34/99) and on the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security (resolution 41/92), among others.

Again, as usual, we are now faced with this daunting and perennial problem of putting our resolutions into practical effect through necessary implementation. The major reason has been the abandonment of the system of collective security and thus the weakening of the United Nations by a rather misguided reliance on alliance security under the two military blocs. The security of nuclear deterrence and interwoven military concepts and doctrines merely serve to accentuate this approach, upon which ever increasing accumulations of weapons are rationalized.

However, as the world has come to realize, unless the arms race is halted and reversed, those who rely on the sanctuary of sophisticated armaments for security know that genuine security cannot be found through arms. Otherwise, with the capacity to eliminate all humane and living things on earth 12 times over, the two super-Powers would have remained satisfied with their present level of nuclear arsenals, which we know are being daily increased quantitatively and further refined qualitatively.

The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held from 24 August to 11 September of this year in New York, clearly demonstrates, first, that security is more than the acquisition of weapons and,

(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

secondly, that peace and security constitute ~~something~~ obviously greater than the mere absence of war. This brings into clear perspective the triangular relationship between disarmament, development and security, with disarmament being the key to meaningful global socio-economic development and durable security. That the international community for the first time under United Nations auspices agreed on this interrelationship in all its dimensions, as evidenced by the Final Document of that Conference, is a glowing testimony to the tremendous possibilities of multilateral co-operation towards the goal of a collective security system when there is a political will and determination on the part of States to overcome narrow individual interests for the common good.

Nigeria, like many States Members of the United Nations, believes that genuine global security will be achieved when security stops being defined and addressed only in simple, military concepts with preferred military answers. We believe that security is a multidimensional phenomenon encompassing social, economic, humanitarian, environmental and other facets. The United Nations disarmament studies are replete with the beneficial miracles that could be performed world-wide, if only a fraction of the approximate \$US 1 billion spent annually on armaments could be devoted to welfare projects in many developing countries of the globe that are daily grappling with the crippling effects of abject poverty, economic deprivation, malnutrition of peoples, epidemic diseases, high rate of infant mortality, devastations of crop lands by drought and desertification, ecological disasters and other afflictions that can be made more bearable - if not totally eliminated - through genuine international co-operation enshrined in the Charter.

(Mr. Adeyemi, Niger 1a)

Added to those national burdens, which threaten not only the security but the very stability and survival of many developing countries, are the international dimensions of the economic consequences of the arms race on the national economies of developing countries in relation to the industrialized and developed North. These span vast areas, including debt-servicing, loss of income on low commodity prices; protectionism; trade barriers, whether tariff or non-tariff, and other forms of discrimination; the consistent reduction of resources put at the disposal of multilateral development institutions; and the widening gap between the North and the South in the distribution of global resources. All these are non-military threats to lasting international peace and security.

On the other hand, while it is generally agreed that there has been no war or major breakdown of security in Europe since 1945, it would be sheer illusion to think that this was due solely to nuclear deterrence or balance of terror. The post-war reconstruction under the Marshall Plan, and the attendant prosperity have created incentives for mutual peace and stability among European countries. However, the spiralling arms race and the consequent galloping inflation and recession in many industrialized countries are gradually eroding that former prosperity, with the greatest impact being felt by the lower strata in society. The increasing manifestations in Europe of social frustration, unemployment, labour unrests, homelessness and the readiness of disgruntled groups to take arms against their very own societies point to the slow but steady decay of those old concepts of security.

Thus, whether in the developed or the developing societies, security can have no meaning or relevance for the poor, the hungry, the unemployed, the homeless or those who are denied the good benefits of their society or are living in an atmosphere in which freedom and justice are more preached than they are truly

(Mr. Meyemi, Nigeria)

practised. Those polarizations and contradictions, at either national or international levels, constitute sure recipes for insecurity that must deserve our collective attention.

My delegation therefore reaffirms its support for efforts to strengthen international security, either by means of political dialogue to enhance co-operation and reduce tensions, or through a viable comprehensive system of international peace and security. However, if they are to be result-oriented and durable, such initiatives must boldly address the root causes of insecurity at both national and international levels. International collective security interests must be accorded priority over individual, often selfish and narrow national-security preoccupations. Military and non-military threats to security must be tackled on multilateral platforms, because it is only in such forums that genuine solutions can be found. States must rededicate themselves to the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Above all, nuclear weapons, which pose the greatest danger to the survival of human civilization, must be eliminated from nations' arsenals, and the two military alliances, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact, which between them possess over 90 per cent of the world's most sophisticated and destructive nuclear and conventional weapons, must subsume their ideological rivalries and alliance security system to the collective global security system guaranteed under the United Nations.

As the consensus Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly states a

(Mr. Adeyemi, Niger 1a)

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority. Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces, by international agreement and mutual example, leading ultimately to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. At the same time, the causes of the arms race and threats to peace must be reduced and to this end effective actions should be taken to eliminate tensions and settle disputes by peaceful means." (S-10/2, para. 13)



(Mr. Adeyemi, Nigeria)

These are words of wisdom and should be our guiding star in our bid for an effective collective security system which, if faithfully implemented, will contribute immensely to making the world a safer and happier place for all nations, big or small.

In concluding this statement, I should like to add that the Nigerian delegation regards the initiative on the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security as a positive contribution towards the goal of the First Committee in having a more purposeful and action-oriented debate on this important subject of strengthening international peace and security. My delegation sees this initiative as a welcome block that would reinforce the edifice of a viable system of international security, since the one in place at the moment is hardly serving the international community as envisaged in the United Nations Charter.

We therefore agree with those who regard the Soviet initiative as a continuing evolution with room for meaningful consultations and exchanges of views aimed at fleshing up and concretizing those ideas. In this connection, my delegation will remain sympathetic to genuine arrangements that will promote the revitalization of the United Nations and other multilateral institutions for the higher interests of mankind.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes today to state its position on a number of questions connected with the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and of the Declaration on the Prevention of Societies for Life in Peace and with the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. The purpose of Soviet foreign policy is the elimination of the threat of a new war and the maintenance of peace. That dictates our approach to the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Soviet Union

(Mr. Oleandrow , USSR)

implementation of that Declaration by all States acquires a special significance in today's complex and contradictory but, in many respects interrelated world, especially now, when we see the opening of real opportunities for moving from the baneful atmosphere of confrontation to new relations of peace and co-operation.

The quintessence of the new philosophy in international relations at the time of the shaping of comprehensive security has been the article of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, M. S. Gorbachev, entitled "Realities and Guarantees of a Safe World". That article embodies the basic ideas which are of concern to the international community and, using the new political thinking, discusses concrete, practical ways for achieving the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. Consideration of the question of the implementation of the Declaration on Strengthening International Security would provide a good opportunity for further detailed multilateral dialogue on the relevant problems of security. It is destined to provide a stimulus for practical actions aimed at disarmament, the settlement of conflicts, the elimination of colonialism, racism and apartheid, the democratization of international relations, the establishment of a new international economic order and international co-operation in all spheres on a footing of equality.

The Soviet Union reaffirms its dedication to the Declaration on Strengthening of International Security, which remains an effective document of the United Nations. It will actively co-operate with other members of the international community for the purpose of ensuring the implementation of that Declaration.

Also of particular significance is the implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace, adopted at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly on the initiative of the Polish People's Republic. In our

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

opinion, that Declaration is also organically related to the task of the formulation of the comprehensive system of international peace and security. Ensuring comprehensive security presupposes the establishment of appropriate moral and psychological guarantees. Further, its implementation makes an important contribution to the establishment of such guarantees by introducing into people's awareness the idea of the protection of peace and the inadmissibility of war.

The Soviet State is practicing a policy of educating the Soviet people in a spirit of peace. In this respect, the restructuring taking place in our country and typified by a radical series of transformations in society is of fundamental significance. The Soviet State is doing everything it can to see to it that the efforts to educate peoples in a spirit of peace are based upon reliable material bases, primarily upon real achievements in the field of disarmament and the strengthening of the foundations of peace.

In accordance with the Constitution of the Soviet Union, war propaganda is prohibited in the USSR. The Soviet Union intends to continue co-operating fruitfully with the United Nations and its Member States and with international social organizations in order that the provisions of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace may be fully implemented.

A concrete problem before our Committee for consideration is the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. The maintenance of tension in this region is causing particular alarm. The causes are well known: the increasing military, including nuclear, presence of States situated thousands of miles away from the region; large-scale military preparations; the blocking of a just and comprehensive settlement of the situation in the Middle East; the anti-Libyan Campaign, which has taken the form of direct armed attack on Libya; the continuing threat to the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

of the Republic of Cyprus) and **threats to use force** against other **countries** of the Mediterranean **basin**. All **this is** fraught with dangerous **consequences** which reach far beyond the limits of the Mediterranean region. It **is** quite clear that the development of the **situation** in the **Mediterranean** directly affects the **Soviet Union**. The Soviet Union **is** vitally **interested** in **guaranteeing** security, **stability and peace** in that region. It **consistently** advocates converting the Mediterranean **from** an arena of military **confrontation** into a zone of stable peace and co-operation. The **resolve** of the Soviet Union to make **a significant** contribution to improving the **situation in the** Mediterranean **is** embodied in concrete **proposals**.

(Mr. Oleandrow , USSR)

Those proposals provide for the following: the application to this region of agreed confidence-building measures) the reduction of armed forces) the withdrawal from the Mediterranean of ships carrying nuclear weapons) the rejection of the idea of deploying weapons on the territory of non-nuclear Mediterranean countries; an Undertaking by nuclear Powers not to use such weapons against any country in the Mediterranean which does not permit the deployment of such weapons within its own territory and to apply to the region of the Mediterranean the idea of establishing a zone free from chemical weapons.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, there is, in principle, no need for the presence, on a permanent basis, of its naval forces in the Mediterranean. Our country is obliged to keep its vessels there for one reason, and one only: the presence of the United States Sixth Fleet carrying nuclear weapons in the immediate vicinity of Soviet borders. If the United States were to withdraw its fleet from that region, the Soviet Union would do so at the same time because the Soviet Union is prepared to enter into negotiations on this question immediately. A constructive role in the elaboration of practical steps to strengthen security in the Mediterranean region can be played by the non-aligned countries, which, in 1984 at Valetta, supported the conversion of that region into a zone of peace, Security and co-operation.

The Soviet Union welcomed the convening this year in Yugoslavia of the meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and it has expressed the hope that the meeting would contribute to the implementation of the initiative in question. A useful role could also be played by a broader conference, similar to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Apart from Mediterranean countries and countries bordering the Mediterranean, it might also be possible to have other interested

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

countries participate in such a conference. States could also agree on the elaboration of definite recommendations for the establishment of a régime of peace and security for the Mediterranean region. Now, as never before, urgent steps are needed to normalize the situation in the Mediterranean region.

The Soviet delegation is convinced that the United Nations must use its authority and its resources to contribute in practical terms to the conversion of the Mediterranean region into a region of stable peace, security and co-operation.

**Mrs. OSODE (Liberia)** : My delegation finds the call for a review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security a worth-while exercise.

We cannot, of course, in one statement review all the activities of the United Nations, its organs and specialized agencies, all of which are involved in the matter. Such an extensive review would require a careful scrutiny of the whole host of resolutions adopted by those bodies as well as by the General Assembly. We would also have to ascertain to what extent all Member States had taken practical steps to implement the many resolutions and decisions.

We shall therefore limit ourselves to a general review of the United Nations as an organization for the maintenance of international peace and security as we see it.

When the Charter of the United Nations was first adopted, the maintenance of international peace and security was the purpose and principle that stood highest in the hierarchy of aims which the United Nations was designed to fulfil. The success of the United Nations is therefore determined by its actions or its failure to act properly in the political field. But, of course, all other activities of the United Nations, being essentially of an auxiliary nature, are measured in terms of their respective contribution to peace and security.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

For Liberia, a founding Member of the United Nations, by far the greatest expectation aroused by the establishment of the United Nations was based on its conceived merit as a security organization. Chapter VII of the Charter was considered to be its very core. The technical features of the collective security system incorporated in that Chapter were supposed to ensure the effectiveness of new machinery for peace. We are all aware that, according to this concept, a threat to the security of one is a threat to the security of all, and states are obligated to come to the help of any State that is threatened. Yet some States have appeared to be mere onlookers, not concerned about the immediate resolution of the tragic situation in southern Africa, the Middle East, Central America, and west and east Asia, which fall within the scope of some action under Chapter VII of our Charter.

Although universal membership is the ultimate goal of our Organization, experience has shown that that was never meant to imply that coercive powers were to be universally applicable in view of the right of permanent members of the Security Council to veto any enforcement proceeding. The Organization seems to be in a position to institute enforcement proceedings against any of those who are privileged to exercise the veto and we have all witnessed that none of the smaller States are entitled to regard collective security or collective protection as certain, or even likely, if and when their security is threatened. At best, it could be hoped that a legal security mechanism of the United Nations would operate in cases of conflict between small States, but the veto applies in those cases as well. For example, racist South Africa has been encouraged in its intransigence to ignore United Nations resolutions and decisions, always confident that a veto would be cast in the Security Council in its favour.

(Mrs. Oeode, Liberia)

My delegation **believes** that the collective security **mechanism** which we **desire** **is** fully attainable within the **framework** of the participation of the super-Powers. The provision in the Charter for regional arrangements renders it an effective **means** of ensuring peace **based** on political concepts.



(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

Liberia for its part, as a founding member of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), has always supported this concept within such arrangements.

In the intergovernmental setting, Liberia was able to play a crucial role in preventing the expulsion of Egypt from the Movement Of Non-Aligned Countries during the Havana summit meeting in 1979. My Government considers the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to be an essential instrument for the preservation of international peace and security. It is in this right that the action taken in 1979 was of the greatest importance to enable the Movement to preserve its balance and credibility.

It is true that the Charter may have its shortcomings, but the answer is not to replace it, which could have legal and financial implications. Adherence to the Charter, the demonstration of political will, as has so often been stressed in this Committee, as well as the use of the diplomatic methods of persuasion and negotiation, are the best ingredients for the achievement of international peace and security.

Furthermore, one of the roles of the Security Council is to deal with political disputes. Indeed, it has its rules and regulations, procedural and substantive, that should strengthen considerably its legal authority as a peace-keeping organ, if only we give it a chance.

We all know that the Organisation encourages political relationships among its Member States. However, most of us have stressed that the character of such a relationship, coupled with the state of world affairs, depends primarily on the state of affairs between the super-Powers. Nevertheless, small States have in their own way, through resolutions and actions which they have initiated within the Organization, endeavoured to nurture the political relationship.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

My delegation reiterates its commendation to the United States and the Soviet Union for their agreement in principle on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles which, if translated into positive action, could go a long way towards paving the way to more transparency or to better understanding, confidence-building and other measures, thus contributing to the disarmament process and to international peace and security. In this regard, we would be remiss if we did not underscore the role of multilateralism in this process.

We have been quite pleased to observe that, during this session, our discussions and voting in the First Committee have taken into account divergent views and interests. Indeed, if we want our Organization to fulfil its main purpose and function, we must adhere strictly to the Charter.

Finally, my delegation wishes to comment on what it perceives as a new trend in the work of the Committee. I am sure other delegations would agree with me that our work this year has been characterized by a splendid attitude of co-operation. We attribute this to the excellent manner in which you, Mr. Chairman, and the Bureau have guided our work.

Ms. MEDINA KRAUDIE (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): To preserve and maintain international peace and security according to the letter of the United Nations Charter is the supreme objective and *raison d'être* of this world body. It therefore behoves our Organization as an obligation or a priority responsibility to eliminate the threat of a new world war, in particular a nuclear war, and to strive towards the elimination of policies of supremacy, domination and power which seek to legitimize the use of force in international relations in order to create spheres of influence and to deny to small countries the right to choose freely their own political, economic, social and cultural systems.

We believe that, in order to realize the purposes for which the United Nations was created, every Member State must comply fully with the principles and norms

(Mr. Medina Kraudie, Nicaragua)

contained in the Charter and embodied in international law, while, at the same time, enhancing the effectiveness of the Security Council, whose primary responsibility is the maintenance of international peace and security.

The meagre progress achieved in the field of disarmament, the continued existence of various hotbeds of conflict, the deep-seated economic situation besetting two thirds of mankind, with its terrible social and humanitarian consequences, the continued existence of policies of intervention and occupation, whereby attempts are made to deny to peoples their right to independence and self-determination, are all elements that characterize today's international situation.

In the Middle East, the holding of an international conference to solve this problem is still in abeyance. That would be a means of guaranteeing the return of the Arab territories illegally occupied by Israel and the right to independence and self-determination of the Palestinian people. In southern Africa, South Africa continues to occupy Namibia illegally, oppressing its own people through the heinous system of apartheid, while it commits acts of aggression and destabilization against its neighbouring countries.

In Central America, the efforts of the Central American countries to bring peace to the region through the conclusion of the Esquipulas agreements, once again come up against the blind and adamant policy of continuing to finance terrorism and destruction through the mercenary contras in Nicaragua.

In the face of these and other circumstances, the Security Council has either confined itself to adopting resolutions that are violated with impunity, or its hands have been tied by the abusive use of the veto power when it has tried to act in the exercise of the attributes and responsibilities bestowed on it by the Charter.

(Ma. Medina Kraudie, Nicaragua)

We cannot fail to recognize that the United Nations has achieved a great deal in promoting international peace and security. In this connection, we should single out the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples - resolution 1514 (XV.) the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations - resolution 2625 (XXV) ; the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security - resolution 2734 (XXV) the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes - resolution 37/10) ; the Final Document adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, in 1978) the adoption of the Declaration on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development) and, at this session of the General Assembly, the Declaration on the Enhancement of the Effectiveness of the Principle of Refraining from the Threat or Use of Force in International Relations.

In order to meet the demands of all peoples for a stable and safe world it is necessary to strengthen the role of the United Nations. All initiatives aimed at strengthening international peace and security and enhancing the role of the Organization in effectively maintaining and protecting peace and security have the support of my delegation,

The importance that Nicaragua attaches to the Charter, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and the international juridical order in general, has been the fundamental concept that has guided us in our endeavours to put an end by peaceful means to the war that we have been waging since 1981 and which has already had more than 50,000 victims and resulted in material damage exceeding \$2.8 billion. These figures are the very high cost paid by the people of Nicaragua to defend its right to be free, sovereign, independent and non-aligned.

(Me. Medina Kraudie, Nicaragua)

The State which has committed acts of aggression against Nicaragua has violated the Charter of the Organization and the international juridical order. It has also placed itself outside international law through its failure to abide by the Judgment of the International Court of Justice, of 27 June 1986, on military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua.

We should emphasize that in that Judgment the highest judicial organ of the United Nations reaffirms the validity and the mandatory nature of the principles which constitute the basis of the security system provided for in the Charters that is, the principles of the non-use of force or the threat of the use of force in international relations; non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States; the sovereignty and juridical equality of all States; the self-determination of peoples; the mandatory recourse to peaceful means to resolve disputes between States; the compliance in good faith with international obligations and due observance of treaties.

The United States of America should bring its conduct into line with the Charter and comply with the Judgment of 26 June 1987 if it truly has the political will to prevent the policy of force that it is advocating and that threatens to destroy our Organization and undermine the international juridical order from acquiring credentials.

On 7 August 1987, in the city of Guatemala, the five Central American Presidents signed an agreement on procedures for the establishment of a firm and lasting peace in Central America. The objective of that agreement, which represents a decisive step in the struggle of Central American peoples and takes into account the negotiating efforts prompted by the Contadora and Support Groups,

(Ms. Medina Kraus, Nicaragua)

is the restoration to Central America of peace, justice and economic and social development without external interference.

At present, the sole obstacle to compliance with the Esquipulas II agreements is the Government of the United States, which persists in waging war against and bringing destruction to Nicaragua through endless military manoeuvres and demonstrations of naval force, spying flights, and stubborn persistence in financing mercenary forces that seek the downfall of our legitimate Government.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to state that it will continue to fight to ensure that reason prevails over the forces of war, so that in future we may enjoy the peace and security which in October 1945 this Organization declared to be its fundamental objective.

MC. AL ZEDJALI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic); Today we are debating questions relating to the items on international peace and security. In this context I should like first to ask whether there is a real need to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security. The answer to that question is not difficult. We are indeed in need of a comprehensive system to ensure international peace and security. The world today is in a state of tension, fraught with disputes, skirmishes and wars that flare up in various parts of the world. This is because of the greed, ambition, suspicion and mistrust that prevail in relations among nations.

The world has changed naturally and progressively since the adoption of the United Nations Charter. Many countries have freed themselves from the shackles of colonialism and attained independence and national sovereignty, and the number of Member States has increased. Several countries have joined military alliances centred on two poles. Some Powers have adopted a policy based on the protection of their strategic and economic interests. One group of nations pursues a policy of neutrality and non-alignment with regard to those two poles and its members have

(Mc. Al Zedgaly, Oman)

tried to steer a middle course in term6 of their demands , aspira tions and dea ires.  
Relations among nations have developed into a complex, intertwined yet orderly  
system.

(Mc. Al-Zedgaly, Oman)

The United Nations, since its inception, has taken into account the importance of relations among nations, big or small, old or new, rich or poor. It developed criteria to govern relations among nations, including the principle of non-interference in the affairs of others, respect for the sovereignty of every State, the promotion of ties of friendship and interest among all nations without discrimination, and the establishment of relations on the basis of mutual respect and good faith.

It is true that the present United Nations system might not satisfy the desires or fulfill the aspirations of all peace-loving nations. It is also true that there are deficiencies and shortcomings in that system as a result of the complexity of relations among nations. But that does not mean that the United Nations has failed to fulfil its mission and therefore should be written off and a replacement found. The United Nations has demonstrated its ability to fulfil its primary mission, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security. The Sultanate of Oman has, since its admission to the world Organization, expressed its commitment to respect all resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and to comply with them. Oman has also approved the recommendations and resolutions of the special sessions, beginning with the first special session devoted to disarmament, in order to reduce the arms race.

World military expenditures have reached astronomical figures. We reaffirm what we have already stated time and time again that we cannot imagine that disarmament resolutions could be adopted in a vacuum. There is a close link between curbing the arms race and establishing rules for international law and security. The Sultanate of Oman has supported all endeavours aimed at strengthening the peace and security of certain geographical regions. Naturally we express more interest in and support for the regions to which we belong, namely, the Middle East, the Gulf and the Indian Ocean. The Arab and Islamic peoples in



(Mr. Al Zedgaly, Oman)

these regions aim at achieving peace and security and at steering clear of endeavours to trap them into spheres of influence. These people would like to turn their region8 into areas of constructive development and welfare, where peace and security prevail, and not areas that are hotbeds of tension, disturbances and strife.

In his statement last week on my country's national day, His Majesty the Sultan emphasized that we must respond in a positive and clear manner to the developments around us and that we should exert every effort to create conditions for peace and security in our region and throughout the world. His Majesty also expressed regret at the continuation of the war between Iran and Iraq, which has brought about untold suffering and poses a threat to regional and international peace and security. His Majesty supported General Assembly and Security Council resolution8 that call for the ending of that conflict so that peace and security could prevail among two Muslim neighbours in the region. He also indicated that my country's policy has been and continues to be to promote and to make use of the opportunity available for conducting a dialogue to resolve the differences between the two parties and he called upon the international community to support those goals.

The issue of the Middle East is at the top of the international agenda and remains a threat to international peace and security. This mounting danger is due to the intransigence and arrogance that characterizes Israel's policies and practices. It can be traced to the persistent and blatant disregard by Israel of the resolution, and convention8 adopted by the international community. The danger is also attributable to Israel's failure to heed the ever-increasing international calls for the realisation of Arab rights, particularly the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Al Zedqaly, Oman)

Israel's disregard for world public opinion has assumed intolerable dimensions. Israel's obstinacy and behaviour heighten tension in the region and undermine prospects for a just and lasting solution of the problem. Israel's failure to heed the wide range of resolutions passed by this Organization and by other international forums also hampers the efforts of those international organizations to improve living conditions in the region and imposes constraints on its potential to contribute to the cause of peace. Thus, the Sultanate, together with other countries, has supported the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East.

It has become clear to all of us that the concrete realities on the ground indicate that the failures are due to the non-implementation of and non-compliance with United Nations resolutions by certain States. In this context, Israel is a case in point. That prompts me to make a few remarks on draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89, submitted to the Committee by the Eastern European Group of States, regarding the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. Notwithstanding the thrust and noble cause of the draft resolution in order to make it more acceptable to us, the proposal should take into account ways and means whereby Member States can have renewed confidence in the Organization. In this respect, I mean that States should be encouraged to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly, Security Council and other organs that are responsible for general and complete disarmament.

Our work today is gripped by genuine fears of the possibility of the outbreak of a nuclear war that might result in the total annihilation of mankind. Statistics indicate that the nuclear arsenals of the super-Powers can destroy life on our planet 60 times over. It is thus imperative that the super-Powers maintain a dialogue in a bid to curb the nuclear arms race. The Sultanate of Oman, like all

(Mr . Al Zedgaly, Oman)

other peace-loving nations , hope8 that the super-Powers, because of their special responsibilities for maintaining international peace and security, will make sincere efforts to relieve the world of the spectre of war, especially nuclear war. That contribution would be beneficial to the entire international community. Thus we consider that, while general and complete disarmament is the ultimate goal of all international negotiations and endeavours, due regard should be given to the implementation of the relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations and its various organs.

Mr . MAHMOUD (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic) : It is with keen interest that my delegation has taken the floor to state its views on the three agenda items 71, 72 and 73, entitled, respectively, "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region"; "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security"; and "Comprehensive system of international peace and security". My delegation hopes that the discussion of those three important items will help strengthen the ability of the United Nations to ensure that the Organization can discharge its primary responsibility, namely the maintenance of international peace and security, and restore the confidence of Member States in the principles of justice and the primacy of law\*

(Mr. Mahmoud, Iraq)

With regard to agenda item 71, concerning the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region, I wish to remind the Committee of Iraq's views, as expressed in document A/42/570, dated 30 September 1987. In that document Iraq expressed its deep concern at the escalation and aggravation of the situation in the Mediterranean, the use of military and non-military pressure against non-aligned countries in the region, the continuing confrontation between East and West, the build-up of military arsenals - particularly nuclear weapons - by the super-Powers, the establishment of foreign bases and the movements of foreign fleets in the region and the continued occurrence of crises and acts of occupation and aggression in the region.

Iraq rejects any pretext or excuse designed to justify the use or threat of force in the internal affairs of Mediterranean countries, as well as the creation of situations that may produce such results.

For that reason, my country strongly supports the conversion of the Mediterranean region into a zone of peace, security and co-operation and the adoption of measures to insulate the region from confrontation and conflict. It supports efforts to promote security and co-operation in the region, in accordance with the resolutions of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the United Nations, particularly the efforts of the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to reduce and eliminate tensions and to promote comprehensive co-operation for the benefit of all.

Iraq considers the Valters Declaration of September 1984 concerning peace in the Mediterranean region to be a very important instrument. Accordingly, we favour refraining from the threat or use of force, commitments by States not to use their arms, forces, bases and military facilities against non-aligned countries in the

(Mr. Mahmoud, Iraq)

Mediterranean basin and an undertaking by those countries not to permit foreign forces to use their territory, territorial waters and airspace for launching acts of aggression against one of them.

We believe that the second item, concerning the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, is closely connected with the item on a comprehensive system of international peace and security. Here I wish to refer to our opinion, set out in document A/42/668, dated 3 November 1987, stating that it is important to ensure that international attention is focused on the creation of the basic conditions required for the establishment of peace in the world, in order to create the peaceful climate that is indispensable for the development of peoples and nations at the political, economic, social, scientific and other levels.

One of the greatest dangers threatening the life, security and freedom of peoples and making it impossible to live in peace is the existence of racist, expansionist and fanatical régimes, such as the racist régimes in Palestine and South Africa and the régime in Iran which is now co-operating with them. Those régimes strive for hegemony, expansion and the usurpation of the land of others through aggression, slaughter, destruction, expulsion of citizens from their countries, seizure of their land and property and attempts to impose, on various pretexts, racist beliefs totally alien to the spirit of the age. This presents a direct threat to the neighbouring peoples, which live in constant fear of aggression. The international community must therefore take a responsible and resolute stand to deter and boycott these régimes and put an end to their racist practices.

The solution of the economic problems of the developing countries is an urgent necessity, as is the establishment of a new international economic order. Without

(Mr. Mahmoud, Iraq)

economic development and the solution of social problems, the basic conditions for the establishment of a peaceful climate cannot be met.

The delegation of Iraq reminds all States that it is necessary to respect the political independence and sovereignty of other States, not to interfere in their internal affairs, to seek peaceful solutions to conflicts, to refrain from the use of threat of force in international relations and to implement the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.\*

Mr. GRANDERSON (Trinidad and Tobago): My delegation wishes to address items 72 and 73, concerning international security.

As a small State with a limited capacity to guarantee its national security, Trinidad and Tobago has always looked upon the United Nations as the guarantor of its political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Indeed, this was the fundamental reason for our becoming a Member of the United Nations 25 years ago. We believed then, and continue to believe, that the best way of ensuring our national security lies in the collective security system of the United Nations and adherence to the provisions and principles of the Charter.

In an ideal world, the global commitment to international peace and security, which is the corner-stone of the collective security system, would mean accepting the renunciation of the threat or use of force, non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, a commitment to the peaceful settlement of international disputes and an obligation to support collective measures, both military and non-military, to counter an act of aggression by one State against another.

---

\*The Chairman returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad and Tobago)

However, if that system is to function effectively, all States must fulfil their commitments and legal obligations under the Charter. Unfortunately, this has not been the case, and as a result the collective system of international security has been unable to live up to the high hopes put in it by the founders of the United Nations. But it is not the system that is at fault. It is we, the Member States that have failed to make it function effectively. Obligations have been violated, commitments have been reneged upon and the principles of international law have been ignored. The collective security system has also been undermined by the lack of political will and by the inability of the five permanent members of the Security Council to maintain a co-operative working relationship. Without such co-operation and trust the Security Council cannot be the efficient instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security that it was meant to be.

The consequence of this breakdown in the collective security system is a world in which understanding and co-operation have been replaced by a frenetic competition to acquire ever more sophisticated and devastating weapons; a world in which regional conflicts are allowed to fester as the super-Powers jockey for strategic advantage; a world in which, despite the significant advances in science and technology, deprivation, disease and famine continue to flourish and exact an unacceptable toll; a world in which collective responsibility and the perception of shared mutual interests have been replaced by the promotion of narrow self-interest, dogmatism and increasing recourse to coercion.

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad and Tobago)

It is self-evident that the United Nations collective system of security needs to be strengthened. Over the years all Member States have addressed the shortcomings of the United Nations in the sphere of maintenance of international peace and security. There is a surprisingly high degree of convergence of views as to what these measures should be - fulfilment by all Member States of their obligations under the Charter, full utilization of the existing collective security machinery, increasing the effectiveness of the Security Council, strengthening the preventive role of the Secretary-General when crises or potential crises threaten international peace and security, reinforcing the peace-keeping capabilities of the United Nations, settling international disputes and conflicts by peaceful means and the implementation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Yet the political will to implement these measures is absent. For example, as we know in this Committee, in accordance with the provisions of resolution 38/191 of 20 December 1983 an Ad Hoc Committee should have been established to seek ways and means of implementing the collective security provisions of the Charter. That Committee is yet to see the light of day.

We have listened with great interest to the statements made by the proponents of the comprehensive system of international security. My delegation welcomes this proposal, as we would any other which seeks to reinforce the role of the United Nations in its primary task of maintaining international peace and security. Trinidad and Tobago agrees fully with the premise set out in the tenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.89/Rev.1 that

"the collective security mechanism embodied in the Charter of the United Nations constitutes the fundamental and irreplaceable instrument for the preservation of international peace and security".



(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad  
and Tobago)

However, if this is indeed the premise, my delegation has difficulty in understanding the implied corollary - that by strengthening the United Nations and by implementing the provisions of the Charter we shall somehow be creating a comprehensive system of security.

My delegation is also not persuaded that the conceptual base of the present system of international security is in some way outdated because of the profound changes which have transformed our world since 1945. The objective of the collective system of the United Nations has, from its inception, been broader than just the absence of war. The work of the United Nations and of its specialized agencies in other areas, such as the international economic situation, trade, development, the environment, human rights, population studies and so on, is recognition of the fact that the maintenance of international peace and security is based on factors other than just the avoidance of war.

The Organization has also shown its flexibility and adaptability to contemporary problems by studying and advocating action on problems and issues which are part of the present reality of international relations - for example, the use of and trafficking in illicit drugs and the relationship between disarmament and development. It is, however, my delegation's view that certain mechanisms of the collective system of international security need to be brought into line with the realities of a contemporary world characterized by increasing interdependence and the democratization of international relations.

Finally, the collective security provisions of the Charter are the heart and soul of the efforts of the global community to improve the international political climate and to make our world a safer place. These provisions should not be allowed to lie dormant at a time of increasing use or threat of the use of force in

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad  
and Tobago)

the international arena. It is for that reason that my delegation will study attentively any proposal whose ultimate objective is the revitalization of the Charter.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : The Permanent Observer of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ambassador Pak Gil Yon, has asked to speak. With the Committee's consent, I now call on him.

Mr. PAK (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) : Allow me first to express my congratulations to you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of this Committee and to wish you success in discharging your responsible assignment.

To prevent nuclear war and defend global peace and security is now a matter of primary concern to the people of the world. A large number of nuclear weapons are deployed in many countries and regions of the world, and nuclear fleets are constantly present in the Pacific, Indian and other oceans. Military exercises and activities which may cause a nuclear war are ceaselessly conducted in many countries. Heavy, dark clouds of nuclear war are hanging over us, threatening the very existence of the planet itself.

Never has the danger of nuclear war threatened the existence of mankind so seriously as it does today. The explosive power of atomic bombs stockpiled on the planet is now more than 1 million times that of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima. The world public fears that a nuclear war may break out by accident.

To avert a new world war, a thermonuclear war, and defend peace and security is the solemn demand of the times and the unanimous desire of mankind. As long as the arms race continues and nuclear weapons exist on the globe, the danger of nuclear war cannot be removed, nor can mankind be freed from the constant nuclear threat.

(Mr. Pak, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

The existing arsenals of nuclear weapons should be frozen, drastically reduced and then completely abolished, to remove the danger of nuclear war once and for all. To abolish nuclear weapons and prevent nuclear war, nuclear-free zones, peace zones, should be established and constantly expanded in different parts of the world.

Quite a number of proposals and initiatives have been put forward on establishing nuclear-free zones, peace zones, in various parts of the world. One such initiative is the proposal to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security. That proposal is made by the European socialist countries, whose aim is to bring about a world free of nuclear weapons and war. This initiative presupposes, first, the elimination of nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction, a deep reduction of armed forces and an adequate reduction of military budgets. The proposal also requires the dismantling of military blocs, the elimination of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of armed forces stationed abroad.

In our view, this initiative fully reflects the serious concern about the future of mankind, particularly in the face of the threat of a nuclear holocaust, and the desire of the people of the world to live in peace, without nuclear weapons.

The proposal, therefore, should be encouraged. It should be broadly studied, and a group of eminent persons should be set up to work out ways and procedures for such a comprehensive system of global peace and security.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea fully supports all the peace proposals made by the socialist countries to prevent a nuclear war and preserve world peace and security, and highly values their sincere efforts to implement them.

(Mr. Pak, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

We extend our full support to the European socialist countries and the people in the region in their struggle to create nuclear-free zones of peace in the Balkan peninsula and in many parts of Europe, and we express our firm solidarity with peace-loving people throughout the world in their struggle to create nuclear-free zones of peace in Africa, the Middle East, the Indian Ocean and the South Pacific Ocean, and many other parts of the world. My delegation also supports the important measures and initiatives taken by the socialist countries to reduce their armed forces and military budgets.

Peace on the Korean peninsula is directly interlinked with the peace and security of the world, in particular, security in Asia and the Pacific region. Artificial division of the Korean peninsula for about half a century, prolonging the state of armistice for nearly four decades, constitutes a constant source of war and military tension. The presence of more than 1,000 nuclear weapons of various types and 43,400 American troops in this small peninsula and the conduct of extremely adventurous and offensive military exercises every year - with more than 200,000 regular troops and strategic command and nuclear commanding aircraft and nuclear attack control planes - are further evidence of the extremely tense situation in Korea. This arouses much concern, not only on the part of the Korean people, but also on the part of the peace-loving people in the region and in the rest of the world. In this situation war could break out as a result of any accidental happening in Korea and could easily become a thermonuclear world war extending beyond the boundaries of Korea.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, out of a sense of responsibility for the destiny of the nation and its noble mission for global peace, has put forward many proposals for a durable peace on the Korean peninsula and has made a

(Mr. Pak, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

very sincere effort for their realization. The proposal to conclude a peace agreement between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States of America and to adopt a non-aggression declaration between the two sides in Korea; the proposal to convert the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone of peace; the proposal for high-level political-military talks between the North and the South; all these proposals are intended to bring about a durable peace in the peninsula.

In order to ease tension and remove the danger of war on the Korean peninsula, sharp military confrontation must be dissolved and complete disarmament realized. To that end the Democratic People's Republic of Korea made an important proposal last July on massive military reduction on the Korean peninsula and on the holding of multinational disarmament negotiations among the parties concerned on the Korean question. When the proposal for armed reduction materializes, the armed forces in the North and the South of Korea would be reduced to 100,000 or less in 1992, the Korean peninsula would be free from foreign forces and foreign military bases and the demilitarized zone along the military demarcation line would be converted into a complete peace corridor. This would eradicate the root cause of another war on the Korean peninsula, bring lasting peace, and open a bright prospect for the independent and peaceful reunification of the country.

It is the view of my delegation that the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolution on the Korean question is very important in preventing another war and preserving peace on the Korean peninsula. Twelve years have elapsed since resolution 3390 B (XXX) on the question of Korea was adopted at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly. This resolution called for dissolving the United Nations Command, withdrawing all foreign troops from South Korea, replacing the

(Mr. Pak, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

armistice agreement with a peace agreement, and removing the military confrontation between the North and the South, thus maintaining durable peace on the Korean peninsula.

It reflects the unanimous desire of the Korean people and of all peace-loving people for peace in Korea and its peaceful reunification in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. However, after twelve years, the resolution has still not been implemented.

It is therefore our sincere hope that United Nations resolution 3390 B (XXX) on the Korean question be implemented as early as possible. It is the hope of my delegation that those who really treasure peace and who are concerned about the destiny of mankind will join the struggle against war and for peace and not remain indifferent to the grave situation on the Korean peninsula.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

May I remind members of the Committee of the procedure we have agreed on in this connection, that is, that statements are to be limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second.

Mr. ZIFFORI (Israel): Yesterday and today we heard several Arab delegations comment on the so-called threat that Israel poses in the Mediterranean region. This false depiction of Israel is frequently used to deflect attention from the real sources of instability and tension in the Mediterranean: namely, Syria and Libya. Those two countries house permanent terrorist infrastructures and continue to direct international terror from their shores. A third country in the region, Lebanon, has been savaged for years by internal strife and by the effects

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

of terrorism. It is well known that the PLO and other terrorists use various Mediterranean routes to transport their death and destruction in the ports of Lebanon to Europe and beyond.

For its part, Israel will continue to take effective measures to defend and protect its citizens. We also continue to extend our hand to our neighbours who wish to strengthen the prospects of peace and call for direct peace negotiations on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), with or without the assistance of others, and on the basis of mutual respect for the rights of Israelis and Arabs alike. This, we believe, is not only in the interest of Israel and its neighbours, but also in the interest of the whole international community.

It is clear though that there can be no peace and security as long as certain States in the region continue to sponsor international terror. To ensure peace and security is not only to prevent war between States in the Mediterranean region but also to have an area where innocent tourists can take a cruise without terrorists hijacking their ship, where yachtists can anchor in a harbour without being murdered by terrorists, and planes flying in the skies over the sea are not menaced by terrorist bombs.

Mr. MASHHAD I-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) : It seems that we are living in a world of paradox. Words have become devoid of their true meaning. The Iraqi representative used terms in his speech as though he were characterizing the régime ruling his country.

After the revolution in Iran, the Iraqi President went to the Iraqi Parliament and said: "We unilaterally abrogate the Iran/Iraqi Agreement, signed in 1995 at Algiers." He further stated, "At that time, we were in a position of weakness. Now that we are in a position of strength, I do not abide by the Algiers Agreement," - unilaterally abrogated. On 22 September 1980, 12 armoured mechanized infantry divisions attacked Iran and, at that time -

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : I call on the representative of Iraq on a point of order.

Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic) : I ask the representative of Iran to stop departing from the subject. He must talk about the general world system of peace. If he takes the floor, he may reply to what I have said, but he should not go into the whole background of the war between Iraq and Iran.

Mr. MASHHAD I-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) : I should like to ask the Iraqi representative when the term "continued threat to neighbouring countries" is used, which country is threatening which? That is not out of context. When the words "expelling people from their homeland" are used, we should know which country is responsible. It is not out of context.

At that time, 22,000 square kilometres of our territory were occupied, several times the whole territory of Lebanon. Our people took up arms and defended their integrity and they were able to expel the occupiers at the time when the Iraqis were not able to defend -



The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of Iraq on a further point of order. I would also appeal to delegations to ensure that the exercise of their right of reply is carried out in accordance with the rules of procedure and that the time allotted to delegations to exercise their rights of reply should be duly respected by all delegations.

Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The speaker has referred at length to the start of the war. I do not think this is the place in which to do so. The representative of Iran should talk about his country's compliance with the seven Security Council resolutions accepted by Iraq and rejected by Iran.

Mr. MASHHAD I-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should just like to know whether occupation of another country is a threat to international peace and security or not. If it is, it is in context and I should like to ask you, Sir, to rule on whether this subject is within the context of international peace and security or not. After the occupation of our country, our people took up arms and defended themselves and were able to expel the occupiers, when the occupiers were not able to resist, they used chemical weapons. They attacked mercantile vessels, ships and civil aviation and they expelled hundreds of thousands of Iraqis of Iranian origin. That is what they did. The Iraqi representative referred to the continuing threat to neighbouring countries and the expelling of people. They expelled people. I do not know how are we proceeding in this world, where everything is upside down?

MY. MAHMOUD (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Everybody knows how this bloody war started. Since Khomeini came to power in 1979, he has been threatening countries in the region and that threat continues today. As regards those people who were deported from Iraq, they were Iranians who had no right to reside in Iraq. That is why they were expelled. That has been reaffirmed in the Third Committee.

When I said that the territory was occupied and people expelled from it, I compared South Africa to Iran. I wish to refer to that similarity. The mission of Iraq received a publication, as did other permanent missions I believe, dealing with the oil embargo against South Africa. That publication is dated 9 October 1989 and it says that Iran sends 50 per cent of its oil to South Africa in exchange for weapons.

Mr. ALSHEKE (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): In a series of lies and allegations, the representative of the Zionist entity mentioned my country. At this time I totally refute what was said about my country. We would like to stress the fact that the source of tension in the Mediterranean resides in the existence of the racist régime, Israel, which, over the 40 years of its existence, has practised a policy of aggression based on racism and international terrorism against the Palestinian people and the Arab nation. That régime has occupied Palestine, expelled its people and is trying to eliminate that people. The racist régime has been continuing aggression against Arab nations and wishes to extend this at the expense of the Arab nation.

(Mr. Alsheke, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

The records of the racist régime are full of acts of aggression which threaten peace and security in the Mediterranean and in the Arab world.

Hundreds of resolutions have been adopted condemning the racist Zionist régime of Israel. We know that there is a Committee in the United Nations which studies acts of aggression perpetrated by the Zionist régime against the Palestinian people and this proves that the régime practises terrorism.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : I call now on representatives who wish to exercise the right of reply a second time.

Mr. MASHHADI-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) : I am glad to hear the Iraqi delegate himself say that the people were expelled from Iraq. That shows that that régime is racist and that people who had been there for generations were expelled from that country without grounds.

I have one question that I would like the Iraqi representative to answer. Which country's forces were in Iran from 1980 until 1982? That is a simple question and I demand an answer. Were Iranian troops in Iraqi territory or Iraqi troops in Iranian territory for the two years from 1980 to 1982? Who were the aggressors?

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel) : I would first like to remind the representative of Libya of your ruling earlier in our session, Mr. Chairman, that representatives should use the right and proper names of the countries when referring to them in this debate - not that I am ashamed of being called a Zionist; I think it is a badge of honour+

If analysed, the Libyan statement, like the statements of some other countries, shows that the real aim in attacking Israel has nothing to do with this territory or that territory, but is to eliminate Israel; to get Israel out of the

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

Middle East entirely. I think that is very clear from the words that we have heard from the Libyan representative earlier and just now.

We really ought to analyse the real problems in the Middle East: why the peace process is stalled, why it is not progressing. The true reason is the lack of the will for dialogue on the part of some of the players - not all, but some of the players - of which Libya is one of the prime examples. It is the lack of the will for dialogue.

Mr. MAIMOU (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The will of our international community is represented by the decisions of the Security Council. Just a few weeks after the start of the war, the Security Council, on 28 September 1980, unanimously adopted resolution 479 (1980), which was accepted by Iraq but rejected by Iran. Indeed, I might mention the series of resolutions adopted by the Security Council. Does the representative of Iran feel that he is entitled to oppose the will of the international community?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): The following delegations have put their names down to speak at the next meeting of the Committee, which will be held tomorrow at 10 a.m.: Guyana, the United States of America, China, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.