

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly
FORTY-FIFTH SESSION
Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
47th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 28 November 1990
at 3.30 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 47th MEETING

Chairman:

Mr. **RANA**

(Nepal)

CONTENTS

General debate, consideration of and action on draft resolutions on international security agenda items (continued)

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter III, section **D**)

Question of Antarctica: consideration of and action on draft resolutions (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 corrigendum for each Committee.

**Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/45/PV.47
7 December 1990
ENGLISH**

90-63298 3483V (E)

35p.

The meeting was called to order at 3.55 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 69, 70 AND 12 (continued)

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

REPORT OF **THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL** (chapter III, section D)

Mr. SARDENBERG (Brazil): Allow me to start on a personal note, Sir.

Twenty years ago, when the General Assembly adopted virtually unanimously the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security (resolution 2734 (XXV)), I had the opportunity, as a junior member of the Brazilian delegation to the First Committee, to participate in the intensive negotiations leading to the final text of the Declaration, to which the Latin American States made a significant contribution.

In 1970 the world was a different place. United Nations membership was a little more than 120 States, and we were still discussing the Question of the admission of two Germanys. East-West confrontation was a crude reality, with the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, reaching overwhelming proportions. Conflicts around the globe were fuelled by super-Power competition for spheres of influence. Decolonization in many countries was still a coveted dream, and the international community was increasingly aware of the heinous régime of apartheid. The need for a more just and balanced economic order was at the top of the international agenda.

The celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations stressed the fact that our Organization was not attaining the high goals for which it had been conceived in San Francisco. A stalemate had been reached. The world Organization was unable to address the political issues of concern to the majority of the international community, through the General Assembly, the Security Council or the Economic and Social Council, in their specific spheres of competence. The

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

Organization was relegated to the role of spectator to numerous violations of the principles enshrined in its Charter. Any attempts to deliberate on the pressing political issues related to international peace and security were dismissed as unrealistic **or**, more surprisingly, as not conducive to betterment of the political situation.

The adoption of the Declaration in those circumstances constituted, therefore, an extraordinary achievement of multilateral diplomacy, and fostered hopes, particularly among developing countries, that the United **Nations** had made an important step towards the consideration of a new -world order of international peace and security, in line with the purposes and principles to which all Member States subscribed when they signed the Charter.

As the then **Permanent** Representative of Brazil said at the **moment** of the adoption of resolution 2734 (XXV):

"we consider **that** this session of the Assembly is a turning-point in the life of this Organization. So we have a feeling, not of satisfaction with what we have achieved, but of determination to face the tremendous tasks of the future, a future based on the concept of justice, not on the concept of power: a future in which political realism will not be invoked to freeze the aspirations of the smaller nations: a future in which peace **among** nations will **mean** something more than a tolerable state of warfare: a future in which disarmament will mean something **more** than a tolerable arms race: and a future in which economic development for all nations will become a reality, and not only a tolerable state **of** poverty," Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, 1932nd meeting, para. 123)

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

He also said:

"We consider that the draft Declaration on the strengthening of international security represents a formal repudiation of all current theories of power politics, balance of power and spheres of influence. . . . A new right is now recognized and proclaimed by the United Nations: the right to security, which will be the corner-stone of the evolving law of international security." (ibid., para. 120)

After that almost 20 years of painful frustration went by without the hopes that the Declaration gave rise to materialising. Those were years of limited, insufficient achievement in the fields of international peace and security, of persistent recourse to power politics and of an intolerable state characterised by war, the arms race and poverty. The cold war and the adoption of highly selective approaches to the issues of international peace and security smothered the potential for an interdependent world and universal participation in the international decision-making process.

In your introductory remarks, Mr. Chairman, you expressed in a very able and eloquent manner the view that the world has entered a new phase, in which confrontation has been superseded by co-operation. Indeed, we are living at the dawn of an era of renewed hopes for the establishment of a world order based on peace and security, with the full participation of all States. I need not compare the issues which confronted us in 1970 with our present concerns. Secretary-General Javier *Perez* de Cuellar himself stated in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organisation that

"The period we have entered is Janus-faced." (A/45/1, p. 2)

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

The positive developments on the international scene underscore the need to address the challenges that still lie ahead. Those challenges cannot be underestimated, as the present crisis in the Middle East clearly stresses. The possibilities of fulfilling our long-held expectations have never before seemed so concrete. **But** despite **major** changes in the patterns **of** East-West relations and in the approach to international security issues, the extent *to* which the new developments will lead to a shift from policies based on **force and** power to a new security **system** based on justice, equality and co-operation remains to be seen.

As the United Nations addresses the challenges of a new world order it is the primary task of the General Assembly, through this Committee, to deliberate on a comprehensive **and** structured **system of** international peace and security, ensuring that the concepts of power which in one form or another have prevailed since 1945 will finally become obsolete.

The first question to be addressed **concerns** the full participation of all States in the consideration of security issues which are of global concern. The tendency towards what has been called "**selective** multilateralism" in dealing with international security issues runs contrary to the need to build a **system** devoted to lasting peace. The right of all States to participate in the process **of** building a new world order is essential for the successful achievement of this goal.

As President Fernando Collor stated in **the** General Assembly:

"Peace is multifaceted and should translate at the international level **the trends** towards democracy, participation and representation. **Democratization of** the world order is a prerequisite for a peace that is both just and sound, free from any kind of threat. Peace must **mean more** than the abolition of conflicts, of threats and **of** the hegemonic preponderance of the **most** developed or **most** powerful. Thus, the **major** international institutions

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

murt refloat the new realities and be capable of accommodating the rapid and fruitful increase in contacts among States and the formation of multiple groupings." (A/45/PV.4, p. 12)

The renewed commitment to the United Nations and to its main organs is certainly to be considered a major achievement of the present time. The strengthening of the role of the United Nations fully coincides with the need to give new meaning to the concepts of peace and security. While strengthening the role of the Security Council and of the Economic and Social Council, as envisaged in the Charter, remains important, we should concentrate our efforts on enhancing and giving increased significance to the General Assembly, as the central and universal political forum of the United Nations system. Only with the full participation of all Member States can the Organization achieve the goal of constructing a new world order. We should therefore earnestly begin to consider ways and means to strengthen and enhance the role of the general Assembly.

Significant advances have undoubtedly been made in the field of disarmament. The recent agreements between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on nuclear disarmament and the agreement on the reduction of conventional forces in Europe are very important but still limited steps towards reducing the levels of armaments in the most armed region of the world. General and complete disarmament under effective international control remains the objective to be attained as the only guarantee that the use of force will be ruled out of international relations.

I have already had the opportunity to present at length in this Committee the Brazilian position on this issue, underlining the need for disarmament negotiations to be given full and general scope. Let me therefore stress just one point: disarmament is a necessary corollary of the principle of non-use of force to which

(Mr. Sardenbera, Brazil)

we have committed ourselves in the Charter of the United Nations. If genuine peace and security cannot be achieved without disarmament, only lasting peace and an effective system of security will allow **for** the necessary confidence to disarm,

The creation of a just international economic order - responsive to the needs of the developing countries and geared to correcting present imbalances - is also an essential condition for the strengthening of international peace and security. Despite the declared objective of enhancing international co-operation for development, the last decade has witnessed a widening of the gap between developed and developing countries, inhibiting the economic, commercial and technological growth of these countries. A tolerable state of poverty should no longer be considered acceptable; correcting the present imbalances in the economic order is an essential part of the process of building lasting peace and security for all.

But as is the case with disarmament, selective and discriminatory approaches to international co-operation, particularly in the scientific and technological fields, are undeniable indicators of the persistence of the **idea that** some countries are somehow entitled to enjoy privileges and prerogatives in certain areas, to the detriment of the goals of justice and equity.

In this connection, the debate yesterday **in** the Assembly regarding the Zone **of** Peace and Co-operation of the South Atlantic should serve as an example and as **guidance**. In a non-confrontational world, the issues of peace and co-operation can no longer be seen through the narrow lenses of military or strategic concerns. **Recent** developments have shown that peace and co-operation are possible only if freed from the strait-jacket of power politics. We should now translate this perception into practical politics everywhere in the world,

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

As we reach a new turning-point in international relations and in the life of the United Nations, the agenda for the future put forward by my delegation in 1970 is more than ever relevant. It bears a clear resemblance to the agenda put forward this year by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his report, an agenda he qualifies as ambitious but necessary.

(Mr. Sardenberg, Brazil)

The rapid pace of change in the world, and the ambiguities of that change, should not serve as a justification for inaction, for passivity or for limited or partial solutions. On the contrary, we should be ready to confront the new realities and respond, in a comprehensive manner, to the challenges they present. The international community should actively pursue the task of giving shape and meaning to the changes in international relations; it should direct this process of change towards the fulfilment of the purposes and principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, developing what my delegation, in 1970, already envisaged as the law of international security.

President Collor has stated:

"The Brazilian Government is prepared to discuss the basic outline of a new international structure that can ensure peace and further co-operation. It would not suffice merely to preserve the current global political and economic arrangements and even less to repeat the past, recent or remote. The highly antiquated concept of power, as the capacity for destruction and as an expression of economic hegemony, should be finally abandoned." (A/45/PV.4, p. 11, para. 4)

A real opportunity to build a new system of peace and security for all is clearly at hand and should not be squandered. As we approach the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, my delegation is of the firm belief that this Committee can and should fulfil the mandate given it by the General Assembly, the mandate to give substantive consideration to the question of international security. The new international political climate clearly shows that attempts to design a security system based on force and power have failed. We should now explore, in a constructive and imaginative way, the avenue towards justice and equality.

Mr. HAGOSS (Ethiopia): The year which is about to end will be remembered as one in which further progress was made in the ongoing process towards the establishment of an international order shielded against the hazardous winds of the 1990s era. In many parts of the world, painstaking efforts continue to be made to make it possible for the relief felt by the international community following the improvement in East-West relations to be consolidated into a permanent feature of inter-state relations at the global level.

In Europe, a continent which continues to benefit from the emergence of the new international climate now prevailing, new security structures and arrangements have come into existence in legal terms,

In Africa, a chronic colonial problem, one with obvious ramifications for the maintenance of international peace and security, has come to an end with the emergence of Namibia as an independent State. The pernicious system of apartheid is continuing to lay low.

In Central America, we have witnessed the further consolidation of peace, thanks to the complementary efforts of the countries in the region and of the United Nations.

Statesmen from the south, as well as from the North, are continuing to pursue solutions to the many conflicts which have afflicted various regions of our planet. Indeed, the flurries of diplomatic activity and gatherings which have taken place throughout this year clearly indicate that all countries, irrespective of their size or their economic or military might, can contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security. Needless to say, how sustainable peace is depends on the involvement and collaboration, of all the parties concerned, in the process leading towards that peace,

(Mr. Hagoss, Ethiopia)

Perhaps the most rewarding form of **security** assurance which has accrued from the change in the international climate has been, and remains, the enhanced role which the United **Nations** continues to play **in** the **realm** of international peace and security. The **momentum** which the Security Council has **gained** in **recent** months has been a source of particular satisfaction to **us**. Likewise, we are heartened to note the increase in the intensity and frequency with which the good offices of the Secretary-General are being used in global efforts aimed at resolving problems that have adverse effects on international peace and security.

Although trend-setting developments continue to take place in **many** parts of the world, all is not well **in** the family of **nations**. **Indeed**, as the invasion of **Kuwait** by Iraq on 2 August 1990 **and** the subsequent occupation of Kuwait clearly indicate, the temptation to resort to the use of **force**, for purposes of attaining **hegemony**, seems to be ever present. **As** a country **which** has **been** a victim of such aggression, **Ethiopia** considers this abominable act by Iraq to be not only a challenge to the rule of law itself but also an act of adventurism, and that in the **most** volatile region on our planet. We have therefore **supported** the appropriate and timely **measures** which the Security Council has taken in condemning the Iraqi aggression **and** reasserting the **sovereignty** and territorial integrity of Kuwait.

As we **have** pointed out on a **number of occasions**, peace **is** indivisible. **If** peace is to prevail globally, it is imperative that the non-military factors likely to have a bearing on the maintenance of international peace and security should receive due recognition. **If** peace is to prevail in all parts of the world, it is essential that we should **take** the most comprehensive view possible of how it is to **be realized**.

(Mr. Hagosa, Ethiopia)

Indeed, ● ndwiag peace cannot be attained on a planet characterized by imbalances in *many spheres* of human existence. The lopsided distribution of power and resources in the world continues to be an impediment to the genuine pursuit of peace. It must be recognized that even the best-intentioned efforts for world peace and security are likely to be only partially effective unless due consideration is given to the social and economic problems faced by the overwhelming majority of mankind. We therefore welcome the proposal put forward by the Soviet Union regarding the need to adopt a comprehensive approach to international peace and security.

Attaining peace and security is a matter to which my country attaches the highest importance. It is our considered view that confidence-building measures adopted by members of any one region are likely to be of major significance in consolidating peace at the global level; by availing themselves of the opportunities created by the Inter-Governmental Authority on Drought and Development, whose membership comprises the Governments of Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda, my country and its immediate neighbours had taken the first step towards a sustainable peace and the security, development and stability of the subregion.

It is our earnest hope that the countries in the subregion will continue to utilize this machinery to pursue solutions to the many problems facing them and to enhance a spirit of dialogue and co-operation in matters of mutual concern. For its part, Ethiopia will continue to support this regional initiative) in the same vein, my Government will continue to pursue its declared policy of resolving the internal conflicts in Ethiopia by peaceful means.

(Mr. Hagoss, Ethiopia)

As you, Mr. Chairman, and many speakers have pointed out, the international milieu has never been so conducive to the pursuit of peace and justice and, indeed, to the advancement of the very causes the United Nations was intended to promote. As we move into a new era in which States are expected to conform to universally defined codes of conduct, the attempt by some to defy accepted norms of legality is likely to be a challenge to the resolve of the international **community** in upholding commonly shared principles. As a community of nations we have no choice but to face this challenge squarely.

Mr. TAEB (Afghanistan): The present debate of this Committee on agenda items relating to international security is taking place at a time when the **international community** has moved forward in this regard through the results of the Paris **Summit** Conference of 34 nations. The signing **of the Agreement on the** Reduction of Conventional Armed Forces in Europe between the **two major** military alliances has marked an outstanding event in the modern history of inter-State relations. We welcome it as a significant step in the right direction.

Since the adoption of the Declaration **on** the Strengthening of International Security, two decades, full of painful events, have elapsed. The principles and ideas of the Declaration, based on the provisions of the United Nations Charter, have proved their validity and need special attention in relations among States. The Declaration in part says:

"... the **promotion of** international co-operation, including regional, subregional and bilateral co-operation among States, in keeping with the provisions of the Charter and based on the principles of equal rights and strict respect for the sovereignty and independence of States, can contribute to the strengthening of international security." (**resolution 2734 (XXV), para. 25**)

(Mr. Taeb, Afghanistan)

International experience, especially since the establishment of the United Nations, would lead us to the conclusion that co-operation, mutual understanding and dialogue among nations and a peaceful approach to the settlement of international disputes are the best ways to preserve civilisation on the globe, No one can deny that the rapid transformation of world relations in a short and unpredictable period comes from a non-confrontational approach and mutual understanding. Indeed, this is an extraordinary lesson of history from which every nation should draw wise and prudent conclusions.

In these new circumstances the role of the United Nations should be further strengthened to enable it to meet its main responsibility, that is, to maintain international peace and security. My Government highly appreciates the work of the United Nations in this field and hopes that joint and constructive endeavours of Member States carried out in a co-operative spirit will greatly contribute to ● enhancing the role of this body with the objective of building a secure world in which all nations, irrespective of their size, geographical location, level of development or political, economic and social system, can live in peace based on justice. We think that the present international atmosphere could and should provide a real opportunity for making the United Nations work in accordance with the Charter.

We are living in an interdependent world. Hence the question of international security should be considered in such a framework. Existing global problems and issues such as disarmament, development and environment are closely linked to the problem of international security, though there are also many other factors in this respect that should not be ignored.

(Mr. Taeb, Afghanistan)

We recognise that various aspects of international security continue to be discussed at different **United Nations** bodies and at multilateral, regional, subregional and bilateral levels elsewhere. We **encourage** all efforts in this respect, but at the same time we stress the view that the United Nations **must** play the central role for these purposes.

An international security **system** must be comprehensive and cover all its aspects. It should aim at nothing less than, in the words of the Charter, saving "succeeding generations **from** the scourge of war". My delegation strongly believes that the security of one can only be ensured through the security of all. Genuine disarmament and especially nuclear disarmament **measures** are the main factors in the strengthening of international peace and security. We are of the opinion that any step taken in the disarmament sphere, particularly in reducing military expenditures, should promote development. The financial, natural and technological resources now devoted to military purposes should be reallocated to eradicate hunger, poverty and disease, which consume the lives of hundreds of thousands every year in the developing countries.

The improvement **of** East-West relations has made a great impact on the world situation as a whole. None the less, with regard to regional conflicts, tensions remain in South Africa, the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and South-East and South-West Asia. In all these hot-bed areas, millions of people are suffering from destructive armed conflicts which claim **many** lives every day. We think that the international community should address all those problems on an equal level, taking into account their specific situations.

Unfortunately, in our region the imposed war still continues, claiming the lives of innocent Afghans **almost every** day. The signing of the Geneva Agreements in April 1988 was aimed at putting an end to the conflict in our region through

(Mr. Taeb, Afghanistan)

political means. The Geneva Agreements established the legal basis for removing the decade-long armed conflict situation in our region. The Geneva Agreements would have greatly contributed to the strengthening of the security of the entire region if they had been fully implemented by all who are parties to them. To save the time of the Committee, I would only draw the attention of the representatives to documents A/45/165, A/45/201, A/45/318 and A/45/600, which give a picture of the development of the events and the existing tensions in our region.

The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan, for its part, has made a number of proposals covering various aspects of the problems relating to Afghanistan, to settle the questions through negotiations and dialogue. We hope that the concerned Governments will consider them with responsibility and demonstrate their goodwill for constructive co-operation in the region. The time of confrontation, especially military confrontation, has passed. It does not work any more. Wisdom must prevail.

With regard to agenda item 68, "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region", the principal position of my delegation is consistent. We attach great importance to the Mediterranean region and its important geographical location.

(Mr. Taeb. Afghanistan)

We fully **support** the transformation of that region into a region of peace, security and co-operation. We are of the opinion that all non-regional military forces now stationed in the region must be withdrawn. My delegation supports the constructive role in the Mediterranean process played by the foreign ministers of the non-aligned countries of that region, whose third meeting took place in June 1990 at Algiers, with a view to facilitating thi search for a solution to the problems that still exist there.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Secretary of the Committee, who wishes to make some announcements.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: **A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2:** Burkina Faso; **A/C.1/45/L.65:** Morocco.

AGENDA ITEM 67 (**continued**)**QUESTION OF ANTARCTICA: CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTXONS**

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with my announcement yesterday, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 67 - namely, draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2** and **A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1.**

I shall first call on **the** representative of Tunisia, who will introduce draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1.,** on behalf of States **Members** of the United Nations that **are members** of the Group of African Statos.

Mr. JERANDI (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the Group of African States I have the honour to introduce to the Committee draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1.,** on the question of Antarctica. The Committee will recall that a draft resolution with the same title was introduced last **year** and adopted by the General Assembly as resolution **44/124 A,**

(Mr. Jerandi, Tunisia)

This year the Group of African States is once again submitting a draft resolution on this subject because of South Africa's continued participation in meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties, in spite of the resolutions adopted in 1987, 1988 and 1989. We are therefore submitting a draft resolution again this year as a further appeal to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties urgently to take the necessary measures to put an end to South Africa's participation in their meetings.

The Committee will note that the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs refer to the resolution adopted by the Organisation of African Unity in July 1989 and the resolution adopted by the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries in September 1989. Those resolutions again confirm the position taken by those two bodies on this question.

Operative paragraph 1 is justified, of course, by the fact that the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties have not taken the concrete measures set forth in paragraph 2 - I emphasize: paragraph 2 - of resolution 44/124 A adopted at last year's session of the General Assembly, in which the Assembly appealed to the Consultative Parties to take urgent measures to exclude South Africa from participation in their meetings at the earliest possible date.

I should like to draw attention to an omission in operative paragraph 3, of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev. 1. As corrected, the paragraph should read as follows :

"Appeals once again to the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to take urgent measures to exclude the racist apartheid régime of South Africa from participation in the meetings of the Consultative Parties at the earliest possible date, and invites them to inform the Secretary-General of the measures taken regarding the provisions of the present resolution".

(Mr. Jerandi, Tunisia)

In the draft resolution **I am introducing today the Group of African States** rightly insists that South Africa's participation in the meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties end. Although the situation **in South Africa would** appear to be evolving to a degree, there are still manifestations *of* the policy of **apartheid** in ideas and practices, and that is an **affront** to morality. The black majority of South Africa is purely and simply excluded *from* the great benefits and advantages the international community might derive *from* Antarctica. The African countries will not stop calling for South Africa's immediate exclusion from the meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties until a democratic **and** non-racial society is established in that country.

The **CHAIRMAN:** Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions, I shall call on delegations that wish to **make** statements other than statements in explanation *of vote*.

Mr. AL-BATASHI (Oman) (interpretation **from** Arabic): Once again my delegation *notes* with regret that the list of **speakers on** the present item, the question of Antarctica, which has **been on** the **Committee's** agenda since 1983, does not include any of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties. My delegation interprets this boycotting *of* and non-participation in the **Committee's** discussion as a sign of the Consultative Parties' confusion and uncertainty in refuting the arguments and facing up to the legitimate questioning of the international community concerning the efficacy *of* the Antarctic Treaty **system** and its ability to make a contribution to international peace and security, the **environment, the world economy,** scientific research and **meteorology** and to **respond to** the repeated calls by the General Assembly which echo the international **community's** concern at the exceptional significance of the **Antarctic continent for the survival of mankind** in light of the continued exclusivity of the Treaty **system** which **remains** closed to the international community.

(Mr. Al-Batashi, Oman)

Owing to the **Antarctic Treaty's exclusivity**, that system is unable to furnish adequate *proof of the efficacy of the safeguards in the Treaty system.*

For our part, we question the efficacy of *that system*, which was adopted in 1959 by a small group of economically and scientifically advanced States, in **ensuring that the Antarctic Continent would be used solely for peaceful purposes and not transformed in some future date into an arena of or cause for international controversy**, given the competition among the great Powers to mine and exploit the continent's still-untapped natural resources. The prospecting and mining operations carried out in the region have had an influence on the entire ecosystem of the planet.

(Mr. Al-Batashi, Oman)

Those operations disrupt the harmony and pattern of climatic cycles, damage the flora and fauna and destroy the human environment. They cause the depletion of the ozone layer and lead to the global-warming known as the greenhouse effect.

My delegation continues to believe that, in the light of the international community's broad recognition of Antarctica's importance, we must view that continent as the common heritage of mankind; it should be administered and used internationally in consonance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, in a manner that would serve and promote international co-operation and the interests of all mankind. By adopting that approach, we would put an end to claims of sovereignty, contribute to meeting the basic needs of the overwhelming majority of States concerning the democratisation of decision-making in the framework of the Treaty.

Moreover, organising broader scientific and research activities and projects of scientific co-operation can play an important role in ensuring the use of the continent for peaceful purposes through the establishment of multilateral research stations and through the availability of information on all aspects of the question of Antarctica.

In that connection, my delegation welcomes the courageous stand by some of the Consultative Parties to the Treaty in refusing to ratify the treaty on Antarctic mining. We view this as ample proof of the growing awareness in those countries and the strong impact of public opinion and awareness of the risks to the world environment posed by prospecting and pollution. It also reflects a recognition by those countries that there is an urgent need to study the Treaty once again in order to respond to the concerns of the international community.

(Mr. Al-Batashi, Oman)

On the other hand, we as members of an international community which live in the new age of *détente*, cannot but marvel at the Consultative Parties' failure to exclude the South African régime from membership, and the continued participation by that régime in meetings of the Consultative Parties. This has enabled South Africa to benefit from the technical information available to the Consultative Parties but thus far not available to the international community at large,

My delegation joins the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2 in appealing to the Consultative Parties to respond to the calls of the international community to declare Antarctica the common heritage of mankind, to distribute its natural resources in the interest of all mankind, to stop creating new environmental problems - the last thing the world now needs - and to agree to co-operate with the Secretary-General to enable him to draw up the required comprehensive report on the environmental status of Antarctica and its implications for the rest of the planet and outer space, and to permit the United Nations to be a repository of such information in the interests of all mankind.

Mr. WILENSKI (Australia): I have asked to speak again, before the vote, in order to make a statement on behalf of States parties to the Antarctic Treaty.

The Antarctic Treaty parties deeply regret that this is the sixth session of the General Assembly at which it has not proved possible to arrive at consensus on the issue of Antarctica. The continued failure to achieve consensus on the item on Antarctica is a matter of concern for the General Assembly. Consensus is the only realistic basis for dealing with the item in the General Assembly.

The Treaty parties continue to believe that consideration of Antarctica by the General Assembly should proceed only on the basis of consensus. This approach is based on full regard for the integrity of the Antarctic Treaty and the continuing successful operation of the Treaty system, which is beneficial also for non-parties

(Mr. Wilenski, Australia)

to the Treaty. The *Treaty* parties regret therefore that the proponents of draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2** remain unwilling to take the necessary steps to **recognize** this and achieve consensus.

Treaty parties, in order to leave no doubt of their view that the question of Antarctica should continue to be handled only **on** the basis of consensus, will not participate in the voting on draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2**. On draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1**, Treaty parties will **reflect** their views in ways that do not prejudice their position **on** the integrity of the Antarctic Treaty. Most **will** not participate.

I **request** a roll-call vote **on** each **of** the draft resolutions.

As I have previously indicated, a **number** of *Member* States will indicate that they are *not* participating in **the** voting. I ask that **the records** of the Committee indicate explicitly that those Members chose not to participate in the voting.

Mr. KAMBWE (Zambia) has asked to speak in order to associate itself with the statements **of the** representatives of Malaysia and Tunisia **in** regard to draft **resolutions A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2** and **A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1**, as orally amended, which they introduced **on** 21 **and** 28 November **1990** respectively under agenda item 67, "Question of Antarctica". My delegation is proud to be among **the** sponsors of both draft resolutions.

My **delegation** is optimistic that these draft resolutions will not suffer the fate of previous resolutions on this subject, which were mired in the **unproductive** East-West politics **of** yesteryear,

With regard to draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2**, we are **particularly pleased** that the **draft** resolution seeks to **give concrete** expression to the declaration of Antarctica as the common heritage **of** mankind by **recommending** the

(Mr. Kapambwe, Zambia)

setting up of a United Nations research facility in Antarctica. That action-oriented approach is one which we hope will characterize the United Nations; this would enable it to meet to the full all the potentials given it by its founding fathers.

The recommendation of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2 to establish a United Nations research facility in Antarctica should, therefore, receive the unqualified support of the entire membership of the United Nations, in whose interest it is proposed the facility be established. The benefits that will accrue to all Member States from the United Nations research facility cannot be over-emphasized,

My delegation also hopes that the generally positive international political atmosphere in which this General Assembly session is taking place will enable the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to align themselves with the majority view in the United Nations with respect to the membership and scope of the Antarctic Treaty. In particular, my delegation appeals to the Consultative Parties to expedite the implementation of the measures requested of them by the present draft resolution and by previous resolutions on Antarctica.

(Mr. Kapambwe, Zambia)

With regard to draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1**, as orally amended, my delegation wishes to underscore its disappointment that, long after the racist South African **régime** was suspended **from** membership of the General Assembly because of its **apartheid** policies, it has continued to be a **member of** the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties and to participate **in** their **meetings**, including the ongoing Santiago special session. We find it difficult to **understand** the basis on which the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties find the participation **of** the United Nations Secretary-General in their meetings unacceptable while seating the delegation of South Africa. The Secretary-General is, moreover, the Personification of the United Nations, **under** whose jurisdiction should fall the management **of** all those environments designated as common heritages of mankind, of **which** Antarctica is one.

Some may wonder why the countries of southern Africa should continue to insist on the isolation of South Africa when **the current** Government in South Africa has taken **some** measures, such as the **unbanning** of political parties, the release of some political prisoners. including Nelson Mandela, and the lifting **of** the state of emergency. These measures are indeed **most** welcome.

But apartheid did not begin when political **parties** were banned, nor did it begin when Nelson Mandela was imprisoned; and it **most** certainly did not begin when the state of **emergency** was imposed in South Africa. All these events **were** mere consequences undertaken in the defence **of apartheid** and did not, either singly or collectively, define **apartheid**. That these measures are no longer in **force** is therefore not equivalent to the end of **apartheid**.

We have been asked to be realistic, to drop the rhetoric of a bygone era and to come up with **a language of** the 1990s in regard to South Africa. It is a great pity that **some view apartheid as a matter of mere** rhetoric. **Apartheid** is more serious **than** that. Millions of our people have lost their lives at the hands of

(Mr. Kapambwe, Zambia)

apartheid. Talk about the team of thousands of amputees in Angola; talk about the hundreds of thousands of starving refugees in the region) talk about the thousands of orphaned children and the widowed; talk about the economic dislocation of the countries of Southern Africa - and in all these tragedies apartheid has been the root cause. To us in the region, apartheid is a reality - an everyday reality.

The Committee may wish to know that only two days ago, on Monday, 26 November, at around 1 a.m., a bomb exploded in Lusaka, the capital city of Zambia, at the house of a cadre of the African National Congress. Luckily, no one was killed,

Yes, we would be more than willing to bring our rhetoric on South Africa up to date with the language of the 1990s, that we do not know how the apartheid of the 1990s differs from the apartheid of the 1940s, the 1950s, the 1960s, the 1970s or the 1980s.

Mr. Dzvaire (Zimbabwe): The delegation of Zimbabwe announced itself with all previous speakers who expressed concern at the status quo in Antarctica and the continuing polarized positions on the part of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties and the rest of the international community.

The environmental aspects of Antarctica have been elaborately and exhaustively highlighted by many speakers. Their importance in view of the implications for all of mankind cannot be overemphasized; and these aspects must be urgently addressed before it is too late. However, my delegation fears that in addressing the very pertinent questions of Antarctica and the environment we may well fail adequately to address the burning question of the management of the continent. The implications of the management of Antarctica and their potentially explosive effects on international peace and security warrant closer attention in this regard of much-touted improvement in the climate of international relations.

(Mr. Dxvairo. Zimbabwe)

Thus far, thankfully, Antarctica has remained a nuclear-weapon-free **zone**. However, in the absence of internationally laid down and agreed principles relating to territorial claims and the legal status of the continent, the possibility of territorial conflicts remains an underlying if ignored threat. We shudder to think of what would happen in the event of territorial conflicts between those Parties with research stations on Antarctica, especially in view of the fact that many of these stations have military personnel carrying out experiments in what we understand to be a civilian capacity.

My delegation welcomes the responsible stance taken by some Treaty Parties in calling for a world park to be established on Antarctica, and sincerely hopes that this is the beginning of genuine dialogue on the future of that crucial part of our common world. In urging members of the Committee, especially those who are also Treaty Parties, to facilitate this dialogue, my delegation hopes that they will pay closer attention to draft resolutions **A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2** and **A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1** and give them the support they deserve in the interests of the entire international **community**.

Mrsi MULAMULA (United Republic of Tanzania) **wishes** to associate itself with the statement made by the representative of Tunisia on behalf of the African Group. My delegation wishes, however, to make a brief statement before the Committee takes action on the two draft resolutions regarding the question of Antarctica.

It has now been eight consecutive years that the General Assembly **has** been considering the question of Antarctica, a question which **over the years** has assumed great importance in the maintenance of international peace and security and the protection of our environment. The successive debates on the question in **our Committee** have undoubtedly galvanized world public opinion in favour of **preserving** Antarctica **for the benefit of all mankind, an opinion** which the Treaty Parties

(Mrs. Mulamula, United
Republic of Tanzania)

can certainly no longer ignore. As one writer on the environment so succinctly put it:

"The white continent's affairs may once have been run by an exclusive club of diplomats and scientists, but they are now accountable to an increasingly wider audience",

The emerging trends in international relations that many have welcomed during our deliberations at this session have unfortunately not influenced positively the consideration of the question of Antarctica, which is equally important in the bid to foster international co-operation and understanding, and we are still witnessing the silent conspiracy of the Antarctic Treaty Parties. The advocates of transparency, glasnost and objective information on military matters as necessary measures for building confidence among countries and regions of the world have not seen fit to extend such principles to the management of Antarctica. The Antarctic Treaty system remains a closed shop. We all have the right to know what is going on in that continent, which represents a common heritage of mankind and the mismanagement of which would have a bearing on our future existence on the planet.

While we do not dispute the reports that the Antarctic Treaty Parties have kept Antarctica free of *the* arms race, it is incomprehensible on the other hand that the so-called peaceful scientific research stations are being manned by military personnel.

(Mrs. Mulamula, United
Republic of Tanzania)

This is deplorable. It is the hope of my delegation that the study requested in draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2** will pave the way for the establishment of a United Nations scientific monitoring station.

I wish now to turn to an issue that has always troubled my delegation, that is, the question of the continued participation of **South Africa** in the closed and secret meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties. That South Africa, which represents an outlawed regime and a **system** that has been condemned as a crime against humanity, should be accorded consultative **status**, which allows South Africa to participate in decision-making as a **civilized** nation is hard for many of us to comprehend. As a **system, apartheid** negates all the principles of international law which **the** parties to the Antarctic Treaty purport to uphold.

It is therefore the hope of my delegation that reason will prevail and that the Antarctic Treaty Parties will **take** the necessary measures to exclude that **régime** until such time as a free and democratic system has been established in South Africa.

The CHAIRMAN: The **Committee** will now proceed to take a decision on revised draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2**, entitled "Question of Antarctica". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the 43rd meeting of the First Committee on 21 November **1990**. An oral statement will be made with respect to its programme budget implications.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors and the oral statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): t **resolution**

A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2 has the following sponsors: Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Brunei **Darussalam**, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Comoros, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, the United Republic of **Tanzania**, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

I would also like to **make** the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General with regard to draft resolution **A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2**, entitled "Question of Antarctica**.

By the terms of operative paragraph 5 of that draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to undertake a comprehensive study with the help of relevant United Nations programmes and **specialized agencies such as the World Meteorological **Organization** and the United Nations Environment Programme, using available data and resources, on the establishment of a United Nations-sponsored station in Antarctica with a view to promoting co-ordinated international co-operation in scientific research for the benefit of mankind, particularly the importance of Antarctica to **the** global environment and ecosystems, **as** well as to act as **an** early-warning system on climate change and accidents, and submit a report thereon to the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session.

"By the terms of operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, the Assembly would also request the Secretary-General to submit a report, using available data and **resources**, on the state of the environment in **Antarctica** and its impact on the global **system** to the General Assembly at its forty-sixth **session**.

(Mr. Kheradi)

"In carrying out these tasks, the Secretary-General would request and collate such information as might be provided by Member States, the relevant specialised agencies, programmes, organs, organisations and bodies of the United Nations system, including but not limited to the World Meteorological Organisation and the United Nations Environment Programme and other relevant international organizations.

"In programme element 2.3 - Regional Security Co-operation and Zones of Peace - under section 2A.B - Department of Political and Security Council Affairs - of the programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991, provision is made, inter alia, for substantive servicing of the First Committee of the General Assembly in relation to Antarctica and for reports of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly. Accordingly, it is envisaged that there would be no programme budget implications for the biennium 1990-1991."

The CHAIRMAN: A roll-call vote has been requested on revised draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2.

A roll-call vote was taken.

Peru, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Fiji, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Malta, Portugal, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Venezuela

Revised draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.63/Rev.2 was adopted by 7 votes to non . with 8 abstentions.*

* During the course of the roll-call vote the following **members** announced that **they were not participating: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Romania, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam.**

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1 as orally revised.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1 was submitted and introduced by Tunisia on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States.

The CHAIRMAN: A roll-call vote has been requested.

A roll-call vote was taken.

The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Ireland, Liechtenstein, Malta, Mauritius, Portugal, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1 was adopted by 84 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

* During the course of the roll-call vote the following members announced that they were not participating: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Romania, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: I call now on representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. SADER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): Once again, my delegation feels compelled to explain why it did not participate in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1, which the Committee has just adopted, regarding the participation of South Africa in the meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties.

Ever since the question was first raised in the Committee my delegation has maintained a consistent position on what, in its view, are the areas of application of two distinct international legal instruments. We believe that the draft resolution does not apply to the Washington Treaty, which is governed by its own norms, in keeping with international law. That is the simple reason why we did not participate in the voting.

Similarly, I repeat that our position should not be interpreted as meaning that Uruguay has in any way altered its policy of total condemnation of the system of apartheid.

Mr. BELLINA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The Peruvian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/45/L.64/Rev.1, as orally amended, which was introduced by the delegation of Tunisia on behalf of the Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States. This was because the Government of Peru believes that it will help to strengthen the international community's appeal to the Government of South Africa to end the unjust and inhuman system of apartheid. Thus, our vote in favour in no way implies that we are questioning the principles of international law applicable to obligations and duties deriving from international treaties.

JB/13

A/C.1/45/PV.47

47

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has completed its consideration of agenda item 67.

The meeting rose at 5.35 P.m.