



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 52nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

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

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

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

28p.

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA **ITEMS** 67, 68, 69 AND 141

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

The **CHAIRMAN**: This morning the **Committee** will begin its general debate, consideration of and action on draft resolutions on agenda items 67, 68, 69 and 141 relating to international security.

In connection with **item** 67, entitled "**Strengthening** of security and **co-operation** in the Mediterranean region", I should like to draw the attention of delegations to the report of the **Secretary-General** in document **A/41/486/Add.1**, containing proposals, declarations and recommendations from **Member** States on strengthening peace, security and **co-operation** in the **Mediterranean** region.

Item 68, entitled "Review of the **implementation** of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", is a long-standing subject considered by the Committee. At each session it has provided an opportunity for many delegations to present their **positions** on the most **outstanding aspects** of international **peace** and security.

In regard to item 69, entitled "Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international **peace** and security", I should like to point out that **the ad hoc** committee called for by resolution **40/159** has not been established. The Secretary-General, in his note in document **A/41/431**, **states** that

"The President of the **General Assembly** **conducted** consultations with the chairmen of the regional groups to constitute the membership of the **ad hoc** committee ...". (**A/41/431, para. 3**)

(The Chairman)

The Secretary-General also draws our attention to the fact that, owing to different opinions of the regional groups pertaining to the allocation of the number of seats, no agreement could be reached and, therefore, the ad hoc committee has not been constituted. Accordingly, the progress report called for in the aforementioned resolution is not available for consideration.

Finally, the Committee has on its agenda a new item submitted at this session entitled "Establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security". For its consideration, the Committee has before it a letter dated 5 August from the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addressed to the Secretary-General and contained in Document A/41/191, as well as a draft resolution in document A/C.1/41/L.89.

During the consideration of disarmament problems, many delegations highlighted the intimate relationship between international peace and security and disarmament. It was pointed out that security cannot be ensured for any State, big or small, as long as the arms race continues unabated on earth. Moreover, there is a danger of spreading the arms race into outer space. Concern was expressed that, in spite of certain recent positive developments in international relations, the world is confronted with extremely difficult global problems.

In addition to the arms race, there are other causes for the erosion of international security, such as the existence of conflicts and tensions in many parts of the world and the persistence of hunger, poverty and underdevelopment in many countries. Consequently, delegations stressed that in order to enhance international peace and security comprehensive measures should be adopted, and I hope that through its deliberations the Committee will make a contribution to that end.

(The Chairman)

The proclamation of 1986 as the **International Year** of Peace constituted a **source** of inspiration for **peoples** and **Governments** everywhere to **contribute** to **peace** and security. I believe **that Member States have** the potential and instrumentality to find genuine **solutions to the major issues confronting humanity**. It is my firm conviction that, through a constructive dialogue and spirit of **compromise**, we **can** find the ways and means **to enhance** the goal of **world peace** and **security**.

Mr. ESZTERGALYOS (Hungary): Although document A/41/191 outlines in broad **terms the reasons** why the **sponsors found it necessary** to request the inclusion of this new item on the **Committee's** agenda, I should **like** to go into **somewhat** more detail about **some** of the ideas **contained** in that **document**.

At the outset, I should like to say a few words **about the present** international **situation** that prompted the **sponsors** to **come** forward with this initiative. **If we** compare the **present time** and the **threats we** are now **facing with** the time of the creation of the **United Nations 40 years ago**, we find a qualitatively different **situation**. At that time, the task was to save succeeding generations from the **scourge** of war. How, if we were to **commit the mistakes** of the past and allow a **descent down** the path to **confrontation**, there would be no **succeeding generation to be saved**. **For** the first time in its **long** history, mankind possesses the **material basis for** its own **annihilation**. That **fact** in itself **requires new thinking**, especially concerning concepts of **security** as the most directly relevant area. **We take encouragement from the** fact that similar thoughts' were **expressed** earlier in the **Committee** by **many** speakers from different groups during the general debate.

It is thus **becoming** increasingly **evident** that security **cannot** be ensured by military means alone. **Even** the **most powerful States** possessing the **most**

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

destructive weapons cannot feel secure. National security cannot be ensured unilaterally; it is increasingly interrelated with international security. In other words, security has become indivisible. It can only be universal and equal for all. That implies that security cannot be ensured at the expense of others. On the contrary, security policies should be conducted on the basis of co-operation and States should keep in mind the security interests of other States.

Another important and relevant recognition of recent times is the broadening of the concept of security. For us, security is not just a question of military balance; it is also the elimination of imbalances in the world economy, joint solutions to the global problems of mankind and economic co-operation, as well as opportunities for contacts between people and respect for human rights and other basic rules of conduct among States.

Therefore, when we propose the idea of the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, we propose to tackle all the relevant problems in an integrated manner, recognizing their interrelationship.

That approach would be new. So far, all attempts to solve the important issues have been made separately from each other, in different forums, concentrating mainly on their internal connections without paying due attention to their interrelationship.

A comprehensive system which would cover not only the military and political but also the economic and humanitarian-human rights fields, and which would also be comprehensive in the geographical sense, covering every continent and country of our globe, would, in our view, hold better prospects for a co-operative solution of the problems we are facing.

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

The reason for proposing the elaboration of this new concept in the United Nations is really self-explanatory. The United Nations is an almost universal organization in terms both of its membership and of its areas of activities. Its main task - what we would like to strengthen - is the maintenance of international peace and security, but that is not its exclusive task. The United Nations has an important role to play in other fields as well, interrelated with purely security issues.

In fact, the United Nations is the only international organization that is suitable for launching this idea and the only organization capable of putting it into practice. But that suitability is mutual. Not only is the United Nations suitable for our initiative, but our initiative is also suitable for the United Nations.

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

It is fully consistent with the provisions of the United Nations Charter; its realization would enhance both the prestige and the effectiveness of the United Nations and ensure full compliance with the provisions of the Charter by all.

Let me add a few words for the sake of those who might ask: If our initiative is so fully in conformity with the Charter - moreover, if all the elements of our proposal are already covered by the Charter - why do we need it? Is it not enough to live up to the provisions of the Charter?

We consider the United Nations Charter to be a document of fundamental importance. We respect it and do not want to rewrite it. However, its provisions cannot and do not cover all the spheres of international life in a sufficiently detailed manner. In some areas we have already succeeded in working out important and more detailed international documents - for instance, in the field of human rights based on the Charter - in order to ensure fuller compliance with its letter and spirit. It would only help bring about realization of the provisions of the Charter if we could agree on principles governing other important activities as well.

Take economics, for instance. The Charter recognizes the relationship between stability and well-being, on the one hand, and peaceful and friendly relations, on the other. It even sets the aims: to promote higher standards of living, full employment, conditions of economic and social progress, and so on. But the Charter does not spell out how we are to achieve those goals or what principles should govern our co-operation in the economic field. This issue is of direct relevance to our subject. Security, political security, can only be called solid if economic security is assured. Economic problems between States can and do lead to political tensions and, conversely, political tensions have an adverse effect on the development of economic relations.

(M Esztergalyos, Hungary)

Would it not be logical to try to work out guidelines on those and other related fields?

We know full well that the process of establishing a comprehensive system of international peace and security will be a long and complicated one. But we are not starting from point zero. Valuable ideas and experience have been accumulated both within and outside the United Nations. Suffice it to refer to the decisions and documents of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Delhi Declaration, the proposals by the six States from four continents and the thoughts, ideas and proposals of the Palme Commission.

We did not come here with ready-made answers. We should like to know the opinions and ideas of others. How would they envisage the elaboration of ideas leading to the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security? We need those views and ideas all the more because alone we cannot establish such a comprehensive system. We need the involvement of all countries large and small.

We are not engaging in a propaganda exercise. We do not ask who is responsible for the present dangerous situation. Rather we should like to search for a way out, in co-operation with other Member States. Our aims for this session are quite modest. We should like to launch, to introduce this new idea, to hear the views and ideas of others and, after analysing them, to come back to this issue at the next session with more concrete ideas and proposals.

Before concluding I should like formally to introduce Graft resolution A/41/C.1/L.89 on my country's behalf and also on behalf of the other sponsors - the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(Esztergalyos, Hungary)

I hope that after this statement I need not dwell on the merits of our draft resolution. I also hope that after careful examination other delegations will find it non-controversial both in form and in content.

The draft resolution would essentially like States to contribute to the working out of the basic ideas for the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security and would assure our continuous involvement with the present item.

Mr. GARCIA ITURBE (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish) : Our Committee is beginning its analysis of the items related to international security at a time when it is of the highest importance for the international community to make an effort - perhaps a greater one than ever before - to achieve the strengthening of world peace and security. If we analyse the situation of international political relations at present, and furthermore if we analyse the impact of various areas of tension on the world situation, it is obvious that some of the events of recent times have led to a greater deterioration in the whole process of understanding and international co-operation.

One of the events of major significance of recent months, the summit meeting in Reykjavik, did not lead to the results for which we had all hoped with regard to nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space, because of the obstacles raised by those who insist on militarizing outer space and turning it into a new area for confrontation and aggression.

The Conference on Disarmament, the only multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, continues to be unable to initiate practical negotiations on a nuclear test ban, on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and the prevention of nuclear war because a few of its members make that impossible.

At the world-wide level, we see actions taken that continue to raise problems

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

and increase the risk of aggravating already explosive situations we face, whether in Central America, in southern Africa, in the Middle East, the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean or the Caribbean.

The common element inherent in all this is the constant efforts to achieve military superiority, in order for some to impose themselves on others from a position of strength, and attempts to maintain an unfair international economic order from which we all suffer and which, instead of alleviating present difficulties, tends to increase them.

That is why my delegation believes that, in relation to the examination of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, it is of the highest importance once again to call on all States³ scrupulously to comply in their international relations with, their obligations under the United Nations Charter and to refrain from using force or threatening the use of force, from intervention, interference and aggression, and from imposing coercive political or economic measures, and to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence and security of other States.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

It is highly necessary that all States co-operate in efforts to halt the arms race and to achieve general and complete disarmament. To that end, negotiations must be commenced immediately, with a view to implementing the recommendations and decisions taken in this regard by the various United Nations bodies that have considered the question.

In a worldwide context, it is important that actions threatening international peace and security in various regions should cease.

In Central America it is imperative that the United States Government cease its uninterrupted intimidating and threatening military manoeuvres in the region. If peace and security are to be ensured in the area it is extremely important that that Government halt its interventionist policy aimed at overthrowing the Government of Nicaragua, for the pursuit of which the United States Congress recently appropriated the sum of \$100 million. It is also extremely important that the United States halt its manoeuvres and its pressure against Nicaragua's neighbours; these activities affect the sovereignty and self-determination of those countries with respect to their international relations. Such steps by the United States would be a very important factor for the success of the Contadora peace initiative, and would finally bring about that which all of us in Latin America desire: peace in the region.

The final document of the eighth summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held recently at Harare, contains the following statement about the situation in Central America:

"In this connection, the Heads of State or Government expressed outrage that the United States Congress had approved the allocation of further funds totalling \$100 million to its mercenary contra army, authorizing the open participation of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in its direction and

(Mt. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

control as well as the participation of military advisers, **members** of the Special **Forces** of the **United States armed forces**, in the training of the mercenary **forces** for the purpose of overthrowing the **legitimately-constituted Government** of Nicaragua. They strongly condemned this immoral and illegal act which violates accepted norms of **international** behaviour and law. They **emphasized** that this blatant act of **aggression** against the **Republic** of Nicaragua not **only** violates the **sovereignty**, political independence and **self-determination** of that **country**, a **member** of the **Non-Aligned Movement**, but **also constitutes** an affront to the **principles and objectives** of the **Movement** of Non-Aligned Countries and of the Charter of the **United Nations.**" (A/41/697, para. 227, p. 105)

Apart from Central America there is another area of **tension** on which the **United Nations** has often declared its **position**, and where imperialist interference is seen: **southern Africa**. The same **warlike, interventionist position** and the same **scorn** for the principles of the **United Nations Charter** and the decisions and **resolutions** of this **body** have perpetuated a situation which is so **irrational** and inhuman that it ought to have ceased years ago. In that **connection, Comrade Fidel Castro**, in his address to the **Harare summit**, said the following:

"The current **United States Administration** has peremptorily refused to **accept economic** sanctions against South Africa and has systematically vetoed **Security Council** decisions affecting the Pretoria **régime**. At the **same time**, with growing fury, it establishes economic blockades against small progressive or **revolutionary countries** such as **Cuba, Nicaragua, Viet Nam, Libya** and the **Democratic People's Republic of Korea**.

(Mr. García Iturbe, Cuba)

"Encouraged by the support it gains from the United States Government's policy of so-called constructive engagement, South Africa not only defies the world by retaining and strengthening apartheid, but also continues its occupation of Namibia and prevents that colonized country from gaining its independence, in open defiance of all the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations.

*South Africa organizes mercenary bands to destabilise neighbouring States and carries out traitorous surprise attacks against Lesotho, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Angola. Through its continued support for subversive groups, it disregards the the Nkomati agreement it signed with Mozambique. Now, with its open, shameless support for the UNITA bands in Angola; the United States has supplemented these destabilising plans by introducing into Africa the nefarious methods it has used in Latin America:

We see a similar situation in the Middle East, where, owing to the 'strategic alliance' of the United States with Israel, the latter country continues to occupy Palestinian and other Arab territories and to exploit their natural resources and wealth, United States assistance to the Israeli Zionists has prevented and continues to prevent the implementation of United Nations resolutions and of the recommendations of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, as adopted by the General Assembly. .

It is relevant at this stage to make a few brief comments about the implementation of the collective security provisions of the United Nations Charter designed to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. My delegation thinks it is vitally important that the United Nations play the role entrusted to it by the Charter in relation to the maintenance of peace and the solution of international problems, To do this it is essential that all States

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

respect the purposes and principles of the Organization and co-operate in applying Charter principles to various situations before the Organization, in particular those being considered by the Security Council.

It is imperative today that we begin to take the necessary steps toward creating a comprehensive system of international security, encompassing not only the military sphere but also political and economic security, with a view to guaranteeing development opportunities, especially for the developing countries.

When we analyse the various factors influencing the effective maintenance of peace and the strengthening of international security, we must take into consideration the importance in that connection of the economic development of countries, of their social situation and of the trading system determined by the international economic order - hence the importance of convening the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

It is important for the maintenance of international peace and security that the present situation of the world economy be remedied. Each year hundreds of billions of dollars are wasted on weapons while two thirds of the world's population lives in poverty and misery. It is of basic importance that the disarmament measures we adopt lead to freeing a variety of technical and economic resources that could be used, especially, for the benefit of developing countries.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

Finally, there must be a greater awareness that the establishment of a new international economic order is part and parcel of the over-all efforts to ensure lasting peace. This must be done by restructuring the world economy and by wiping out the existing economic differences between the developing and the developed countries. This gap, in conjunction with the present situation of exploitation, has led to the heavy burden of external debt so many peoples have to bear.

A world-wide system of international security, conceived as a system of practical measures and specific obligations within the framework of the United Nations Charter, would assist in implementing collective acts taken in all spheres to maintain world peace and would assist in reaffirming the role of the Charter of the Organization in international life. We are in favour of a system equal for all, whether small or large, which would lead to security in all spheres - military, political, economic and humanitarian.

As we said at the very beginning of our statement, this is a very complicated time in the international political situation, and it is of extreme importance that all of us, with full awareness, should devote our efforts to ensuring a régime of peace which would make it possible to work towards satisfying the most elementary needs of our peoples. To do so we must achieve the security that would permit us to use with confidence the resources available to mankind in a constructive manner and for the benefit of our own lives.

We believe that this is a task where the underdeveloped countries have a lot to receive and the developed countries a lot to give. If we can ensure that this exchange is carried out in a harmonious, honest and respectful way, then every step taken in that direction will be one more step towards strengthening international peace and security.

(Mr. Garcia Itucbe, Cuba)

Before concluding, I should like to quote the following words from the statement of Comrade Fidel Castro at the Harare Conference of Heads of State and Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which objectively reflect the situation:

"Peace, disarmament, the settlement of the external-debt problem and the new economic order are indivisible matters. If the statesmen of the developed capitalist countries are not capable of seeing things in that way, they will be recognizing the anachronism, the egoism and the irrationality of their own economic and social system, as well as their total inability to contribute to the solution of the problems of today's world.

"We cannot sit back with hands folded; we must find solutions because we have the right to survive the dangers which threaten us and to live in dignity and peace."

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In submitting the question of the establishment of a comprehensive System of international peace and security for the consideration of the forty-first session of the General Assembly, the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, are motivated by serious concern for the fate of the world and for the future of the peoples. They act on the understanding that international relations are at a crucial point now. We are all faced with a historic choice: either to allow the onerous legacy of the flawed logic of confrontation and of the struggle for power to plunge the world into nuclear self-annihilation, or to be guided in our actions by new thinking, which calls for political solutions to the problems of this nuclear and space age.

This dilemma confronts each people and State, regardless of their political orientation. At this extremely important, perhaps even appealed, decisive, moment

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

in mankind's history, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on 19 November this year, to all parliaments and peoples

"resolutely to come out in favour of a practical transition to building a nuclear-free world and establishing reliable security, equal for all States.

This goal should be set above any disputes and ideological differences between States".

Whether the twenty-first century will become a golden age or whether the world will be turned into a radioactive desert actually depends on the ability of the international community to embrace new political thinking.

By virtue of its vocation as a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations, the United Nations must take up this challenge of the day. As has often been the case at crucial times in history, the United Nations should now use its moral and political authority to facilitate the development of revitalizing processes in international life and help nations find a common language, mutual understanding and trust.

That was precisely the role played by the United Nations in encouraging the positive trends towards the easing of tensions in the 1970s. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted in 1970, charted timely routes for taking concrete actions to address pressing international issues and improve international relations. Although many provisions of the Declaration have yet to be put into effect, this document has left the world community richer for the experience it has gained in considering the problem of ensuring international security on a comprehensive basis, with due regard for the requirements of the day.

Today - and a great deal has been said about this during the debate at the current session of the General Assembly - it is more imperative than ever before to turn our backs decisively on confrontation and espouse relations of peace and

(Mr. Pstrovsky, USSR)

co-operation among States. For that reason it is extremely important that the United Nations should once again focus the efforts of all States along those lines.

For it is here, at the United Nations, that the experience of the coexistence of States on this planet, their achievements and setbacks should be analysed and understood. It is precisely here that we must speak with one another as good neighbours and co-operate in the interest of the life and progress of the present and succeeding generations. It is precisely here, on a democratic and equal footing, that it is our task constructively to discuss the common problems of mankind and find solutions in the interests of all. It is here that we, as members of the single family of nations, can rise above our ideological and other differences in the common interest of civilization, in the name of peace as a supreme value.

The United Nations cannot keep out of the unfolding struggle between the old political thinking and the new one - the struggle which will determine the future of the world. This struggle knows no ideological, geographical or national frontiers. On its outcome depends the question whether civilization will survive and whether any of the ideologies or social systems will have any chance at all of demonstrating its virtues, or whether they will all perish in a nuclear holocaust.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

We believe that there can be only one choice, a choice in favour of exclusively peaceful competition and co-operation. This is a choice to discard hopelessly obsolete and now dangerous concepts with regard to the use of arms as a basis for national security and the admissibility of wars and international conflicts, and the idea that the world can rest on nuclear powder keg.

This old approach must, in our view, give way to a realistic and, if you will, a pragmatic understanding of the commonality of the fate of all States and peoples as passengers on one relatively small and fragile spaceship where safety is of major concern to everyone on board. The realities of the nuclear and space age leave us no choice other than to admit that national security is no more than a figment of our imagination if it fails to form part of international security, and that the most powerful nations can guarantee it only along with other States - and not by military or technological means but, rather, through political and exclusively peaceful means, without detriment to any other country.

From the days of ancient Rome, the axiom of the pre-nuclear age had been: "If you want peace, prepare for war" - in other words, place your own national-security interests above the interests of international security. Today's political thinking has categorically rejected that approach.

It is a postulate of the new political philosophy that security, if we take international relations as a whole, can only be universal. And if we consider the relations between the USSR and the United States as the historically established political and military poles of two different systems, their security can only be mutual. Underlying that philosophy is a refusal to regard other countries and peoples as enemies, as well as a profound awareness of the fact that, notwithstanding all the contradictions and differences that exist in today's interdependent and integral world, when it comes to the most important question

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

we are all partners and allies in the struggle for the survival and progress of the human race.

It goes without saying that what is at issue here is an extremely complex and comprehensive task that cannot be accomplished through the efforts of a single country or even of a group of countries. Nor can it be accomplished at one fell swoop. What is required is purposeful and persevering collective efforts, together with the combined reason and will of the entire world community of nations.

The initiative taken by the socialist countries at this session is based precisely upon the foregoing considerations. Its purpose is to open a broad and productive dialogue on the entire range of issues relating to the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. What would such a dialogue produce? First, it must be emphasized that there is simply no alternative to it, for there is no other way to reach a common understanding of the objectives and means of a collective movement towards a safe and just world for all. Dialogue enables us to analyse and benefit from everything that has so far been done in terms of shaping new political thinking and drawing up a reasonable strategy for security.

In this connection it is important to note that we are not starting from scratch. In fact, it is a matter of continuing work that began at the time the United Nations was founded. For it was the deep insight that saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war was our supreme common task that brought the Organization into being. It is for that reason that the Charter, drafted at the very threshold of the nuclear and space age, remains the foundation for contemporary international relations.

It is no accident that States, out of their desire to erect additional barriers against the threat of war, have throughout the entire post-war period been

(Mr. Petrovsky, (USSR))

attempting to embody the purposes and principles of the United Nations in bilateral and multilateral documents, in Security Council decisions and in General Assembly resolutions and declarations, bearing in mind the real challenges involved in the strengthening of international security in today's world.

A major role in the process of asserting the new political thinking falls to the countries members of the Non-Aligned Movement. In their very first Declaration, adopted a quarter of a century ago, the non-aligned countries proclaimed that

"the principles of peaceful coexistence are the only alternative to the cold war, and to a possible general nuclear catastrophe." (BEO/6/Rev. 2, p. 5)

At the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held recently at Harare, a Declaration was issued that stated:

"The accumulation of weapons, in particular nuclear weapons, constitutes a threat to the continued survival of mankind. It has therefore become imperative that States abandon the dangerous goal of unilateral security through armament and embrace the objective of common security through disarmament." (A/41/697, para. 31, p. 23)

We are gratified to note that the voice of the non-aligned countries, calling for the strengthening of the bases of international peace and security, is sounding out ever-more strongly and insistently. Even those who are reluctant to abandon the outdated stereotypes created by the policy of acting from a position of strength are compelled to heed it.

Similar efforts have been made by the group of six States of five continents that have repeatedly issued warnings about the fragility of any security based on complex technology alone, and that have strongly urged the development of a new concept of global security without nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Also of great value are the ideas contained in the report, "Common Security, a Blueprint for Survival," drawn up by an independent Commission under the chairmanship of the late Olof Palme. That Commission included prominent political and public figures: Egon Bahr of the Federal Republic of Germany, Gro Harlem Brundtland of Norway, Josef Cyrankiewicz of Poland, Jean-Marie Daillet of France, Robert A.D. Ford of Canada, Alfonso Garcia Robles of Mexico, Haruki Mori of Japan, C.B. Muthamma of India, Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria, David Owen of the United Kingdom, Shridath Ramphal of Guyana, Salim Salim of Tanzania, Soedjatmoko of Indonesia, Joop den Uyl of the Netherlands, Cyrus Vance of the United States of America and G.A. Arbatov of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In their conclusions, they stressed the need to replace the widely prevalent concept of nuclear deterrence, which allegedly guarantees peace and international security, with a new approach to ensuring security for all throughout the world.

The pressing need for new political thinking and its gigantic potential were convincingly demonstrated by the meeting between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the United States President, Ronald Reagan, at Reykjavik. That meeting proved that new political thinking, when translated into the language of practical policies, could produce unprecedented results. Never before and nowhere else has such progress been achieved in the disarmament field as was achieved at Reykjavik.

(Mr. Petrovsky, JJSSR)

For the first time in history the declaration was made that the Soviet Union and the United States were ready to eliminate basically all their nuclear arsenals by 1996. For the first time the two sides agreed on an acceptable option for medium-range missiles. In a word, for the first time in essence a package was agreed upon with regard to the entire range of nuclear-disarmament measures, except for one: the question of the strategic defence initiative.

Thus large-scale agreements on problems of war and peace and human survival entered the realm of the possible, which until only recently would have been almost beyond belief.

We must not allow the door to a nuclear-free future that was opened in Reykjavik to be slammed shut. At this meeting of the First Committee we are authorized to say that the USSR has not withdrawn any of the proposals it made in Reykjavik, which were designed to eliminate all nuclear weapons. We should like to inform the First Committee that in their totality those proposals have been set down as guidelines for the Soviet delegation in the Geneva negotiations.

But the Reykjavik meeting showed something else too: in order to solve the urgent and complex problems of the world, what is demanded of the USSR and the United States, and indeed of all States without exception, is a breadth of approach, a sense of responsibility, political farsightedness, realism and honesty.

"Now, after Reykjavik," the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail S. Gorbachev, stressed recently,

"a new situation has emerged in international relations. There is no turning back. But the path ahead lies only in new political thinking, recognition of the realities of the existing diversity of a contradictory yet single world that demands respect for the choice of each people, its right to independence and to its own voice in world affairs.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

"It is precisely on the basis of that position, the position of our twenty-seventh Party Congress, that we have been acting and will continue to act in international affairs."

The representatives of virtually all the main groups of States have at this session of the General Assembly spoken in favour of adopting new approaches to the problem of security. I should like to refer to the statement of the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Kyprianou, in which he said it is

"imperative that we all concentrate our efforts as a matter of high priority on the establishment of an international security system, and any proposal as to that effect should be seriously studied within the context of a result-oriented dialogue for the purpose of achieving the desired objective."

(A/41/PV.10, p. 7)

We welcome the statement made in the First Committee on behalf of the 12 European countries by the Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom, Mr. Renton, that

"We need to see international security based not on armed coexistence but rather (on) . . . co-operation." (A/C.1/41/PV.4, p. 4)

We also agree with the opinion expressed by the United States Government in a letter to the United Nations Secretary-General that security for all requires harmonization of the general views and policies of States.

Launching a broad discussion in the United Nations on the problem of universal security will make it possible to merge into a single stream the innovative ideas of all those who are guided by common sense and have their feet firmly planted on the soil of political realism.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

This proposal of the socialist countries is not confrontational; quite the contrary. In its very essence it is opposed to confrontation. It is a proposal for a constructive, unbiased, open and frank exchange of views. It is designed to find a common language, which is imperative if the United Nations is to become an effective centre for harmonizing national and State interests with the interests of mankind. It is the language of proper, truly civilized relations, one not bound by prejudice or suspicion, not burdened with various reservations that are but clichés intended to conceal reluctance to co-operate.

The proposals of the socialist countries are intended to establish a point of departure and the broad outlines for such an exchange of views. We see in the elaboration of a global security concept a school of new political thinking. We also see it as a stimulus to improve the international climate and to create a favourable atmosphere for the consolidation of relations of peace and co-operation.

Our proposals have nothing to do with mere academic abstractions. They are intended to translate the new political thinking into concrete action. The proposal to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security encompasses both the concept of the long-term positive development of international relations and a determination to find practical ways of achieving it right now, this very day, in the light of existing realities.

The creation of a comprehensive system of international security has as its aim the creation of a world free from policies based on might or the threat of nuclear self-annihilation, a just and democratic world in which there will be no nuclear or military space clubs in which only certain chosen Powers belong. It would be a humane world in which the right of the person to life would be guaranteed, in which peoples would be able freely to choose their own independent path of development. It would be a world of law, order and morality, in which the

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

free and safe development of each people would be vital to the free and safe development and prosperity of the entire international community, a world in which the interdependence of States would be manifested not in the threat of mutual destruction in a nuclear conflagration but rather in mutual understanding and trust, in the development of equal economic and humanitarian relations and the pooling of effort to resolve global problems. The representative of Denmark was right when, during our Committee's general debate, he said that "peace and security implies more than mere absence of war" (P/C. 1/41/PV.9, p. 7).

It is most important now to start, without delay, building a reliable structure of comprehensive global security which would weather any changes in the international climate, strengthen mankind's mechanism of self-protection and ensure that under any circumstances peaceful coexistence would remain the highest principle of relations among States. This structure, we are convinced, should comprise military, political and international legal, economic, moral and psychological direct and indirect guarantees that the world will not be destroyed and that the tasks of doing creative work in conditions of freedom, now facing mankind, would be accomplished through the joint efforts of States and peoples.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The whole edifice of security should rest on a foundation of direct guarantees that both nuclear and conventional war will be outlawed. It is thus crucially important to eliminate the material basis for waging war and to achieve disarmament, which would physically rule out the possibility of the use of armed force.

Dependable security for all requires both the elimination of existing arsenals of weapons on Earth and the prevention of the spread of weapons to outer space. Dependable security cannot exist if the threat from Earth is supplemented or replaced by a threat from space. It is necessary to prevent anything that would disturb equality in the process of disarmament.

Strict and comprehensive international control, without which there can be no trust or disarmament, must be an integral part of the guarantees of global security through disarmament. As we move to a nuclear-free, weapon-free world, the requirement of verifying compliance with the relevant agreements will become even more stringent.

It would be wrong, both theoretically and practically, to view disarmament and another guarantee of security, the settlement of conflicts, as separate. It is rightly pointed out in the United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and international security that progress towards disarmament will strengthen international security by creating conditions that will make it possible to take steps to reduce tension, achieve the peaceful settlement of disputes and take joint action to prevent the outbreak of war.

It is quite obvious that the establishment of international law and order, the elimination of existing regional conflicts on a just basis, the prevention of new conflicts and the resolute suppression of international terrorism are the top-priority tasks in terms of ensuring global security.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Here we face a confrontation whose causes are extremely complex because they are rooted in the historic past of the peoples of the world. It is perhaps in this area more than any other that it is necessary to ensure absolute respect for the right of each people freely to choose its own course of development. It is necessary to engage in a persistent and patient search for peaceful alternative ways to defuse conflict situations in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In order to establish truly dependable security it is particularly important to take measures to bring the structure of international economic relations into line with the requirements of justice and mutual advantage. It is essential to place external economic relations at the service of all peoples and to provide full scope for the economic rapprochement of nations.

The battle against underdevelopment and hunger; co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space and the high seas; protection of the environment; and meeting the energy and raw-materials needs of the planet: those are the goals to which the enormous resources currently being consumed by the Juggernaut of the arms race will have to be reallocated.

By the same token, dependable security is inconceivable without scrupulous observance of human rights and freedom. Here too a new approach is required. The Soviet Union attaches fundamental importance to developing co-operation in the humanitarian field. With that in mind, the Soviet Union has proposed the holding, in Moscow, in the framework of the pan-European process, of a representative conference on a whole range of these issues, including contacts between people and questions of information, culture and education.

Thus, we do not rule out, but rather favour comprehensive and fruitful co-operation in this area, which is of fundamental importance to the ensuring of global security. Nations must search for effective and feasible forms of such

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

co-operation, so as to put an end once and for all to racism and apartheid, to abuses of the honour and dignity of man, to moral degradation and to persecution on political and religious grounds. Our approach to this question is dictated by the fact that it is the interest of real people, of each and every individual, that is the ultimate goal of all our efforts.

A reliable system of global security is impossible without a sound moral and psychological atmosphere, without openness in policy and actions, without the promotion of a spirit of peace in the peoples of the world. The heart of such a system is a spirit of tolerance and mutual respect, and the introduction throughout the world of a political mentality making it impossible to cultivate militarism, hatred and violence.

Honesty in business, flexibility and a readiness to make reasonable compromises with a view to reaching mutually acceptable agreements are also inseparable, integral parts of the new political thinking and style in relations among States. However, if States mix hypocrisy or half truths into their positions, if they use a double standard, believing that generally recognized principles and norms of international law apply only to others and considering themselves completely free to use their own discretion, then the edifice of global security will collapse, being constructed on such a moral and political platform. We cannot do without equal dignity and equal honesty; we cannot remove the barriers of confrontation without them.

Of course, we are aware that in a situation where there are differing social systems, our ideals and our vision of the future are not to everybody's liking. There may also be differences in the understanding of social values. However, these problems should be discussed without hypocrisy or speculation, and without attempts to impose one's views on others.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

It is important to supplement efforts to strengthen universal security on a world-wide scale with the establishment of regional security systems and bodies, and with steps to enhance their effectiveness. In this respect a great deal is being done in Europe, where the confrontation between two military and political groupings appears in stark relief, and where even a feeble spark of armed conflict could instantly develop into an all-destructive nuclear holocaust. In spite of all the difficulties, the mountains of nuclear and conventional arms and the accumulated mistrust and suspicion, the achievements of the European process have set the whole world an example of how the desire for peaceful co-operation can prevail.

The Asian and Pacific region must be enabled to breathe evenly and freely. That is true also of other regions, which can and must be involved in the overall process of establishing a comprehensive system of international peace and security. Steps towards creating zones of peace and co-operation and nuclear-free zones in various parts of the planet are also a contribution to the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, for both regional and global security systems are located within the same matrix of co-ordinates.

The establishment of comprehensive security demands that the greatest possible use be made of all existing international organizations and forums, with due regard of course for the specific nature of their activities. Improving the efficiency of existing machinery for arms-limitation and reduction negotiations is of paramount importance in the process of building a safe world. Where necessary, new international institutions could be set up

A special role belongs to the universal organ for multilateral co-operation: the United Nations.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The beginning of an era of concrete actions to ensure global security in all spheres of international relations raises the problem of further enhancing the authority and prestige of the United Nations and increasing the effectiveness of its decisions. What is required here is a radical reversal towards adopting a reliable and comprehensive system of international security, law and order - that is, towards a practical implementation of the ideas which were conceived at the inception of the United Nations.

The proposed comprehensive system not only does not run counter to the Charter of the United Nations but, indeed, should represent a system of practical measures and specific commitments by States within the framework of the Charter. The initiative of the socialist countries is not aimed at revising or duplicating the United Nations Charter, but at implementing it in present-day conditions. This proposal is fully consistent with the Charter idea of collective actions by States to maintain international peace.

The United Nations not only should take an active part in the elaboration and establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, but also should serve as a ready-made machinery for the functioning of such a system.

Without the United Nations it would be impossible to maintain civilized international law and order in a future nuclear-free and safe world. The United Nations must become a reliable guarantor of a world where international security would be based on law and morality, not on force or arms. In a situation where international relations will be more democratic, the management of the processes which affect the very foundations of the existence of civilization on Earth will increasingly come to depend on the United Nations.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Those are our ideas about the content of a comprehensive system of international security, but we make no claim to possess the truth or to be the final arbiters of the truth. The co-sponsors of the initiative call for a difficult yet necessary undertaking: joint work to produce basic ideas on the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. I cannot over-emphasize that a search for a solution to this major and important problem requires a broad, action-oriented and serious approach, free from propaganda and other encumbrances.

We suggest that, even now, in the course of discussing this issue at the current session, efforts should be made to overcome the logic of confrontation which is still manifest here in the United Nations in the blind repetition of obsolete stereotypes: if one side makes a proposal, the other has to reject it, regardless of its actual content,

Representing here the community of nations, none of us has the right to forget that we have very little time available but that our results should be maximal: we must do away with outmoded political thinking and chart the concept and routes for advancing towards a nuclear-free and safe world.

We expect that during the discussion, views will also be expressed on the content of a comprehensive system of international peace and security and about the lines on which work should proceed in the future,

Furthermore, we believe that the stock of valuable ideas and suggestions should not be allowed to disappear in archives. Subsequently, this stock could be consolidated in a document which would lay down guidelines for moving towards the main goal of establishing a system of reliable and secure peace. We are convinced that such a document could become a kind of synopsis of the ideas and views expressed by States.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Even now we can say with confidence that this document should be oriented towards practical actions by States. The international community is weary of words and fruitless discussions. As we see it, what is needed is a concrete programme of practical measures to provide guarantees of global security in all areas. A United Nations document outlining the concept of a comprehensive system of international security could become a manifesto of the new political thinking, which would inspire and breathe new life into the Charter of the United Nations..

Hence, that is for the future. Right now, in our view, it is important to embark upon a substantive and constructive dialogue, which should not be interrupted. Therefore, a draft resolution of a procedural nature prepared by the -sponsors is now under consideration in the First Committee. The draft suggests that the idea of a comprehensive system of international peace and security should be endorsed in general terms and that consideration of this issue should be continued at the forty-second session of the General Assembly. We expect it to be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind the Committee that, in conformity with the Committee's programme of work and time-table, the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions under agenda items 67, 68, 69 and 1.41 is tomorrow, Friday, 21 November 1986, at 6 p.m.

Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform members that the names of the following delegations are inscribed on the list of speakers for tomorrow morning's meeting: the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, who will speak on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, Poland and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

(The Chairman)

I should also like to inform the Committee that, with a view to conserving conference resources, we have, with the co-operation of the delegations concerned, managed to consolidate the list of speakers for tomorrow and, accordingly, there will be only one meeting tomorrow, at X0.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.