



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 55th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

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

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

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

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

AGENDA ITEMS 67, 68, 69 AND 141 (continued)

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

Mr. LUI XUAN NHAT (Viet Nam): In their Harare appeal, when assessing the international situation after the coming into existence of the Non-Aligned Movement, which now represents two thirds of the world's population and is committed to the search for global security and the development of equitable international co-operation in solving the main political and economic problems of the world, the Heads of State or Government of the Movement's members stated:

"Two and a half decades have passed, and the deterioration of the international situation from the economic, political and security points of view has placed humanity in a situation as serious as, if not worse than, the one which inspired the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries to take action in 1961." (A/41/697, pp. 157 and 158)

we have known of late ambitious strategic military programmes which would not only intensify the arms race on earth but also extend it into outer space, the increased resort to the use of force in international affairs and the greater inequality in international economic relations. If these developments are not stayed, mankind will be confronted with much more complicated threats in the years to come, and first of all the increased threat to its survival posed by the existence of nuclear space weapons and many other types of vastly destructive weapons.

Hence Viet Nam considers the initiative concerning the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security as timely and constructive

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

in **seeking** ways to fulfil the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter under the **conditions prevailing** at present, as well as those **that** will **emerge** in the world in the future. This initiative **is also in line** with **the assessment** contained in this **year's** report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations:

'It **is** in looking ahead at the **characteristics** of the future **world society** as they are now emerging that we can **most** clearly perceive the increasing need for **effectively** structured multilateral co-operation." (A/41/1, p.1)

An **essential** part of the **comprehensive** system of **international peace and security** is to bring to an early end those conflicts which have long brought terrible tragedy to the countries and peoples directly involved and to eliminate hotbeds of **tension** in various parts of the world. Naturally, **durable stability and security** must be based on removing the danger not only of military attack but **also** of political pressure and economic coercion.

There have long existed different explanations of the **causes** of **numerous armed** conflicts and wars that have taken place in the world since the end of the **Second** World War, as well as the cause of continued instability and hence of lack of confidence, in various regions. In one of the most familiar **arguments**, the **cause** **is** attributed primarily to **East-West confrontation**; quite often, it **is** attributed to miscalculation of military capabilities and lack of **openness** in military matters. In analysing these **arguments**, one cannot fail to mention the situation in **Europe**.

At present Europe **is** the continent where the two largest opposing military alliances exist, and it has the biggest nuclear as well as conventional arsenals in the world. **But it is also** in Europe where there really **is** a process of promoting security and co-operation, and thereby **it** significantly contributes to international peace **and** security.

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

Since the historic 1975 **Helsinki** Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, European and other countries concerned have been engaged in successive **stages** in **making** further progress in the strengthening of confidence and security in all fields - military, political, economic **and** humanitarian - and in achieving disarmament. The process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in **Europe** not only constitutes a valuable experience and an important achievement in the struggle of the peace-loving peoples of Europe and of the world as a whole; it **also** amply proves unfounded the contention that local and regional wars and conflicts are a **consequence** of **East-West** confrontation.

The hundred or so wars in **Asia**, Africa and Latin America in the last **40** years, **including** the longest and bloodiest war since the Second World War - that of **Viet Nam** - have been waged **by Powers** that **possess** overwhelming military **capabilities** against the much **smaller** countries of those regions. It was clear from **the very** beginning who **had the military** superiority in those **wars**, and therefore it **was not incomparability** or lack of **openess** in military matters that led to them.

On the contrary over **the past 40** years in Asia, Africa and Latin America reality has shown that it **is** the **policies** of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid, racism and Zionism, which are at variance with every people's **right** to decide its own **future**, that **have** brought about repeated **local** wars **and** instability in various corners of the **world**. **Under** whatever banner such policies may be carried out, they are entirely against the principles **of maintaining** international **peace** and security as set out in the Charter of the **United Nations**: the sovereign **equality** of all **countries**, the peaceful settlement of **international** disputes and the **non-use** or threat of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. In this context **we see** the **establishment** of a comprehensive system of international **peace** and security **as** a process to strengthen

(Mr. **Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam**)

the United Nations collective security system and to facilitate ~~the~~ maintenance or initiation of proper courses to implement concretely and concertedly the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter so that ~~hotbeds~~ of tension can be eliminated and conflicts and disputes ~~between~~ States can be **settled** through peaceful means.

To indicate what such a system may embrace, it suffices just to **name** the initiative of an International Peace Conference on the Middle East, the process pursued by the Contadora **Group** of countries aimed at securing a negotiated **solution** of the crisis in Central America and ~~the framework~~ envisaged by the Organization of African Unity, as well as the Non-Aligned Movement, to achieve **peace**, stability and security in southern Africa.

Today, due to **many** factors, Asia and the Pacific are **acquiring** far greater importance in international life. Situated in that area are countries which have distinct and long histories of political, economic and cultural development and which aspire to new frontiers of development. **One** can **also** clearly see the increased interest shown in that region by all major **Powers**. **Of** late we have ~~quite~~ often even heard that region described as a new centre of gravity.

In **the** years to come the situation there will **develop** through far greater and more complicated interactions of the interests of many ~~of~~ the countries concerned. In our **view**, failure to mention the serious implications for global peace and security of confrontation and **crisis** in the region will run counter to everyone's **interests**. That conclusion also has **been** drawn from the history of **the** region over the past 40 years. Under **present** conditions, the course to be followed must be directed towards a framework that would **enable all** countries concerned to **co-operate** and not to confront one another in advancing their **peoples'** legitimate interests.

(Mt. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

In this spirit Viet Nam **welcomes** and supports the initiative on Asia **and** the Pacific advanced by General Secretary Mikhail **S. Gorbachev** in **Vladivostok** last July. That initiative in essence constitutes a **comprehensive programme** that embraces practical **and** concrete **proposals** aimed at **constructive** dialogue **among** all countries concerned to settle all regional issues on the **basis of** honouring one **another's** independence **and** sovereignty, respecting one **another's** legitimate interests, avoiding confrontation and limiting **and** reducing **weapons** - above all nuclear weapons **and** military activities.

The convening **of** a Helsinki-type Pacific conference attended by all countries of the area will mark a very important change in the process towards peace, confidence, co-operation and **development** in Asia and the Pacific. One can recall the framework of peaceful coexistence **defined** by the 1975 Helsinki Final Act and **the** principles **of** non-use or threat of force, the inviolability **of** existing **orders**, and so on, agreed **among** the participants at the **Helsinki** Conference, set in a constructive **process to** consolidate, through further stages, security and peace on the European continent, **of** which the latest fruit is the **Stockholm** agreement.

We **also** have at our disposal numerous initiatives to be incorporated in such **a** process in **Asia** and the Pacific, namely the signing of **a** treaty of mutual non-aggression **and** non-use of force in relations among States of Asia and the Pacific, the establishment **of** a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific, the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula, **and** so on.

For the past **40** years, South East **Asia** has been the only place in the **world** never to have enjoyed peace. The Vietnamese people have been **subjected** to repeated wars waged by foreign aggressors, and we have carried out an unyielding struggle not only for our independence but also for international peace **and** security.

(Mt. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

Peace and stability have not yet come to the region. while there still exist differences among countries of the **region** and other countries concerned with **regard** to the causes of, and hence the ways of **solving, this situation**, there is a **common** wish among all of those **countries**: to ensure peaceful conditions for their socio-economic endeavours. Therefore we are **of** the view that the solution of the existing differences can be found in dialogue and negotiations between all countries concerned on the **basis of equality**, with neither side imposing its will on the **other**. Viet Nam welcomes the **activities** to this end undertaken by Indonesia, acting as representative of the **ASEAN** countries. Viet Nam, together with other Indochinese **countries**, has made a good number of proposals, and **is ready** to exert its best efforts to promote the trend of dialogue and **co-operation** in solving **the** **question** of South East **Asia** in an **equitable** manner.

On this occasion Viet Nam wishes to reiterate the importance it attaches to the bilateral relations **between** Viet Nam and the People's Republic of China and to recall its desire for the early **normalization** of relations between the two countries. Also, Viet Nam has once again put forth proposals to that end and is cognizant of **the** relevant positions of China. **We** are **ready** for negotiations with China at any level, at any time **and** anywhere so as to resolve the substantive **questions** of mutual concern in conformity with the time-honoured friendship and interests of the two peoples.

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

As strongly teasaerted by the Heads of State or Government of the **Non-Aligned Countries** at their **summit** meeting in **Harare**:

"... there **is** no viable alternative to **co-operation** and peaceful coexistence among States, regardleas of **their political**, economic and social systems, or their **size** ot **geographical location**" (A/41/697, para. 28).

It **requires** not **only** the concerted efforts of all **peoples** but also the far-sighted vision of all Governments **and** statesmen to maintain and develop the achievements of the international struggle for peace and security over the past **40** years in the face of new and **immense challenges** of the present day world. An open, democratic and constructive **discussion** and consideration at the United Nations on the question of the **establishment** of a canprehensive system of **international** peace and security would bevery useful in further **exploring** ways and means to restructure **international** relations on the basis of **co-operation** and joint action for the peaetvation of peace in accordance with **the** realities of the nuclear and the space age.

Mr. SCHMIDT (**Federal Republic** of Germany): On 20 November, the **representative** of the **United Kingdom** of **Great Britain** and Northern Iceland, on behalf of the 12 **member** States of the **European Community**, made a statement on the **agenda** items relating to international security. My delega **tion**, while sharing his views fully, would like to add **some** observations to his statement.

In **its** Article 1 (1), the **United Nations** Chatter, a **legal** instrument. of the **community** of State8 that is unique in the history of nations, spells out as the **first** and hence primary goal of the **United Nations** the maintenance of **international** **peace** and **security**.

The Charter is the **most comprehensive** system for **the** maintenance of international peace and security, binding all **Member** States of the **United Nations**.

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal
Republic of Germany)

The Charter should lay the basis of action for all **States** in **their** concrete effort for a safer and more **peaceful world**. When we in this forum reflect on **ways** to strengthen **international** security, this mandate of the Charter should **also** in the future unalterably remain the **uncontested basis of our** action.

What is called for is concrete **decisions** for the **implementation** of the **provisions** of the United **Nations** Charter and their translation into practical policies of States. The policies they actually pursue **must** be the yardstick for their declared political aims. Their declared political **aims must** be congruous with **their** practical behaviour.

It is therefore with satisfaction that we have taken note of a **statement made** by the **representative** of the Soviet **Union**, who in this forum on 14 **October said** the **following**:

"The times require action from us, not **merely** lofty **speeches** which are not followed by **concrete** action. The world is tired of talk".

(A/C.1/41/PV.4, p.46)

We cannot but emphatically agree with the demand for practical, relevant measures by all States. For our part, we therefore requested in our **statement** during the general debate on disarmament **items in this Committee** on 22 **October** that deliberations in the Committee should be oriented **more markedly** than in the **past** to concrete approaches. **Also in dealing with** the current **agenda items** our **common** deliberations should be concentrated on concrete **approaches**.

We are called **upon to** identify the real requirements for **strengthening** international peace and security. The **First Committee of the General Assembly** should take up this task. It is in this **sense** that the **mandate** given to the Committee by the first special session devoted to **disarmament** must be **understood**,

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal
Republic of Germany)

namely, that it is the task of the Committee "to deal with disarmament questions and related questions of international security".

In conformity with this mandate my delegation wishes to make some observations as to how the comprehensive notion of peace as contained in the United Nations Charter can be better transformed into reality through concrete measures than in the past. In doing so my delegation shall stress the role which our Organization can play in this regard.

The United Nations Charter is founded on a comprehensive notion of peace. It not only proscribes resorting to any form of war as a means of policy but also requires, all States, inter alia, to settle their conflicts by peaceful means, to respect human rights and to develop co-operation in all spheres.

That comprehensive concept of peace underlies the foreign policy of the Federal Republic of Germany. Viewed from this angle, its security policy represents an active policy for peace - as a comprehensive policy of understanding and co-operation. Such a policy fully meets the preconditions of international security.

Primary importance attaches to structures of regional and global balance.

Balance of military power is an essential component of such structures.

International peace, however, cannot be safeguarded by military means alone.

Restraint and calculable responsible behaviour of States also contribute to strengthening security. As an element of security neither perceptions of threat nor the inherent dynamism of developments in the field of weapon technology can be disregarded.

Security is also a matter of respect for human rights and other basic behavioural norms of States, of economic co-operation, and of the possibility of

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal
Republic of Germany)

establishing contact between individuals and a free flow of information across frontiers.

The mandatory ban on the use of force, as enshrined in the Charter, constitutes an indispensable foundation for peaceful relations among States. All Member States have to forgo the threat or use of force to assert their interests - which is to say, they have to refrain from using force as a means of policy in their relations.

This obligation under international law has been accepted by all United Nations Member States upon signing the Charter. In view of growing arsenals and the increasing destructiveness of modern weapons, and of other weapons as well, on a world-wide scale, the ban on the threat or use of force has acquired more and more significance. The horrific record of numerous conflicts that have occurred in many regions of the world - all of them fought with conventional weapons - since the entry into force of the Charter proves, however, that the community of States still has to go a long way to reach the concrete realization of this principle. In the opinion of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany it must be therefore the common goal of all Member States to prevent war in any form, be it conventional or nuclear.

The prevention of war presupposes, above all, political and military stability in international relations. International security can be safeguarded best on the basis of an ensured and credible capability of each individual State to defend itself.

As in the past, international peace and security hinge on the resolve of States to protect their existence through autonomous defense efforts, on their own or in alliance with others. The legitimacy of defense efforts is strictly geared to actual threats and has been recognized by the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal
Republic of Germany)

Adequate defense efforts, however, must be complemented by comprehensive co-operative endeavours in all fields of international relations. Such endeavour must start with the national policies of all Governments. A policy for strengthening international peace and security is essentially dependent on internal peace prevailing in all States.

A policy of peace implies desisting from any attempt to educate people, especially young people, in a spirit of hatred and belligerence. A policy of peace requires education in a spirit of tolerance and of preparedness for dialogue, as well as respect for foreign cultures. A policy of peace implies desisting from domestic policies of constraint and oppression. A policy of peace requires the dismantling of hostile perceptions. A policy of peace is unthinkable without the political will of Governments to realize human rights and social justice in their own countries.

Only on this basis can international co-operation contribute to a strengthening of peace and security. The first goal of international co-operation with a view to strengthening international peace and security is the conclusion of concrete agreements on arms control and disarmament.

(Hr. Schmidt, Federal Republic
of Germany)

Co-operative efforts at arms control and disarmament require, first, renunciation of striving for superiority; secondly, recognition of the legitimate security needs of others and, thirdly, recognition of the equal right of all to security.

Safeguarding international security calls for a substantial contribution by all States. This is why co-operative arms control rightly constitutes a primary subject of the United Nations disarmament debate. In this debate the concrete aim is agreement on realistic, substantial, balanced and reliably Verifiable disarmament steps which will stabilize the security of all parties concerned at the lowest possible level of forces.

That aim can only be achieved through patient negotiations aimed at concrete, verifiable agreements. Unilaterally announced steps are, in principle, not binding; they can be revoked at any time.

Substantial progress along the road to lasting peace is not feasible without a minimum of mutual trust. This applies in particular to all efforts at arms control. These must go hand in hand with concrete confidence-building measures in the military sphere, which, in themselves, do not yet constitute disarmament steps, but which will contribute to reducing subjective threat, fear and distrust.

To serve the end of promoting the realization of confidence-building in the military sphere has been the purpose of the guidelines for universally applicable confidence-building measures elaborated on the initiative of the Federal Government and submitted to the forty-first session of the General Assembly.

Confidence-building in the military sphere means, in concrete terms, that States are enabled to rely on it and that any other State will orient its military potential, its strategy for the use of such potential and its actual attitude strictly to its defensive requirements. This calls for the preparedness of all

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal Republic
of Germany)

States to make available objective information based on facts, as well as for their preparedness to display transparency and openness.

In Europe, the results of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe have shown that substantial progress in this sphere in particular is a possibility. Stockholm furnishes proof of the will and capacity of all Governments involved to break the vicious circle of distrust. The agreed measures are intended to create more transparency in the military sphere and to prevent misinterpretation of military activities. The Federal Government appreciates the result as an important step along the road to more stability through arms control and disarmament. In the deliberations at the Vienna follow-up meeting, security questions are figuring prominently.

What is now needed is to draw concrete inspiration from the results achieved within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) in the field of verification for other arms-control negotiations as well. An accord on and the success of disarmament agreements hinge largely on their verifiability. Effective verification arrangements are a significant element of confidence-building.

In this context the United Nations has an important role to play. The establishment of the Standardized Reporting System for military expenditures marked a first significant step towards increased transparency. We would welcome participation by a greater number of States.

Increased transparency is also called for in the field of international arms transfers. The proposals of the Federal Republic of Germany regarding the establishment of an additional United Nations register of international exports and imports of weapons might facilitate a solution to that problem.

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal Republic of Germany.)

The **United Nations** itself must fulfil an important **function** with regard to the securing of peace. Its main organs, in **particular** the Security Council and the office of the Secretary-General, have been **given** important tasks in the settlement of inter national **conflicts**.

The competence they have been granted by the Charter **should** be made use of to a greater extent than hitherto. That applies in particular to the **possibilities open** to them for the prevention of conflicts. We all know how difficult it is to contain a **conflict once** it has **broken out**, let alone to resolve it. This is why conflicts must be defused during their initial **phase**. To achieve that, we need a well-functioning **early-warning** mechanism to enable the **Security Council** and the **Secretary-General** to act quickly. The possibilities available to the Secretary-General in the field of quiet diplomacy should also be enlarged.

Peace-keeping operations **remain** an indispensable corollary of political **efforts** for conflict settlement. The **Federal Republic** of Germany **supports** this important instrument of peace-keeping to the best of its ability through political, financial and **logistical** means. **No United Nations Member State** should **refuse such** support. The **success** of peace-keeping operations depends in large measure **on** simultaneous political **efforts** for **long-term** solutions to the problems that are at the root of the conflict. In the past, such efforts have often been lacking.

In its statement in the Committee on 22 **October**, my **delegation** stressed the **close** connection between **peace**, security and **development**. It is an **incontestable** fact that States' armament efforts not geared exclusively to defence needs will deny significant **resources to those States'** own economic **development**. The **consequences** of over-armament, however, are not confined to the **States** concerned. **Over-armament evokes in other States a sense of threat to which they, in turn,**

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal Republic
of Germany)

respond by the increased employment of resources for defence purposes. This escalation, so detrimental to all States, must be stopped.

The inseparable connection between disarmament, security and development merits further analysis. The International Conference On the Relationship between Disarmament and Development should make a valuable contribution to such an analysis.

Just as national and international security are preconditions for the economic development of States, the strengthening of international economic co-operation between states can contribute to stabilizing and reinforcing world peace. This applies to both the East-West and North-South relationships.

The Federal Government therefore welcomes the continuous intensification of East-West economic co-operation as reflected in the positive development of commercial exchange between the Federal Republic of Germany and the States members of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance in past years. The conditions for improving economic co-operation should be further promoted in the appropriate forum, especially within the framework of the CSCE process and within the Economic Commission for Europe.

Full use should be made of all possibilities for increased concrete co-operation between East and West with a view to reducing the economic gap between North and South for the benefit of the third-world countries. In this context I have in mind the possibilities offered by the United Nations system in the field of multilateral development co-operation. All States, East and West, are called upon to join in such efforts. However, their bilateral and multilateral contributions in support of the developing countries' own efforts must conform to international quality standards. The developing countries, which have to rely on exports, must be offered fair marketing chances. This includes finding adequate solutions to

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal Republic
of Germany)

reduce **system-related, non-tariff obstacles** to trade between developing **countries and States** with a **centrally** controlled economic order.

Peace **and** security also call for the **vigorous promotion** of cultural and **scientific** exchange between **all States**, as well as for an **intensification** of co-operation **across** national **boundaries** for the **protection** of our natural environment.

A novel threat to international **peace and security** is emanating from international **terrorism**. It has developed into a **common** challenge to all peace-loving States. Solidarity demands that **all States** **fight** international terrorism, and no State can evade that **responsibility**. This was reaffirmed by the General Assembly in resolution **40/61**.

The creation of well-functioning **security** structures **presupposes progress** in bilateral, regional and **global** co-operation in all **these questions**, of which I have only been able, of **course**, to make an incomplete list. The **goals** outlined cannot be reached in the **short term**. **What is needed** is patience **and** the will of all **Governments** to **assume** responsibility. Also needed **is** tolerance and respect for the interests of others. Finally, **what is needed is** the **preparedness** of **all States** to strive for a **reasonable accommodation** of national and international interests. **Such accommodation too** lies in the well-understood national **interest** of every **State**.

Words and declarations, well meant though they **may** be, will be of no help to
us.

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal
Republic of Germany)

We must accept the challenge of finding **concrete** solution⁸ to the various **problems** pceseing upon us. We ace **called upon** to realise, step by step, the **comprehensive system** of **international peace** ad **security** as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Realism and pragmatism, therefore, ehould be the **maxims** of cur work in this forum also.

Our children's future will depend on our **succeeding now** in **buttressing** the **foundations** of peace and security in **comortow's world** through a conce te **strengthening** of international w-operation.

Mc. AL-HIWAI (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): The **general** debate in the **First** commit tee on **iterns** 67, **68**, 69 and 141 of the agenda of **the** forty-f **irst** **session** of the General **Assembly** is of **particular** importance because those items **concern** intecnational peace and security. **This** debate **has** attracted the **participation** of delegations of many **States Members** of the **United Nations** - large ad small; **States** with great military sod **nuclear power** and peaceable **non-nuclear States**; **members** of strategic military **alliances** and **States** of differing **ideologies**, including **non-aligned countries**; developed and **less developed countries**.

First and **foremost**, we should like to **highlight** an important **question**, which **everyone** has long **understood**. The **United Nations** can beccedi ted with the maintenance and safeguarding of the **rights** and **duties** of **member countries**; the **Organization** provides an **opportunity** for all delegations to **express the'r views** in all freedom. **However**, though **items** ace **discusse**d in a very proper manner, **some countries** benefit **more** from their participation in the **United Nations** and in other bodies than do othec³, and it **is** true tnet small countries ace **tirelessly** pursuing efforts to preserve their national rights and interests individually, bilaterally, regionally and collectively. **Thus**, countries may Jiffec radically in their

(Mr. Al-Hinai, Oman)

perceptions of international peace and security and in their **evaluations** of regional, national and international situations.

We have heard the opinions of various delegations on the items under **discussion concerning** international peace and security. Our views in this dialogue should be considered as **those** of a **Muslim Arab country, a developing , non-aligned country** that wants to see the maintenance of international **peace and security** throughout the **world**. We believe that, in order to achieve this **goal**, all **parties** should make **a** positive contribution to creating the necessary **conditions** for a **new** order based on respect for the rights of all peoples and non-interference in **their** internal affairs, as well as the **right** of every people to **choose** its own **political** system and to **pursue** its own developmental and political objectives without any outside **pressure** or intervention.

We **Omanis** are a **Muslim Arab** people that throughout **its** history has enjoyed independence and freedom from **imperialist** occupation. Therefore our national **policy** is geared to **preserving** our security and national **sovereignty** from any threat of **imperialist intervention**. Since July 1970, my country has **maintained** excellent relations with fraternal neighbouring countries; we participate in the Council of Co-operation of the Gulf Countries, the **Organization** of the Islamic Conference, the Non-Aligned **Movement**, and in **the** international **Organization** and its **specialized** agencies. We also realize the **importance of** genuine freedom and **security** if **economic** and social **development** is to be **achieved**.

For all these reasons we believe that **trust** and co-operation **among all** countries of the world, as well as among its various groups, are fundamental to **international** peace and security. It must be **recognized** that the arms **race** is a **serious** threat to the **security** of mankind. Yet, we are also confronted with the continuing regional conflict **between** Iran and **Iraq**; Israel's aggression against the

(Mr. Al-Hinai, Oman)

Arab countries, its occupation of Palestine and the lands of occupied Arab countries and the attacks on the southern part of Lebanon; the failure to halt the hostilities in Afghanistan and Cambodia; and the situation prevailing in Namibia and South Africa. These perennial issues threaten all of mankind and perpetuate international tension. Such a situation hardly furthers the aspirations of all peoples to international peace and security, to which so many efforts have been devoted.

We call upon the two super-Powers - at the summit level, such as the recent Reykjavik meeting, or at the regional or bilateral levels - to set an example of understanding and agreement to emphasise the importance of collective efforts at international peace and security. That would promote United Nations efforts to end the nuclear-arms race and allow the Organization to concentrate on furthering world-wide social progress.

We hope that all nations, out of respect for the choice of the world's peoples, third-world peoples in particular, will refrain from intervening in their internal affairs and help them to safeguard their national right to self-determination, freedom of navigation and international trade. Under the rules of international law the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea should be observed and respected by all parties.

MC. OUNTANA (Burkina Faso) (interpretation from French): In the course of mankind's long march down through the ages, now as anything has been sought so ardently as security. Though originally a narrow, selfish pursuit, both at the level of the individual and at the collective and State levels, fostering almost everywhere the pre-eminence of the principle that "might makes right", security today can only be collective in a world where distances have shrunk and where the means of destruction no longer distinguish between regions and continents.

(Mr. Ountana, Bur kina Faso)

One can readily see why the **problem** of international security has been on the agenda of all international meetings throughout the world and has been the **subject** of the special attention of the **most** eminent individuals. It is no longer just another urgency question among so many others, but *rather a* question of the **very survival** of mankind.

Since its creation, the United Nations has, for its **part**, **made** this problem central to its **work** to "save succeeding **generations** from the scourge of **war**", as the Charter **puts it**. Since 1947 the General **Assembly** has **adopted** several **resolutions** and **declarations** containing general recommendations for reducing international **tension** and strengthening peace and friendship among nations. It has repeatedly called for the prohibition of the use **or** threat of **force** in international **relations** and for the **peaceful settlement** of disputes, and has advocated **the** elimination of the **threat** of nuclear **war**.

Indeed, **since** its **Uniting for Peace** resolution of 1950, the General Assembly has **tirelessly reminded** the international **community** of the constant need to strengthen our **common security** by **responsible** international behaviour in **conformity** with the purposes and **principles** of the Charter. The adoption in 1970 of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was a **significant** example.

Mankind appeared to have learned the bitter **lessons** of the **arms race** and the **power struggle** after two **world wars** that ravaged the world and killed millions of **human beings**. In our view, **the** creation of the United Nations was the logical result of that lesson.

Yet today the **international situation** is far from encouraging. More than ever before, regional tensions are flaring up, **fueled** by **those who fan the flames**. **The** security and **independence** of **small** countries continue to be threatened by

(Mr Ountana, Burkina Faso)

colonialist policies, power and bloc rivalries, policies of domination, the quest for spheres of influence and the persistence of unjust international economic relations.

On the most widely varying pretexts, the most powerful countries continue to use force or blackmail with the threat of force in their international relations, either directly or through armed bands organized and financed by them.

Moreover, throughout the world the basic rights of many peoples continue to be trampled under foot. It is clear that international security cannot be fully achieved until there is justice for all. The elimination of hotbeds of tension in the Middle East, Asia, Central America, Africa and other regions is indispensable for guaranteeing genuine and comprehensive international security.

For us, southern Africa is a matter of particular concern. By its policy of three-way aggression against its own people, against Namibia and against neighbouring independent States, the apartheid régime is creating the conditions for one of the gravest threats not merely to the security of Africa but to that of the entire world. Rightly declared a crime against humanity, apartheid is rooted in the same racist, warlike ideology that led to the Second world War.

The main danger to international security continues to be the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race. In that connection, the Heads of state or Government of non-aligned countries, meeting at Harare, declared that

"the greatest peril facing the world is the threat to the survival of mankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons. Since annihilation needs to happen only once, removing the threat of nuclear catastrophe is not one issue among many, but the acute and urgent task of the present". (A/41/697, p. 23-24)

(Mr. Ountana, But kina Paso)

Urgent ~~measures~~ must be taken to put an end to this dangerous escalation both on Earth and in ~~outer~~ space. Unfortunately, all bilateral and multilateral meetings on the ~~subject~~ have thus far failed to live up to our hopes and expectations.

Burkina ~~Faso~~ will always favour any initiative that brings us ~~closer to~~ our ultimate goal. That is why, having welcomed the ~~unilateral~~ moratorium by the Soviet ~~Union~~ on nuclear testing, we are ~~gratified~~ at the initiative of a number of countries to ~~establish~~ a ~~comprehensive~~ system of ~~international~~ security.

The ~~authors~~ of the ~~Mexico~~ Declaration of 7 August 1986 affirmed that "Poverty and ~~economic~~ hopelessness also constitute a threat to international ~~peace and security~~. This ~~threat is aggravated~~ in many developing countries in which the external debt problem ~~reduces~~ still further their ability to allocate ~~sufficient resources~~ for dealing with the urgent and fundamental needs among their ~~people~~". (A/41/518, annex I, p. 5)

We shall never tire of saying that the waste ~~represented~~ by the allocation to weaponry of a large part of the ~~world's~~ resources is a ~~scandal~~ in view of the ~~poverty~~ that is the lot of millions of human beings.

International security is certainly the ~~business~~ of all, but some, more than others, have a special responsibility in the ~~present~~ situation. It is time to take the measures necessary to return to the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, the right to choose one's own political, social and economic system, the peaceful settlement of disputes and scrupulous respect for human rights must be the guidelines for the ~~conduct~~ of every State. In that way we should be working towards an ultimate goal: a new order based on trust and ~~co-operation~~ among nations, in place of the balance of terror that has prevailed thus far.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): Sixteen years after the adoption of the

Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the General Assembly has come to regard the item on its implementation among one of those perennial items on its agenda. In my view, this is unfortunate, for two main reasons. First, the situation with respect to international security has deteriorated since 1970. A glance at the preoccupations of the plenary meetings of the current session and at the views expressed in this Committee during consideration of the items on disarmament confirm that view.

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

The fear engendered by the current unstable situation in which the world finds itself makes it imperative that we seriously consider how to create the conditions necessary to restore a stable international system. Our age has been an era of paradox. The Second World War conveyed an experience that statesmen at that time were determined not to forget. The end of the war saw a common determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. This found expression in the creation of the instrument for an international collaborative régime for the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Meniji, Nigeria)

The elements of such a régime were aptly summarised in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations, namely: effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression; peaceful settlements of disputes; development of friendly relations among States based on respect for the right of self-determination and sovereign equality of States; promotion of respect for human rights; and co-operation in solving international economic, social, cultural or humanitarian problems. A further element - disarmament - though unspecified in the Charter, nevertheless became a preoccupation of the United Nations in the light of events six weeks after the Charter's signing.

The major paradox of our age is that the century is drawing to a close with so much confrontation in the international system, notwithstanding the existence of the edifice erected with such care to promote global co-operation. This situation, of course, is the result of the abandonment of the system of collective security, which was regarded as central to the Charter. In its place has been substituted alliance security whereby each of the two major alliances tries to shape the world according to its own vision. Out of the ensuing confrontation has arisen the greatest military build-up in world history. Thus the main element of present so-called security is nuclear weapons and the body of doctrine built around it.

Historically, States have always invoked security to justify their acquisition of weapons. The fear of military inferiority vis-à-vis a rival Power has always fuelled competitive acquisition. The alliance system that developed after the Second World War coincided with the ideological cleavage in the world between capitalism and communism. This assured that rivalry was not confined to the home bases of the alliances but extended to the acquisition of influence throughout the

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

world. East-West rivalry in the European sector has thus developed its global equivalent in regional conflicts fuelled by the ideological competitiveness of the rival ideologies.

The most obvious manifestation of the bipolar vision of the world has been the arms race. The development, production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons have been confined to the two alliances, the security of whose members rests on the continued existence of those weapons. Constant refinement and the ever-increasing accuracy and effectiveness of nuclear weapons ensure a never-ending spiral in the nuclear arms race. Although the world in general and the non-alliance members in particular perceive a rough parity in the strength of the two super-Powers, which are the Leaders of the two alliances, the constant fear of inferiority of one alliance is used as justification for taking the nuclear-arms race to ever-higher grounds.

Even if one believed in primary deterrence, clearly this concept has now lost its relevance to the enhancement of security. We are in an era when the use of nuclear weapons as punitive rather than primary deterrence jeopardises the security of the States which the weapons were supposed to protect. But the effect goes beyond this: nuclear deterrence is a selfish doctrine built around the security of a few States. Its failure, however, is bound to jeopardize the security of all States. Experts who have studied this issue have concluded that security cannot be based on deterrence. It has been said that nuclear weapons constitute the greatest threat not only to the security of mankind but to its very existence. Studies on the possible effect of the use of nuclear weapons have resulted in the concept of a nuclear winter that will engulf the whole world.

Sight years after the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the General Assembly held its first special session on disarmament.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Although the session was meant to be devoted primarily to disarmament, the concept of the triangular relationship between disarmament, development and security - which was to be later articulated - was also on the minds of the participants. Thus in paragraph 1.3 of the consensus Final Document of the special session, the General Assembly stated:

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority. Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces, by international agreement and mutual example, leading ultimately to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. At the same time, the causes of the arms race and threats to peace must be reduced and to this end effective action should be taken to eliminate tensions and settle disputes by peaceful means." (resolution A/S-10/4, para. 13)

That same idea has since recurred in other well-considered documents such as the report of the Ulf Palm Commission - that is, the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues - and the report of the Ingar Thasson Study Group on the relationship between Disarmament and Development, the Reports of the Working Groups of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) International Conference on Common Security and, recently, the declaration of the Eminent Persons in preparation for the International Conference on Disarmament and Development.

It is clear that the requirements for the safeguarding of international peace and security go far beyond the present alliance structure and its attendant

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

doctrine of deterrence. Deterrence, it should be stressed, has encouraged rather than prevented the expansion of the means of nuclear destruction and has therefore heightened rather than lessened the fear of destruction by the use of nuclear weapons. The destabilizing effect of the deployment of new generations of nuclear weapons tends to whittle away any potential gain which might be expected from disarmament negotiations and therefore render these negotiations null and void, even while they are being pursued.

If the acquisition of the awesome arsenals of nuclear weapons by the super-Powers has not enhanced their security it can safely be concluded that national security cannot be equated with military might. The requirement of mutual security between the super-Powers has not been strengthened by the arms race. Even their own national security can be said to be progressively diminishing, if not threatened. The fear generated in the nationals of the two super-Powers by the possible use of nuclear weapons is, in my view, creating a dichotomy in the perception of security by Government, on the one hand, and by the people, on the other. Moreover, the ever-increasing resource requirement for the pursuit of the arms race is breeding resentment since many relevant areas of human needs are being neglected. The assumption of putting strain on the economy of one's adversary through competitive spending on armaments may well have a boomerang effect.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Beyond the national aspect, however, there is the international dimension of the economic consequences of the arms race. The ever-spiralling global expenditure on arms - \$950 billion, at current estimates - complicates the North-South relationship, which is the most important non-military threat to international peace and security. At a time of global economic difficulty, which has a very serious effect on developing countries, the refusal of the developed countries to undertake negotiations on the new international economic order is in sharp contrast to their willingness to devote a substantial portion of their resources to the unproductive arms race. Internal stability in many developing countries depends largely on economic performance, on which the global environment has a very great effect. The crushing burden of debt, the loss of income arising out of the constant fall in the price of commodities, the exclusion of the products of developing countries from the markets of the developed countries through protectionist policies, the progressive reduction of resources available to multilateral development institutions all have the effect of exacerbating the polarization of wealth and poverty between the group of countries in the North and in the South. But they also have greater effect on the more vulnerable segment of the population in individual countries, namely, the poor. International peace and security cannot blossom in such conditions.

Current concepts and practices in the area of international peace and security are exclusively and narrowly based. Thus they ignore not only several facets which in reality are very relevant; they also ignore the overwhelming majority of nations which are active contributors to the international scene but which are excluded from the security considerations of the major alliances.

The necessity for an all-inclusive system of security therefore needs to be more vigorously explored. The multilateral forum provided by the United Nations is

(Mr. Adeniji, Niger la)

the most appropriate setting for developing such new **concepts**. The Independent **Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues** to which I referred a few moments ago made a **major** contribution with **its concept** of common security. The **report** of that **Commission** was submitted shortly before the **second** special session of the **General Assembly** devoted to disarmament. Surprisingly, however, serious efforts to study the concept of **common security** further, predicated as it is on a **vigorous United Nations**, has not taken place within the **United Nations** itself. It should be mentioned, of course, that under the **World Disarmament Campaign**, the Department for **Disarmament Affairs** has organized **some** regional conferences on the theme of disarmament, **security** and development. **However**, we must also mention that the results of **those** conferences have **not** been **studied** in any serious manner in the course of **consideration** of the **pertinent items** that are **now** before the First Committee. Yet, **one** finds that, **as was** the case with the report of the Independent **Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues**, there are **many** useful **ideas** that have emerged from some of those **regional conferences**.

In the contribution I made to the regional conference held at Cairo in February 1985, I said, inter alia:

"For 40 years since the end of the Second **World War**, the world has **witnessed** the pursuit of international security **mainly** through the arms race by the super-Powers and their alliances. In **the** process, **the** ostensible **reason** for the race has been forgotten and the accumulation of armaments has become the end, not the means. The failure of this approach is underscored by the wide **recognition** that the **arms** race, far from **ensuring** national or international **security**, further endangers it. **In the** circumstances, disarmament should be the primary and the **most** important factor in a new **system** aimed at strengthening international **security**."

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The reasons for that conclusion are not too **far-fetched**.

In **conclusion**, I should like to say that my delegation sees the **new** Soviet agenda item on the question of **establishing** a comprehensive system of international **peace** and **security** as **per**haps a contribution towards **encouraging** the First Committee to have a **more** purposeful debate on the important subject of the strengthening of international **peace** and security, **which**, as I **began** by saying, is being treated **rather** routinely in successive sessions of the General **Assembly**.

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Security **problems** are of **concern** to all States, and the problems of all **States concern** security.

Whatever **the** drawbacks of the somewhat **simplified** statement I have just made, it does essentially **summarize** the essential lesson we must learn from recent **developments** in **the** international climate. There is in fact no major problem confronting any State that does not, in some way or other, affect its security. At the same time, **there** is no international **problem** related to security matters that does not involve, directly or indirectly, every State.

The **concern** of States for their security thus takes on a decisive importance in a world teeming with diverse problems and **complex** situations. **However**, if **security** concerns are legitimately decisive in the conduct of the **international affairs** of a State that is anxious to preserve its **sovereignty** and independence, **such** concerns do, nevertheless, **create** an alarming situation when the **specious adduction** of security per se becomes a threat to the security of other **States**. That is the basic lesson we must learn from the ongoing arms race, which **today** is being carried into Outer space and is **about** to give a **modern**, twenty-first-century meaning to the Sword of **Damocles**. It is also the lesson **to** be learnt from power **politics**, which **induce** certain States to perceive their security interests as

(Mr. Djoudi , Algeria)

extending to the farthest caners of the **Earth** - often and, indeed, undoubtedly, to the detriment of the fringe **countries** of the third world.

For **thermore**, the **present** wald economic **crisis** has shown the tendency of **States** to turn to **secu i' y concerns** when **recession** has **exacerbated** national self-irterest and encouraged the implementation of policies and measures that **directly jeopardize** the economic and social stability, and thus the **security**, of other **countries**, **particularly** those in **the** developing world. This is also a phenomenon that has given additional **prominence** to the non-military aspects of **security**.

The growing interdependence of the questions of **development**, disarmament and security, their interrelationship and increasing **complexity** - which was **evidenced**, **for** example, by the debate on the convening of an International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament **and Development** - are particularly **telling**. It has been established, indeed, that the **problems** of **development** are linked to questions **of** security in the same way that they are linked to problems of **disarmament**. That is why increased **emphasis is** daily being laid on the need to pursue, simultaneously and **unrelentingly**, the process of development and disarmament to bring about increased **security**.

(Mr. Djoudi , Algeria)

This is also an essential point made by the non-aligned countries, whose Misfortune is precisely that they are at the cross-roads of all these difficulties and they are in the cross-fire of all these problems. These economic difficulties are often tragically accentuated by regular natural disasters and security problems, which are further complicated by the return to favour of the policy of armed intervention, whether direct or indirect, and the growing favouring of policies of intimidation staged threateningly close to home.

The global nature of the problems which have arisen demands a universal approach in tackling them. This interdependence and the very seriousness of the problems make it essential that a universal and unified approach be taken. The self-interest of so-called national security interests, which lay claim to the entire world as a field of action and intervention, simply accentuates the existing dangers. The concerted effort to seek world-wide security for all States is the only one worthy of an organized international society and the only one which is commensurate with the objective, not only of the assured survival of mankind in the face of the possibility of nuclear extinction, but above all of its harmonious development.

To make such an act of faith in the future is not simply to display empty piety. It is literally and fundamentally an act of endorsement of the objectives of the Charter, which the present international situation, however remote it may seem to be from the hope entertained by the founders of the United Nations and perhaps because of that, makes particularly urgent.

This also takes us back to the essential problem of the effective implementation of a system of collective security as laid down in the Charter, which has not been able to be achieved for well-known reasons. The Secretary-General eloquently summarized these reasons in his report of 1985 on the

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

activities of the Organization: to wit, the absence of unanimity and esprit de corps on the part of the Security Council, scant respect for the decisions of the Council and inadequate co-operation in their implementation, and very often also a refusal to avoid, or even to attempt to foresee, dangerous situations and thus to make full use of all the possibilities provided by the Council at a stage when the problems could be tackled more easily.

The role and the capacity for action of the Security Council undoubtedly are further truncated in the light of what is required by an international situation characterized by ongoing conflict and the simultaneous appearance and development of new sources of tension. Thus, non-members of the Security Council have often been accused of abusing their right of speaking there and thus transforming that body into a forum for recrimination. But is not this proof that the Council has not been equal to the challenge of taking up properly the items on its agenda, which have continued to be there since the very beginning of the United Nations and have remained unsolved? Is it not therefore natural that the States Members of the Organization would constantly remind it of its duty to discharge its responsibilities properly?

In that light, it should be recalled that, on the occasion of every stock-taking which sometimes reveals that the Security Council is heavily in the red - we have been able to lay to the credit of the Security Council the role which has been played by the peace-keeping forces. However, it should be emphasized that this institution, which Mr. Hammarskjöld called "Chapter VI and a half" of the Charter, has played a rather limited role in comparison with the actual powers invested in it, which it has not been able or willing to utilize fully.

In effect, we find above those cases which may be discussed or have been discussed where this machinery has been utilized, it is essentially based on a

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

concept of non-interference that is confined simply to the handling of conflicts and not to the establishment of just and lasting peace. Without denying in any way the positive aspects of this exercise, we cannot fail at the same time to conclude that its use has sometimes led to the establishment of a certain status quo without this implying any process towards a lasting peace. Because its action has not been conceived as part of an integrated machinery for finding a global and final solution, it has very often undoubtedly guaranteed the cease fire decreed by the Security Council, but its presence, in some parts of the world at least, continues precisely to indicate to what extent the political and military positions of the parties to a conflict remain fixed while the search for a final solution remains in abeyance. But the peace of the world, if it is to be genuine and lasting, is incompatible with the continuance of these ossified attitudes.

Furthermore, how can it be fair to observe, together with the Secretary-General of our Organization, that the two most recent multinational buffer forces were created outside the Security Council and the United Nations?

In other words, the commitment to authentic international peace and security must necessarily entail a renewed commitment to a concerted and multilateral effort, that is, a commitment to the United Nations itself in so far as it forms an irreplaceable framework for concerted and extensive action. The United Nations should consequently enjoy the renewed confidence of its Members and should be strengthened by their sincere, convincing and active participation. Such a commitment should have particular significance in the case of the Security Council, which still has a lot to do and which, under the Charter, has every means available to it to carry out that task.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

In this connection, there are a series of steps which are still expected of the Security Council as such or which are individually or collectively expected of each of its permanent members.

Many sources of tension, such as the situation in southern Africa or the Middle East, require the immediate and urgent attention of the Security Council. The situation in southern Africa, for example, requires measures to be adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter. The implementation of such measures in accordance with the wishes and expectations of the international community would be the only way to hasten the end of the apartheid régime, to remove the threat it represents to the people of Africa and to its neighbours, and to facilitate the decolonization of Namibia. The security Council should also strongly advocate the holding of an international conference on the Middle East, which would provide a proper framework for a just, final and global settlement of the crisis in that part of the world. The Security Council should also ensure that United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) performs its mandate properly, thus permitting the Lebanese Government to assert its sovereignty over its entire national territory, a result which cannot be achieved as long as the occupying Israeli forces remain present there. The same effort for a final and just solution should be pursued with perseverance in the case of Cyprus.

Furthermore, the permanent members of the Security Council are the first to be either individually or collectively called upon to exercise their duty to show restraint, prudence and moderation in the conduct of their international relations. They should now realize more than ever before that each and every action they perform involves the very credibility of the system of collective security laid down by the Charter and thereby the very legitimacy of their status as permanent members of the Security Council. That status indeed confers

(Mr. Djoudi, Alger i)

particular responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and should not be simply equated with the holding of a right of veto, which is all too often exercised.

In that connection, it is their prime duty to contribute individually or collectively, both inside and outside the Security Council., to promoting conditions conducive to respect for the principles and to achievement of the goals of the Charter , which means, in their case, first and foremost, abstaining from the use or threat of force, intimidation, pressure, interference or intervention of any sort against any people.

•

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

The right to self-determination, Independence, sovereignty and development is an inherent right of all peoples. Thus, it cannot be regarded as linked to any privilege derived from military superiority or economic power.

Among themselves, and along with other countries, they should, inter alia, promote confidence, engage in dialogue in good faith, negotiate with a sense of respect for the sovereign equality of States, and act in such a way as to preserve international peace and security.

The Security Council as a body, and its permanent members, individually and collectively, should respect and encourage efforts at regional co-operation and action in their endeavours to promote the maintenance or restoration of regional peace and economic development. In that regard, firm and sincere support should be given to the Non-Aligned Movement and to the Organization of African Unity (OAU), as well as to the Contadora initiative.

Scrupulous respect for the Charter demands the peaceful settlement of disputes and the development of just and equitable international co-operation. This means that the major Powers should formally exclude from their actions both foreign aggression and attempts to exploit local conflicts to their own ends in the quest for strategic advantages and the extension of their zones of influence. That is necessary, without prejudice to the acknowledgement that certain regional disputes or conflicts are indeed of local origin.

At its recent meeting in Harare the Non-Aligned Movement clear-headedly considered the persistence in the third world of some conflicts which are far from peaceful settlement, even though military confrontation has proved to be tragically futile and lethal. But there is a great temptation for: certain Powers to maintain those conflicts in pursuit of advantages valuable in terms of power politics but basically contrary to the goal of promoting international peace and security.

(Mr. Mjoudi, Algeria)

Numerous conflicts persist and endure; their continuation continues to exacerbate the international situation. For that reason, energetic and determined action by the Security Council is required to eliminate them. But the Security Council must regain all the means available to it under the Charter and restore unity among its permanent members concerning the original objective of truly establishing international peace and security. Consequently, genuine debate must begin on ways of bringing about the speedy attainment of conditions propitious for carrying out that task.

For its part, my delegation is ready to make its best contribution, for we are convinced that every State has an important and useful part to play in the effort to ensure that these objectives are reached.

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): Today my delegation would like to address itself to the question of the strengthening of security and co-operation in the region of the Mediterranean.

Throughout a long history, many different political, economic, strategic and other influences and traditions have intertwined in the Mediterranean. For centuries various cultures and religions coexisted there. Bridging three continents and a crossroads of vital maritime and land routes, it has always had special geo-political importance in the global relationship of forces vying for a foothold and for domination.

In recent years, the Mediterranean has captured the attention of the world again. Increasingly - and regrettably, I must say - it is becoming an arena of global rivalry, which brings tension, crises and conflict in its train.

As a non-aligned European and Mediterranean country, Yugoslavia has keenly followed these events and then attempts to influence the social, political and economic development of the countries and peoples of the

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

Mediterranean. Aware of the aspirations and endeavours of the Mediterranean countries to promote the stability and peaceful development of their region, the general Assembly included in its agenda, at its thirty-eighth session, consideration ways and means to strengthen security and co-operation in the Mediterranean. Certain results were indeed achieved. Yet developments in the region have lately taken a negative turn, and many of those achievements were rolled back and erased, we hope only temporarily.

The strengthening of co-operation among Mediterranean countries is opposed primarily by those factors and forces which perceive in it a danger to their privileged position and influence in the region. The existing crises, the wave of terrorism resulting from failure to solve those crises, and the confrontation between the interests of individual countries are used as a pretext for interference and intervention. Hence, present developments are characterized by the policy of force and by frequent threats to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Mediterranean countries, particularly the non-aligned Mediterranean countries.

Aware of this situation, the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia voiced its concern at the beginning of this year over the increased presence of the bloc Powers and the concentration of their military might and weapons, including nuclear weapons, and stressed that this represented an additional danger of the continuing deterioration of the situation in the Mediterranean. Similarly, frequent military manoeuvres and demonstrations of force in the vicinity of the territorial waters of littoral States cannot but further aggravate the situation and cause serious incidents which could jeopardize the security of Mediterranean countries, particularly the non-aligned ones.

It did not take long before those concerns were vindicated: In April this

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

year Libya **was** raided, and the aggressive actions of Israel, in **Lebanon** for **example**, continue unabated.

Force and pressure are not and cannot be a way of solving **disputes**. They cannot be **accepted as** a reality and a **normal** state of **affairs** in international relations. **This** is especially true of the **Mediterranean**, which for **decades** has been plagued by **crises** and **instability**.

The root **cause** of all these crises is the policy of **aggression** and interference and the denial of the inalienable rights of the countries and **peoples** of the region to free and **independent development**. Each and every interference by external factors and **the attempts** to deal with with crises in the **context** of **East-West** rivalry increase the danger of a broader **conflagration** with unforeseeable **consequences**.

Experience has shown that **the** only prospects for the peaceful **development** of the region lie in **overcoming** existing differences and mistrust and in the creation of conditions for dialogue and equitable **co-operation** on the **basis** of the principles of the Charter of the **United Nations** and the policy of non-alignment, with full respect for **the authentic interests** and **aspirations** of the countries and peoples of the **region** for peace and security.

It is, therefore, necessary that a determined joint effort be **made** within this organization to **overcome** the existing **sources** of **tension** in the region. The first step in that direction, in **our opinion**, should be to **launch** a process for the political solution of existing **crises**, particularly **the crisis** in the Middle **East**. In **this respect**, our **Organization** has several important issues to **address**: the question of the exercise of the inalienable **rights** of the **Palestinian people**; the situation in **Lebanon**; the **question** of **Cyprus**; and the peaceful settlement of the dispute between the **United States** and Libya.

(Mr. Pej ic, Yugoslavia)

Resolution of the Middle **East** crisis is possible only on the basis of a total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab territories occupied since **June** 1967, the **realization** of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment **of** a State of its own, as well as the **ensurance** of the right of all countries and peoples of the region to peace and security within internationally **recognized** borders.

To this end it is **necessary** to create conditions for the soonest possible convening of an International Peace Conference on the Middle **East** under the United Nations **auspices** and with the **equitable** participation of all directly interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation **Organization** (PLO) as the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

It **is** also necessary to ensure urgent implementation of the relevant resolutions of the security Council **on Lebanon** and create conditions for the restoration of the national unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that war-devastated non-aligned country. **The** pre-condition for this is the complete and immediate withdrawal of all Israeli troops and the cessation of Israel's interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon.

Similarly, the Cyprus **crisis** can be solved only with full respect for that country's **independence**, sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and non-aligned **status**. We resolutely oppose **the** attempts to divide that non-aligned country; we are for the withdrawal of foreign troops from its territory and for agreement **between** the two **ethnic** communities.

Once again I should like to point out that Yugoslavia, **itself** the victim of senseless terrorist acts on many **occasions**, condemns most resolutely all kinds of terrorism, **regardless** of its perpetrators and their motivations. We are ready to participate most actively in international actions **for** the **suppression** of this dangerous phenomenon of our time.

(Mr. Pejić, Yugoslavia)

The escalation of terrorist acts in the world not only takes a heavy toll in human lives but jeopardizes the territorial integrity and security of countries. This is equally true of all acts of terrorism, whether they are committed by individuals, groups or States.

However, it is important to point out that the legitimate struggle of people under colonial and foreign occupation for independence must neither be considered as terrorism nor identified with it. The United Nations has taken appropriate decisions by which the legitimacy of their struggle has been confirmed.

Stability and peace in the Mediterranean cannot be built on bloc rivalry and the militarisation of the region. The future of the Mediterranean lies in the strengthening of peace and security based on genuine co-operation among the countries of the region, with full respect for the aspirations and interests of the Mediterranean peoples.

The non-aligned countries have on many occasions pointed to the need for the removal of the existing causes of tension in the Mediterranean. For a number of years they have striven for the transformation of the Mediterranean region into a zone of peace and co-operation, free of bloc rivalry and weapons of mass destruction.

Co-operation among the Mediterranean countries has already yielded some concrete results in the field of economy, protection of human environment, science and technology, culture and the arts, tourism and sports. There are also initiatives to promote co-operation in the field of the exchange of information, particularly economic information, industrial co-operation, transport and communications. Those are encouraging signs.

Yugoslavia favours ever more extensive contacts among the peoples of the Mediterranean, which is a vital pre-condition for better mutual understanding and friendship. We must direct our efforts and energy towards identifying

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

the areas of **common** interests and creating an atmosphere of co-operation with **greater** understanding and respect for specific conditions and internal development which will lead to the relaxation of tension in that region.

The Ministerial Meeting of non-aligned **countries** of the Mediterranean, held in **Valletta**, Malta, in 1984, gave important impetus to joint efforts in this direction. At their **Eighth** Summit Conference, held at **Harare**, Zimbabwe, the **Heads** of State or **Government of** Non-Aligned Countries fully supported these efforts of the non-aligned countries of the Mediterranean, particularly the **initiative** for the region's transformation into a zone of **peace** and co-operation. They also supported the orientation of Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries towards making continuous efforts to lessen and overcome tension and to strengthen all-round co-operation in the interest of all.

The forthcoming meeting of economic experts of the Mediterranean non-aligned countries, scheduled to take place in Yugoslavia, should also mark the countries' interests in specific areas of co-operation and make a new contribution to their better mutual understanding.

Similarly, next year's forthcoming Ministerial Meeting of non-aligned Mediterranean countries should give impetus to, and **establish** modalities and areas **of**, all-round co-operation among the countries of the region.

We are convinced that the United Nations can make a substantial **contribution** to the promotion of co-operation and the strengthening of **peace** and **stability in** the region of the Mediterranean. We also believe that the current Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (**CSCE**) follow-up meeting in Vienna will open new vistas and contribute to the creation of a climate of co-operation in the

(Mr. Pejić, Yugoslavia)

region. This **is** in the interests not only of the Mediterranean countries but of other European **countries** as well, since peace and security in the **Mediterranean** and Europe are interdependent and deeply intertwined.

It **is most** important, **however**, that the countries of the region **resolve** their **disputes** and differences by themselves on the **basis** of respect for authentic and specific interests in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, with a view to strengthening general peace and **security** in the region and beyond.

Mr. MORELLI (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The letter addressed to the Secret *-General on 5 August **last** by the foreign **ministers** of a group of socialist countries, the draft resolution contained in document **I.89** and the different statements made on 21 November in the Committee taken all together are of particular **interest** within the framework of the current session of the General **Assembly**.

In view of the important goal sought in this draft resolution one should mind the precedents which have been cited by the **sponsors**. There is the Declaration on international **security**, the **special sessions** of the General Assembly on disarmament, United Nations studies on international security, **the** declarations of the **Non-Aligned** Movement in Delhi **and Harare** and **the most recent** decisions of the **Palme** Commission.

As the **sponsors** themselves **recognize**, and other representatives **emphasize** the fundamental character of the Charter of the United Nations, it **is possible** therefore to establish a broad framework of background material.

The Peruvian **delegation** wishes to reiterate its **position** with regard **to** the **imperative** need to remedy the substantive and operational **inadequacies** of the

(Mr. Morelli, Peru)

international security system. Accordingly, in the light of the basic norms of the Charter, the indispensable task would seem to be, first of all, to compile and collate systematically all existing United Nations agreements and studies on the subject.

(Mr. Morelli, Peru)

Once that task has been performed, it would then be possible to extract the basic elements of a legal framework and of doctrine. Naturally, this long and arduous distillation process presupposes an evaluation of how effectively existing rules have been implemented. It would then be possible in successive stages, to produce work based on the fundamental ideas for the peace and security system proposed in the draft resolution before us. The examination of such standards or norms should take into account General Assembly resolutions concerning implementation of the Declaration on International Security as well as the Final Document of the 1978 first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Significant but by no means exhaustive examples, I might mention certain principles of disarmament formulated in that 1978 Final Document.

Paragraph 13 stipulates that peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces.

Paragraph 22 stipulates that together with negotiations on nuclear disarmament, which are the most urgent and have the highest priority, negotiations should be carried out on the balanced reduction of armed forces and of conventional armaments, based on the principle of undiminished security of the parties with a view to promoting or enhancing stability at a lower military level.

Paragraph 27 states that, in order to discharge effectively its central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament, the United Nations should be kept appropriately informed of all steps in this field, whether unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral.

Lastly, paragraph 16 states that the continuation of the arms race

(Mr. Morelli, Peru)

"is obviously incompatible with the implementation of the new international economic order based on justice, equity and co-operation" (S-10/2, para. 16) and that the resources released as a result of the implementation of disarmament measures should be used in a manner which will help to promote the well-being of all peoples, with special attention being paid improving the economic conditions of the developing countries.

In the light of the present status of international relations vis-à-vis the United Nations, the Secretary-General, in his report of September 1986, stated:

"I believe that the present time should be propitious for renewal and revitalization of the international system. The upheavals and fundamental changes of the post-war decades have begun to settle into a more discernible and coherent pattern. For all the differences of ideology and practice, we are witnessing the emergence of a widening constituency of basically pragmatic Governments with a firm grasp of the economic, social and technological characteristics of our time" (A/41/L.2, p. 2).

Judging by the statements made in the Committee last Friday, particularly the statement of the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, the present international situation is marked by the basically more promising signs that have emerged from the recent summit meeting at Reykjavik, as well as by confidence-building measures adopted at Stockholm within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

For countries that do not belong to either of the major military alliances, the Reykjavik meeting, which was of global importance, allows us to look to the furthering of recent achievements whose implementation has been dangerously long in coming. Now, however, the potential for progress by the two great Powers is of unprecedented scope. The primary responsibility of those Powers is obvious. The option for a stable peace admits no further delay.

(Mr. Morelli, Peru)

With regard to confidence-building measures in Europe, which are promising in themselves, their ultimate goal will be achieved to the extent that they lead to disarmament measures between the parties themselves. To other groups of countries, confidence-building measures in Europe are of relative value, since they are military confidence-building measures made necessary by the confrontation of major concentrations of armed forces, a phenomenon not present in other parts of the world. The European experience would apply to other parts of the world only if there were a similar political will in each of those specific regions.

The balance and interrelationship foreseen in Europe is now a good example for others on both the world-wide and regional levels. Indeed, from the political, economic and social standpoints, the present state of international relations - in particular in view of the future application of scientific and technological achievements - now requires that the great Powers take a historic stand in order to escape from the intolerable strait-jacket of war and peace against a background of ever-higher living standards for the few and ever-lower living standard for many. In other words, to the equation of disarmament and development we must add the boldness that has hitherto been so shortsightedly withheld, which has worked to the detriment of the economically privileged countries themselves.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89 are proposing basically programmatic measures to develop basic ideas on international security. In this connection the delegation of Peru would like to stress the primary role the United Nations should play in this field, including of course, the contribution to be made by the Secretariat and the personal role to be played by the Secretary-General, both of which have been pointed out in the Committee by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of one group of countries.

(Mr. Morelli, Peru)

Lastly, the delegation of Peru wishes to point out that the efforts being made to consolidate and improve norms of international security must be closely linked to efforts to ensure the success of two interconnected United Nations conferences - the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development to be held in 1987 and the third special session on disarmament scheduled for 1988.

At both those conferences, and especially at the former, commitments should be made to give an added dimension to international security so that global and regional negotiations to bring about a stable peace are linked to the simultaneous building of a new and just international economic order. In short, it is of the highest priority to undertake a critical examination of the concept of security itself in order that it may be redefined to include in an appropriate manner the notion of comprehensive security, a basic condition of which is the relationship between disarmament and development.

Mr. OSEKU (Uganda): I take the floor to address myself to some of the issues related to international peace and security. These are indeed issues of paramount interest to all of us in an international community and they touch directly on the basic principles of the United Nations, whose one primary task is that of the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security. Security to me is a condition, among other things, in which there is no danger of military attack, political pressure, economic coercion - a condition in which States can freely pursue their own development and progress. International security is thus the result and the sum total of the security of each and every State member of the international community. International security cannot therefore be attained without full international co-operation. Interdependence rather than unilateralism must equally be our guiding principle and the United Nations its custodian. It is incumbent upon us all 88 States Members of the United Nations to strengthen its role, respect its decisions and recommendations, and implement and abide by the principles of its Charter.

Failure on the part of any State Member of this Organization to respect and abide by any of these cardinal principles inevitably breeds disaster and turmoil. Evidence of this is not uncommon today in the world and it is a manifestation of the increasing efforts to subordinate the sovereignty of the weak to the might of the strong. This is equally evidenced in instances where States have chosen to give a selective interpretation and application of international law to justify narrow national interests. This has been further manifested in many cases by outright recourse to the threat and use of force in international relations and this, no doubt, has been done in utter disregard of the principle of the peaceful resolution of disputes. This constant tendency to defy the rule of international law, disregard the resolutions of the United Nations and impose unilateral

(Mr. Oseku, Uganda)

solutions on disputes between States which otherwise call for multilateral solutions is what has today compounded the problem of maintaining international peace and security.

Nowhere is this deplorable state of affairs more evident and practised than in the southern part of our continent. We submit that the South African situation, more than any other issue, tests the will and the resolve of the international community. The minority racist and apartheid regime flouts all the tenets of international norms with impunity and has no regard for the human rights of its black population.

The régime in power in that country has lost all sense of the value of human life; its people are the constant victims of callous and disrespectful behaviour, even in death. A few months ago, for example, at a place called Evander, 177 people lost their lives in a gold-mine accident. That disaster could have been avoided, but concern for the safety of African miners is not an attribute of the South African Government. The company concerned identified the five dead whites by name, occupation and marital status and even gave the details of how many children each of them had. The 172 dead blacks were merely identified as members of different tribes. Even in death black South Africans are not accorded dignity. We have quoted this incident, first, to illustrate how pervasive that régime's racism is.

That incident illustrates, among other things, that the régime has no shams in infringing the basic principles that are universally accepted as the bases for a safe, secure and civilized world. Here, I hasten to quote the words of the representative of the United Kingdom, who, only last week, speaking in this very Committee stated that "one of the essential principles for such a world is full

(Mr. Oseku, Uganda)

respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms" (A/C.1/41/PV.53, p.27). Yet how many of us continue to have dealings with that régime despite the fact that the international community has condemned it, and the abhorrent practice of apartheid has been declared a crime against humanity?

We wish to reiterate that the racist minority régime in South Africa is a threat to international peace and security. The policy of apartheid practised by the minority régime and its constant incursions into the front-line States with the intention of destabilizing them is another pointer to the magnitude and seriousness of the situation in that part of Africa. All diplomatic approaches to that régime have been rebuffed outright. The resolutions of this Organization also continue to be ignored and the will of the international community is flouted with impunity.

Another related issue is that of the independence of Namibia. Here is another example of the apparent lack of political will on the part of the States Members of this Organization to implement its resolutions. Many of us know very well that the régime in South Africa will not negotiate in good faith over the independence of Namibia and yet a good number of States will come to the United Nations and vehemently try to defend that monstrous régime through all manner of fabrications.

The United Nations has been known to have moved with speed and vigour in the face of aggression to establish a presence in troubled regions of the world. Even today the Organisation deploys peace-keeping forces in various parts of the world; yet we seem unwilling to take the same action in the Territory which is the direct responsibility of the United Nations. What is more, a plan has already been approved by the Security Council, that repository of international peace and security, under its resolution 435 (1978) for ensuring the independence of Namibia through the holding of fair and free elections under United Nations supervision and

(Mr. Oseku, Uganda)

control, including the establishment of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group. But what do we find in Namibia today? A puppet régime, installed by the racist South African Government, and we Members of this Organization stand by seemingly helpless in the face of open arrogance and defiance.

The case of South Africa aptly illustrates how international Peace and security can be compromised once the rule of international law has been defied. In other regions of the world, too, there is an increasing unwillingness on the part of States to heed the basic accepted international law governing Inter-state behaviour. That has invariably led to protracted regional conflicts which are capable of being exploited by outsiders for their own selfish interests.

I now wish to turn to the situation in the Mediterranean region. This is another hot-bed of tension and it is a constant source of concern to the international community. The situation in that region continues to heighten tension and increase instability in the area and it is a threat to international peace and security. The situation has further been aggravated when even the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) is now and then a target of attack. This grave development has incalculable consequences for the United Nations peace-keeping. We earnestly appeal to all concerned to allow UNIFIL to discharge its mandate in southern Lebanon in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions.

My delegation is not, of course, oblivious to the core of the problems of the Mediterranean region, namely, the Palestinian question, among others. Without a solution to that problem, the Mediterranean region will continue to be a hot-bed of tension and a constant reminder of our failure to apply correctly the principles of the Charter of the United Nations in settling disputes. Uganda, however, continues

(Mr. Oseku, Uganda)

to believe that **only a negotiated** solution which **respects** the rights of all states in that region to **secure boundaries** and **recognizes** the **rights** of the **Palestinians** to a homeland of their own will bring a **just and** lasting solution to the **problems** of the region. We therefore urge that **everything possible** be done to facilitate the holding of the **proposed** international conference on the Middle East under the **auspices** of the **United Nations**. The conference, as and when held, **should be attended** by all States in the region, including the PLC, if it is to bring lasting peace to that region.

In **conclusion**, I wish to reiterate that the **United Nations**, in which we repose our **trust** and security, **must** not only **condemn** outright all political and military intervention, but **also** guard against **economic coercion** and **intervention** which **undermines** our national **independence** and **sovereignty**. It must institute effective **measures through** its Security Council to guarantee the safety of its **small** and vulnerable **Members** and insulate them **against** the **encroachment** of the **strong**. On our part, **as States Members** of this Organization, we must **rededicate** ourselves to the **maintenance** of the rule of law in **international relations** through the **strict observance** of the **Charter** of the **United Nations** and the effective application of the collective security **system** provided by it.

(Mr. Oseku, Uganda)

All States must abide by the principles of the peaceful settlement of disputes, non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, respect for the independence and sovereignty of States, and respect for the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence. It is the obligation of all States under international law to abide by those principles. All of us, individually and collectively, must rededicate ourselves to the promotion of the ideas of peace, not the ideas of war; the ideas of harmony, not discord; the ideas of dialogue, not recrimination. To these lofty objectives Member States must recommit themselves. In that spirit, I reaffirm Uganda's strong support for and commitment to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the large number of representatives scheduled to speak tomorrow, it has become necessary to make provisions for an additional meeting tomorrow after noon. Accordingly, there will be three meetings of the Committee tomorrow, Tuesday, 25 November: one at 10 a.m., one at 3 p.m. and one at 6 p.m. In that way I hope the Committee will be able to conclude its general debate on the items under discussion, and proceed on Wednesday to consideration of and action upon draft resolutions under agenda items 67, 68, 69 and 141.

The Collaring delegations are scheduled to speak tomorrow morning: India, the United Kingdom, Ethiopia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Egypt, the Syria Arab Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Afghanistan.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.