



**FIRST COMMITTEE**  
**56th meeting**  
**held on**  
**25 November 1986**  
**at 10 a.m.**  
**now Yak**

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 56th MEETING**

Chairman: MK. **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.

**Distr. GENERAL**  
**A/C.1/41/PV.56**  
**31 December 1986**  
**ENGLISH**

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

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

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

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India) : I should like to offer a few comments of my *delegation on agenda items 67, 68 and 69, as well as on agenda item 141, on the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security.*

At a time when the world moves in the shadow of nuclear vulnerability, the issues of war and peace have assumed vital importance. Mankind has known war since time immemorial; indeed, war as an instrument of policy has been with us almost as long. There were Chinese and Indian writers on strategic theories centuries before the subject became a discipline in its own right in the West. Clausewitz wrote that everything is subject to a supreme law, which is the decision by arms. And yet one fundamental question remained even in the most rudimentary system of international relations - that of reconciling national interest and ambition with peace and international order.

When there were only a few major nation-States, the maintenance of a balance of power, at least among metropolitan European States, ensured that, while the exploitation of colonies continued, an implicit understanding of how the international system would function was arrived at. The balance-of-power theory became an essential ingredient of the policies of realpolitik of the twentieth century. It took the loss of 100 million lives and the maiming and wounding of many millions more in the short span of three decades between 1914 and 1945 for the world seriously to rethink the underlying principles governing international relations.

In the wake of this destruction, the establishment of the United Nations was the first major step towards setting up a more rational world order. The United Nations was thought to presage international organization; there would be

(Mr. Char ekhan, India)

universal participation and peaceful coexistence among States with different and even conflicting ideologies; international law and conventions would be accorded enhanced status; there would be great-Power co-operation; and the finite resources of Our planet would be used to improve the quality of life of all peoples.

Today we are still a long way from achieving the objectives we had set our selves. The continuing accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, the nuclear arms race and its extension into outer space threaten the very survival Of mankind.

The atom bomb changed our way of thinking. Bernard Brodie, one of the earliest American writers on nuclear strategy, wrote in his book "The Absolute Time":

"Thus far the chief purpose of our military establishment has been to win wars. From now on its chief purpose must be to avert them. It can have no other useful purpose."

This was One of the earliest expositions of the doctrine of deterrence in the nuclear-weapon era. A nuclear war would be worse than any situation it was addressed to change. The proponents of the doctrine of deterrence maintain that it has kept the peace for 40 years. There is indeed some irony in this, for they would surely concede that this has meant that peace rests on a negative premise; a framework of security built upon terror rather than hope can at best be tenuous and uncertain.

The doctrine of deterrence is by nature coercive and has only provided the basis for fuelling an unrestricted arms race, particularly in the nuclear field. The piling up of nuclear arms has not meant any additional security, even for countries possessing them; on the contrary, it has had the strongest negative impact on international security. A study on security commissioned by the United

(Mr. Ghar ekhan, India)

Nations have underlined that the present intensive arms race negatively affects every aspect of international relations. The arms race hinders progress in improving and changing relations amongst States on the basis of mutual understanding, mutual co-operation and equality. It renders the international political environment more rigid and more resistant to change. It tends to promote military alliances and to increase levels of confrontation. It promotes mistrust and secrecy. The greater the mistrust and secrecy, the more likely it is that perception of doubts and insecurity will occur among nations.

On the other hand, international security would be considerably enhanced by increased co-operation in many areas, including the broad exchange of ideas, trade, science, technology, culture, knowledge and information, contacts at all levels and sustained dialogue on all problems affecting peace, security and disarmament. International security has to be based not on mutual fear, but on mutual confidence.

The leaders responsible for the five-continent peace initiative, meeting in New Delhi in 1985, called for an immediate halt to the nuclear arms race. The Delhi Declaration of 28 January 1985 stated, inter alia:

"A halt to the nuclear arms race is at the present moment imperative. Only thus can it be ensured that nuclear arsenals do not grow while negotiations proceed. However, this halt should not be an end in itself. It must be immediately followed by substantial reductions in nuclear forces, leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and the final goal of general and complete disarmament. Parallel to this process, it is urgently necessary to transfer precious resources currently wasted in military expenditure to social and economic development. The strengthening of the United Nations must also be an essential part of this endeavour.

(Mr. Gharokhan, India)

"It is imperative to find a remedy to the **existing situation where** hundreds of billions of **dollars, amounting** to approximately one and a half million per **minute**, are spent annually on weapons. This stands in **dramatic** contrast to the poverty, and in some **cases** misery, in which two-thirds of the **world** population lives." (A/40/114, annex, pp. 4-5)

An interesting comparison was made by Professor Carl Sagan, the astronomer. He said a **tril** ion dollars were being spent every year on armaments. A **trillion** dollars is something like twice the total indebtedness of all developing **countries** to all Western banks. He pointed out **that** six months with no **purchase** of nuclear weapons and no support for national military establishment<sup>8</sup> could be used **to wipe out** this entire **indebt**. **ness**.

(Mr. Ghar ekhan, India)

There is an unfortunate tendency to think of weapons only in the context of security. But the fact is that widening disparities in income levels between the developed and developing countries, the degradation of the environment, the virtual breakdown of the international monetary and trading system - all these factors also give rise to international tension and mistrust. The connection between disarmament and development is a very real one and we hope that the international conference on which this Committee has already taken a decision will yield fruitful results. In the field of development, while discussions have reached an advanced stage, they have not been incorporated into an overall concept of security.

My delegation has noted with interest the introduction of agenda item 141, on the strengthening of international peace and security. We believe that discussion of this item will help clarify the issues involved, especially those connected with international peace and security. We believe that at this session of the Assembly the item can receive a general discussion and treatment, which we can follow up with further discussion at the next session.

The United Nations Charter serves as the fountainhead of all international efforts for maintaining world peace and security. The preamble and Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter, which set out the purposes and principles of the United Nations, provide a good description of the term "international security". Article 1 also summarizes the elements that are prescribed for the maintenance of International peace and security. As a Founding Member of the United Nations, India has a total commitment to the Charter. Within the ambit of the Charter there is room for discussion and exploration of ways to see how these efforts could be improved. The entire course of historical evolution is premised on progressive development and strengthening and refining of all concepts through revision and updating in the light of contemporary realities. In particular, it must be noted

(Mr. GharekIndia)

that the Charter was drawn up at a time **when** nuclear weapons did not exist, and for **this reason** makes no mention of nuclear weapons at all. The arms race **having** taken the world to the edge of a nuclear precipice, it is imperative for **the world community** now to address itself, both within and outside the United Nations, to this question. The use or threat of nuclear weapons must be outlawed, since **it is** a **crime** against humanity.

Mr. SOULIOTIS (Greece) (interpretation from **French**): On 21 November the representative of the **United Kingdom**, Mr. John Birch, spoke on behalf of the 12 Member States of the European Community and succinctly but in detail expressed the Community's view on international security. **While** fully **endorsing** what he said, I **wish** to add some supplementary views of my delegation on agenda **item** 141, entitled "**Establishment** of a comprehensive system of international peace **and** security", a subject introduced by the Permanent Representative of **Hungary**.

**We** must nurture a spirit of confidence if we wish to **promote** the idea of international security. We **all** agree that arms control plays a two-fold role. On the one hand, it is the result of a widespread feeling of **insecurity**, and **it** also contributes to that feeling. It is a typical example of vicious circle. That is why any initiative to promote methods **and mechanisms** aimed at consolidating international **security** is **undoubtedly** welcome.

**But**, unfortunately, the **matter** of **international security** is not simple. On the contrary, it covers a wide spectrum, including factors **such** as the institutions that protect individual **liberties**, human and humanitarian rights and **international economic development**. It also comprises **such** matters **as** social inequalities, the instability of political institutions and similar matters which are at the **very** centre of people's interests, **Consequently**, beyond a declaration of good intent, we must all make serious efforts to consider in depth the **complex and** interdependent parameters of international **security**.

(Mr. Souliotis, Greece)

Never theless, the comment must be made: draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89 is of such scope, value and significance that it cannot be considered without reference to the Charter, to which it is linked, conceptually and structurally. A second comment, which derives from the first, is that the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization is still at work. Therefore, it would be wise to ask ourselves whether the undefined goals of the draft resolution should not be considered within the general framework of that Committee.

As for methodology, my delegation favours an approach that would lead to a more systematic and thorough study, and therefore one that would yield more results with regard to the burning problem of adapting the Charter to present-day realities. Clearly, one cannot disregard the rapid and dramatic developments that have taken place in vital areas of human activities since the adoption of the Charter.

The most important aspect of any text adopted by our Organization is, obviously, that Member States respect and faithfully implement it. If that had been done over the past 40 years, I wonder whether it would have been necessary to submit the draft resolution that we are considering today.

For all those reasons, my delegation welcomes draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89, but feels that the ideas in it would be more usefully considered in another forum.

Mr. HAGOSS (Ethiopia) : The question of the maintenance of peace and security at the regional and global levels has always been uppermost in the minds of all those who have serious concern for the well-being and destiny of mankind. Yet never has it been so pressing an issue as it is today.

The current state of international peace and security leaves much to be desired. Indeed, to the regret of those dedicated to the cause of peace,



(Mr. Hagosa, Ethiopia)

contemporary international relations have been, and continue to be, marred by wars of aggression, imperialist competition, instances of gross interference and intervention in the internal affairs of States and the persistence of obsolete policies of racism, as epitomised by the system of apartheid. Today imperialism, with unabated hegemonistic ambition, continues to search for new military bases and political footholds. Furthermore, it is engaged in overt and covert destabilisation campaigns aimed at subverting legitimate Governments and developmental processes not particularly conducive to the perpetuation of foreign domination and exploitation.

(Mr. Hagoss, Ethiopia)

The very fabric of inter-State relations is being undermined by increasing resort to crude schemes of intimidation, ranging from economic blockades to blatant acts of aggression against many States which have neither the capacity nor the inclination to withstand external aggression, let alone pose any threat to regional or international peace and security. Provocative military manoeuvres continue to be conducted in our part of the Mediterranean and in the Caribbean region as well as in South-East Asia, in utter disregard of the legitimate interests of the States of those regions. In fact, the tendency to resort to quick military solutions seems to have become the order of the day.

What is most alarming is the fact that those very circles that loudly profess to be concerned about the prevalence of terrorism are engaged in the training, arming and infiltration of mercenaries dedicated to the destabilization of sovereign States and the overthrow of popular social orders. These same circles seem to have arrogated to themselves the role of arbiter between legitimate Governments and renegade elements, which they often describe as "democratic resistance forces". To our regret, and indeed to the utter dismay of many States, one major Power has on more than one occasion used the General Assembly to express its avowed intention to render support to the destructive activities of such elements against the expressed wishes of the people of the countries concerned.

As we have repeatedly pointed out, such pronouncements not only constitute gross interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States, but are fundamentally unworthy of any State which ought to shoulder special responsibilities as a permanent member of the Security Council. If some continue to view their role in the maintenance of international peace and security in a manner detrimental to the peace and progress of developing countries, they are certainly following the wrong path, one that is bound to undermine regional and

(Mr. Hagoqs, Ethiopia)

international peace and security. From those who seem bent on attempting to determine our future for us, we must demand respect for our sovereign right to choose the developmental path which we deem fit. In this connection, I have to state that the policies pursued by one major Western Power are in clear violation of the basic principles of the Charter and contravene the principles of the 1970 Declaration on friendly relations among States, which, inter alia, provides that

"no State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against . . . its political, economic and cultural elements are in violation of international law." (resolution 2625 (XXV), annex)

If, indeed, the intention of that major Power is the betterment of our peoples, as it sometimes professes, I must point out that there are avenues of international co-operation of which it can avail itself and positively contribute to the enhancement of peace and security in all parts of the world. As things stand now, however, we emphatically reject any attempt to infringe upon our sovereign right to determine our destiny. We also reject any and all attempts to interpret events in our region in terms of narrow global and strategic objectives which are contrary to the legitimate aspirations and interests of the peoples directly concerned. If the world is to be a more peaceful and secure place to live in, States must conduct their foreign policies in conformity with the principles of equality and peaceful coexistence. At this juncture, I appeal to all the major Powers - in particular, the permanent members of the Security Council - to assume their legitimate role in international peace and security, with a clear commitment to the betterment of the one world we collectively inhabit.

(Mr. Hagoaa, Ethiopia)

Motivated by its earnest desire for international peace and security, Ethiopia welcomes the initiative of the socialist community for the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. We have no doubt that, with further study and elaboration, the proposal will contribute meaningfully to the advancement of international peace and security.

As a country which has for centuries resisted all forms of encroachment on, and naked aggression against, its independence and territorial integrity, and one which is keenly aware of the significance of the prevalence of a durable climate of peace and security throughout the world, Ethiopia will continue to be guided by the well-known principles of non-alignment and those enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations - respect for peace, justice and equality, national independence, national unity and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Ethiopia will continue to pursue a policy of good-neighbourliness in its relations with the sister States in its immediate region and indeed with all States in the world that respect the primacy of international law. We wish for others what we cherish most - peace in unity and equality. It is only logical and indeed legitimate that, conversely, we urge others to wish us the same.

Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom) : Last week I made a statement on behalf of the Twelve Member States of the European Community about ongoing issues concerning international security. Today, as the representative of the United Kingdom, I should like to make some comments on one particular proposal which has been brought forward at this session of the General Assembly by a group of delegations. I am referring to the proposal for the "Establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security". (A/C.1/41/L.89)

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

The proposal is not, of course, new to us. In August the sponsors submitted a letter (A/41/191) from their Foreign Ministers to the Secretary-General which set out some of the thoughts behind it. We have looked very carefully at this proposal and have considered it most sympathetically, since we, too, share the concerns of everyone for international peace and security. We agree with many of the expressions of concern about the present state of the world which are contained in the covering letter by the sponsors' Foreign Ministers. We share, for example, their concern about the need to reduce nuclear arsenals and about the non-use of force to settle disputes. We share their concern for many areas of the world which today are troubled or in conflict. In their memorandum the Foreign Ministers of the sponsors mentioned some of these so-called hotbeds of tension: the Middle and Near East, South-East Asia, Central America and southern Africa. Perhaps it was just a slip of the pen that Afghanistan was not mentioned in that category.

We have heard quite a bit from the sponsors during this debate about their initiative. But, despite the memorandum of August and the statements made in the Committee so far, and indeed the conversations I have had with the sponsors, I am still unclear about what exactly they hope to achieve by the draft resolution. I know that many other members of the Committee are equally puzzled. Indeed, the sponsors themselves have not really been able to tell us what it is all about. When he introduced the draft resolution on 20 November, my good friend the permanent representative of Hungary said that the sponsors' aims were modest: they merely wished to hear the views of others and, after analysing them, to return to the subject next year.

Well, perhaps on the face of it this is a reasonable approach. After all, the purpose of this part of the First Committee's debate is to share ideas on how international security can be strengthened. But, with respect, it is not necessary

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

to have a new **agenda** item for that or to talk about **elaborating new** systems of **security or** of **elaborating** new documents. We are already smothered in documents. But let us nevertheless look very carefully at how the **draft resolution** is formulated.

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

Both the title of the draft resolution and operative paragraph 2 refer to the "establishment" of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. My first question therefore is this: does not this formulation prejudice the outcome of our consideration of the initiative? Do not we already have an established system of international peace and security - in other words, the system that has brought us all here to this room? I refer to the United Nations itself. My second question is this: what is wrong with the present system that is embodied in the United Nations Charter?

I am afraid that nothing the sponsors have said so far - and they have said a great deal - provides satisfactory answers to these fundamental points. They have only stated that they do not wish to rewrite the Charter or to undermine it. This is reassuring, as far as it goes. But the draft resolution says virtually nothing about the Charter, and it makes no reference whatsoever to its collective security provisions. Perhaps this is just another oversight. It is our strong view that the assumption that there is a need to establish a new system of international security debases the value of what we already have in the Charter.

We have some other substantial concerns about the initiative in the draft resolution. In his introductory statement last week, the Hungarian representative said that security was not just a military question. We agree completely, and we said so in the statement of the European Community to the Committee on 21 November. However, the representative then went on to mention developments that have taken place since the Charter was written. He suggested that the sponsors' approach was novel, because they were proposing to tackle the world's problems in an integrated manner. Here again, in our view, the sponsors are claiming too much credit and doing an injustice to the founders of our Organization.

(Mr. Birch, United Kingdom)

Those who wrote the Charter fully appreciated the interrelationship between problems of an economic, social, cultural and humanitarian nature, as well as the need to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms. Indeed, the opening of the Charter, Article 1, spells this out. So we do not think that the draft resolution contains much that is original.

Of course, the Charter does not spell out in detail how the ideals which it embodies can be achieved. How could it? No single document can purport to have all the answers to the world's problems. The strength of the Charter lies in the fact that it contains the foundation of common and basic values which should guide international co-operation, while leaving sufficient flexibility for specific issues to be handled in their proper context.

In our view, the Charter provides a perfectly adequate framework for the conduct of international relations, and it is up to Member States to maintain the high standards that it sets.

In short, we do not oppose a healthy debate on the strengthening of international peace and security. On the contrary, we believe that it is an essential part of the First Committee's deliberations. We are convinced that the collective security system embodied in the Charter is an effective system to preserve international peace and security. The problems which undoubtedly exist in the area of international peace and security are not related to the structure of that system. They stem from the failure of States to comply with their obligations under the Charter. We firmly believe that the Charter has stood the test of time and that the United Nations system, if we could make it work properly, would be able to solve the many problems that face mankind.

We therefore consider that any resolution that we adopt on this subject should reflect these concerns. We believe that a firm reaffirmation of the collective



(Hr. Birch, United Kingdom)

security system embodied in the Charter is a **saientiS1** in the operative part. We should also like to see references to the importance of the full participation and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms and of economic and social development as an indispensable ingredient in promoting international security. And we do not consider that there should be a presumption in favour of establishing some new system. We believe that these concerns are shared by many delegations.

We offer these comments and suggestions in a constructive spirit, and as a sincere response to the sponsors' call for dialogue on their initiative.

Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) : The item entitled "Establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security" is new on our agenda this year. Without prejudice to our position regarding the merits of the item, or the language used in drafting its title and relevant documents, I must admit to feeling gratified and grateful to its adoption since it focuses our attention once again on the main responsibility of the United Nations - the maintenance of international peace and security - after it had appeared that in our quest for rationalization we had lost sight of the Organization's raison d'être.

Those who called, in document A/41/191, for the inclusion of the item on the agenda and the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89 have made some extremely valid points. They include the following.

First, no State, however powerful, can expect to defend itself solely by military or technological means. We have always shared this view with the other non-aligned countries, as is evident from our rejection of the concepts underlining the establishment of military alliances.

Secondly, international security involves not only the military and political fields, but also the economic and humanitarian fields. This is in line with our interpretation of the principles, purposes and provisions of the Charter.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Thirdly, **the present** international **situation has become** extremely precarious, and the foundation of International peace and security is **threatened**. With a rampant arms **race** and an **increasing recurrence** of the **use of** force, our **very existence** is at stake. In recognition **of this, we** had previously **suggested** that the Security Council hold periodic **meetings** to take **stock** of the situation.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Fourthly, the United Nations Charter is, and must remain the basis of the international security system. It is our considered opinion that while the test of time has always proved that any system can be improved, the Charter not being sacrosanct, the heightened international tensions emanate basically from lack of respect for Charter provisions and from interpretation of its collective security provisions inconsistent with its principles, purposes and spirit.

In view of all that I have said, we believe that circumstances call for serious reflection and concrete action. We must halt the regression we have witnessed and redress the situation in order to consolidate for the future our endeavours, whether culminating in success or failure, will have implications of paramount importance for the continued validity of the contemporary International order. We should move forward with conviction, on solid ground and with common goals. This can be done only by reaffirming - through our deeds, not just our declarations - that we all remain fully committed to the Charter and faithfully interpret it, particularly its collective security provisions.

This reaffirmation should be translated into the following action: first, full respect for the principle of the non-use of force in international relations; secondly, practical measures confirming equal human rights for all nations of the world, foremost among those rights being the right of self-determination, which continues to be denied to the Palestinian and Namibian peoples; thirdly, full implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter, above all through the proper use of the Security Council, which has limited itself to deliberating on international crises and occasionally indulging in crisis management or peacekeeping operations, while remaining totally complacent and dormant in peacemaking and problem-solving, thus not fulfilling its function as the United Nations organ with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Hr. Badawi, Egypt)

The Security Council's continued and increasing lack of effectiveness has on many occasions been viewed as reflecting the irrelevance of the United Nations system in the contemporary international order and as an indication of its future demise. We must frankly state that the five permanent members of the Security Council are primarily responsible for this situation, for the provision in the Charter of particular decision-making powers for the Security Council was done in cognizance of the special responsibility calling upon its five permanent members, and not in recognition of any special rights.

Fourthly, there should be constructive participation in the negotiations initiated in the different specialized forums provided for by the United Nations system, such as the global negotiations on a new international economic order or the comprehensive programme on disarmament, as well as other comprehensive legal, political and social negotiations under way, meant to give concrete expression to the provisions of the Charter and credence to their continued validity and relevance to prevailing international conditions.

Egypt welcomes the inclusion for the fourth consecutive year of the item pertaining to security and co-operation in the Mediterranean. We do so out of a conviction that security is indivisible. XC It is believed that security in Europe impacts on international security, it also holds true that the former cannot be assured without security in the Mediterranean. Furthermore, how can there be security in the Mediterranean if hotbeds of tension and sources of conflict abound along its shores and in its midst? Let there be solutions to the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Cyprus problem and the Lebanese situation, to mention only a few. We shall then have contributed positively to the cause of international peace and security.

(Mr. Badawi, Egypt)

Other parts of the world also suffer their own share of crises: the infamous war between Iraq and Iran; Afghanistan, Kampuchea, apartheid and Namibia. Yet all those problems have one thing in common: they have all formed an integral part of our agenda here at the United Nations - alas, for too long. Should we be satisfied with issuing year after year the same pattern of resolutions, making ourselves believe that we attached due importance to these problems and given them proper consideration?

As I have already mentioned, the United Nations is replete with various mechanisms which could usefully be put into effect to deal with each of those problems in a timely and effective manner, but have we earnestly made the most of them?

This is certainly not on our part a cry of despair, for we are, and will remain, solid supporters of the Organization; nor is this a barb against the United Nations: it is merely a call for a saner and more positive approach. The United Nations has in the past, through its various organs and in co-operation with regional organizations, succeeded in obtaining satisfactory results in connection with several critical situations. This has been possible because the political will has existed. So let us regenerate this will; only then will we have a healthier United Nations and a better world.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): My country is extremely interested in the agenda item dealing with international peace and security; we approach it with an open mind and a spirit of understanding, for during this International Year of Peace the world will witness the kind of détente designed to achieve international peace.

The nuclear arms race and the race to acquire other weapons of mass destruction is a source of alarm to the entire international community. However,

(Mr. Al-Ataasi, Syrian Arab Republic)

the nuclear arms race is not limited to our planet; it has rapidly expanded to involve the militarization of outer space, the common heritage of mankind.

Countries aspiring to its domination should ponder the dangers of such an arms race.

The enormous resources diverted to the arms race have already reached such levels that we, the international community, can no longer bear the cost. We must put an end to those weapons and devote those resources to economic and social development projects in every country. Throughout the world man needs development in order to raise his standard of living and to achieve prosperity.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Thus there is an additional relationship among disarmament, economic development and the establishment of international peace and security. There must be the consolidation of efforts to guarantee the security of peoples and countries, since these form a basic endeavour to end the arms race and work towards development. In that regard, we do not think that there is a more appropriate single body to work continuously towards all three objectives than this international forum: the United Nations. In its 40 years of life, the Organization has proved its viability and validity. Even though its objectives are achieved slowly, we cannot disregard its achievements in the consolidation of international peace and security and its efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament. Hence Member States must make every possible effort to strengthen the Organization and to build confidence.

If to date the Organization has failed to solve problems and reduce tension in certain regions, it has been successful in heightening awareness of the threat posed to mankind by the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. The United Nations has helped make clear the true nature of racist régimes throughout the world, such as those in South Africa and Israel. In that connection, we cannot minimize the significance of General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX), which linked Zionism with racism.

Hotbeds of tension and wars of aggression persist in many regions of the world. The use and threat of force is the daily practice of certain Governments. Intervention in the internal affairs of other States - even States that are thousands of miles away - has a negative effect on security. States that pursue such policies therefore pose a threat to international peace and security. Aggressive and expansionist policies and a return to the imperialism of old pose the greatest threat to International relations and to international peace and security.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

There is no doubt that in one way or another all these problems result from • lack of commitment by States to the • maintenance of a comprehensive system of international peace • and • security under the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security contained in General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV) of 1970 and to the implementation of the Charter's provision regarding the peaceful settlement of disputes among States.

Central America continues to be • source of international tension and conflict stemming from policies of aggression, interference in the internal • affairs of other States, financing of mercenaries • and non-compliance with decisions of the International Court of Justice. There are all policies of the United States Administration, which find it difficult to live • alongside neighbours wishing to live in peace • and to choose their own political, economic • and social system, independently • and without any outside interference. Threats against Cuba • and • attempts to destabilize the Nicaraguan régime, through the financing of mercenaries or by direct acts of aggression and economic blockade, are major components of the danger to Central America and thus to international peace and • security.

In Africa, United States imperialism • exerts pressure on countries with independent economic systems, and • maintains the apartheid régime in its acts of aggression • against African countries. Its policy is one of aggression against these countries, • especially the front-line States.

The • situation in the Mediterranean is deteriorating owing to the presence of foreign fleets. The United States Sixth Fleet poses • threat to the peace and • security of coastal countries of the Mediterranean. In this connection we recall the acts of aggression carried out last April by United States • aircraft against the sovereignty and independence of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. At that time, United States aircraft based with the Sixth Fleet and on British territory carried out



(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

acts of aggression against civilian centres, destroying schools, hospitals and even the membership of some countries friendly to the United States. I shall go into no further detail about those acts of aggression, because they have already been considered in this Organisation. Suffice it to point out that the presence of the United States sixth Fleet off the United States coast, with the intent of committing acts of aggression against Libya, in collaboration with the United Kingdom, poses a threat to peace.

Since the establishment of the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine some 40 years ago, the Middle East region has witnessed an arms race as a result of the activities of the racist régime in occupied Palestine. That régime has carried out acts of aggression against neighbouring Arab countries and to this day occupies portions of their territory. It continues to pursue a policy of illegal annexation of the Golan Heights, Jerusalem, the West Bank and Gaza. There is a trend to Judaize the region. Through the Security Council and the General Assembly, the international community has urged that State to withdraw all its forces from occupied territories.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Despite those decisions, Israel continues its occupation and inhuman, racist policies in Palestinian territory: Israel has plundered land and property; it has set up colonies for Jews from abroad; it has closed schools and hospitals and waged a harmful policy of terrorism against the Palestinian people. Even more dangerous is the daily expulsion of Palestinian inhabitants, a practice condemned by all religions of the world. In the Golan Heights Syrian citizens are expressing their rejection of that occupation and of the shameful practices there, in particular the establishment of colonies and the imposition of Israeli nationality on the inhabitants of the Syrian-Golan region. The report of the Committee on Israeli practices attests to that Nazi occupation.

In defiance of Security Council decisions, notably resolution 425 (1978), Israel continues its occupation of southern Lebanon and is engaged there in practices that cause the destruction of crops and interfere with the proper functioning of United Nations forces. As a further result of Israeli occupation, many people have died at the hands of the South Lebanon Army (SLA) - mercenaries at the service of Israel.

Aided and abetted by the United States Administration and through the use of American economic assistance that includes weapons, aircraft, tanks and artillery, Israel is pursuing its illegal practices designed to consolidate the policy of occupation, aggression and expansion. Israel has already introduced nuclear weapons into the Middle East and has threatened their use against countries of the region - practices that have been repeatedly condemned by the First Committee and the General Assembly. Nevertheless, as has been documented in several reports, Israel continues its active nuclear collaboration with the United States and South Africa - a development that could destabilize peace and security and lead to disastrous results.

(Hr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Terrorism in all its forms, be it a matter of individual acts or of collective State policy, is condemnable. Itself a victim of terrorism, the Syrian Arab Republic vehemently rejects it. The struggle against occupation, aggression and annexation, however, is lawful and legitimate; the struggle to expel Israeli forces from our occupied territories is internationally acceptable. Never shall we compromise when it comes to the violation of our legitimate rights.

As President Hafiz al-Assad stated,

"We support liberation and the world-wide movement of national resistance to occupation and imperialism; we are 'opposed to terrorism in all parts of the world. The line separating terrorism and the struggle for liberation is perfectly clear.'

The most dangerous form of terrorism is State terrorism. How else can one describe the act of aggression against tiny Grenada; or the attack upon Libya by dozens of warplanes and the bombing of the residence of the Head of State in an attempt to kill him? What about the use of thousands of tons of American-made munitions and aircraft in the three-month-long bombardment of Beirut; or the seizure of civil aircraft in international airspace and their forced landing at Israeli airports? That is the kind of terrorism the American mass media ought to speak of. Such are the actions carried out by the United States and Israel.

Mr. SERGIWA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic) : The geographic, political, economic and cultural link between three continents, the Mediterranean is a strategic region coveted by many foreign colonial Powers. The continued presence there of the United States Sixth Fleet and the deployment of American missiles from bases in certain countries of the Mediterranean pose a grave threat to the security, safety and independence of the Mediterranean countries and

(Mr. Sergiwa, Libyan Arab  
Jamahiriya)

adjacent **regions**, and have **led to increased tension** and **instability** in that vital region of the **world**.

**Indeed**, the American **fleet** and **bases** have been **used** to launch intimidating, **provocative** acts of direct and indirect **aggression** against the **people** of the region. **My own people** continues to **suffer such** threats and **provocations**; witness the united **States** violation of our **airspace** and territorial waters during the **naval manoeuvres** conducted off our **shores** in an open **attempt** to interfere in our **Internal** affairs and prevent us **exercising** our **sovereignty** over the Gulf of Sidra, an integral part of our **territorial waters**. Not only **is it a violation** of Our **sovereignty** and territorial integrity and an impediment to **converting** the region into a **zone of** peace and co-operation it **also** threatens peace and security in the Mediterranean region **and worldwide**.

(Mr. Sergiwa, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

As part of its provocative manoeuvres the United States Administration has strengthened its Mediterranean float, in the particular vicinity of Libya. Prime examples of United States military aggression are the incidents in the Gulf of Sidra of August 1981 and March 1986 and the aerial bombardment of Tripoli and Benghazi on 15 April 1986 - barbarous raids that killed innocent people and destroyed civilian and residential areas.

The achievement of peace and security in the Mediterranean is one of the basic objectives of the countries of the region. Libya has therefore welcomed all regional and international efforts to reduce tension and thus safeguard the independence and territorial integrity of all countries of the region, on the basis of non-interference in their internal affairs and respect for their international boundaries.

My country endorsed the Final Declaration of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Mediterranean members of the Non-Aligned Movement, issued in Valletta, Malta, in September 1984. That Declaration urged all States "not to use their armaments, forces, bases and military facilities against non-aligned Mediterranean members." (A/39/526, para. 12)

My country also endorsed all the resolutions adopted at previous sessions of the General Assembly on the strengthening of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean. Those resolutions urged all countries to co-operate with the Mediterranean countries in pursuing their efforts to reduce tension and strengthen peace, security and co-operation in the area in pursuance of the purposes and principles of the Charter.

My country similarly endorsed the Final Documents of the non-aligned countries in their meetings held at New Delhi in April 1986 and at Harare in September 1986. In the latter they

(Mr. Sergiwa, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

"condemned the military exercises and other demonstrations of military power near the territorial water and airspace of littoral States which lead to the outbreak of very serious incidents and endanger the sovereignty and independence of non-aligned countries". (A/41/697, para. 210)

My country supported the Gorbachev initiative of 26 March 1986, which proposed the withdrawal of all foreign fleets from the Mediterranean.

At the beginning of this year, my country called for a meeting of the non-aligned countries and European countries in the Mediterranean region in order to draw up an international convention covering collective action and arrangements to protect the Mediterranean and to strengthen the peace and security of Mediterranean States. The idea was to prohibit manoeuvres and even the presence of foreign fleets in the Mediterranean, making it an exclusively economic zone for the countries of the region so that they might develop their natural resources for the benefit of their peoples and thus promote regional economic and commercial co-operation and telecommunications.

Since OUC revolution, my country has always endeavoured to strengthen peace, security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region through dismantlement of United States and United Kingdom colonial bases in our territory. As Mediterranean security is closely linked to European security, my country urges European States having United States colonial military bases in the Mediterranean region to take action to remove them, to refrain from providing my military facilities that could be used for interventionist purposes and to call for withdrawal of foreign fleets, inasmuch as their existence constitutes a threat to safety and security.

In conclusion, in order to maintain peace and strengthen international security, we must bend every effort to ensure disarmament, uphold the principles of independence, sovereignty and the territorial integrity of States, non-interference

(Mr. Sergiwa, Libyan  
Arab Jamahiriya)

in their internal affairs, the peaceful settlement of disputes, the non-use or threat of force, and respect for the rights of people to self-determination and sovereignty over their natural resources. In short, we must uphold the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): The question of the strengthening of international security has been debated at length before the First Committee of the United Nations over the past few years. This is not only because the issue represents the commitment of the international community after experiencing hard and bitter examples of the contrary condition, but also because of the increasing occurrence and recurrence of threats to and actual breaches of the aforementioned commitment .

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Building on the ruins left by the Second World War, civilized mankind reformulated certain principles which needed to be updated as a result of the accumulation of the lessons of history. No one could then dispute the fact that the very existence of civilization would have one over-all prerequisite, namely, the elimination of the threat or danger of a qualitatively new kind of war. That conclusion meant that the nations of the world had to assume the overwhelming responsibility for maintaining and consolidating international peace and security, a delicate and complicated yet unquestionably vital task. At times, one wonders whether it is the lack of clarity of implications and consequences that permits those in certain quarters to venture assertions that may well develop into an all-out confrontation. Or is it that the image of a post-thermonuclear-war world drawn by them is, to a reasonable degree, more palatable than the one foreseen by the vast majority of nations? However, with the degree of knowledge and modern technological facilities available to humanity, or even on the basis of common sense, neither of those possibilities is credible.

Why is it, then, that, in spite of the vivid and obvious outcome of the present course of developments, the deliberate exposure of international security to that immense threat still persists? That is perhaps explicable in the context of certain theories that could be described, to put it as mildly as possible, as irresponsible. Thoughts of ensuring security through force, which has dominated the minds of people in militarist circles, have understandably caused serious concern to the rest of the international community. One might have wished those ideas to be used solely as bargaining chips or for the purposes of normal and constructive rhetoric. Some actual deeds by the imperialist warmongering forces, however, have left no room for such wishful thinking. They have embarked upon the road of drastic escalation of the arms race, drawing up and implementing plans that



(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

would bolster, quantitatively as well as qualitatively, the potential for the complete destruction of the Earth.

Apart from the over-all policy of the imperialist forces, their day-to-day conduct of international affairs is also a faithful reflection of that major tendency, namely, to create new hotbeds of tension around the world, to fan the flames of those already existing, to resort to the use of force and aggression against small, independent nations and to exert political and economic pressure on them and destabilize their progressive and independence Governments through the export of mercenaries and subversion.

The recent chronology of events in Asia, Africa and Latin America is full of unmistakable examples of that policy. In the Middle East, the Arab communities of the region have been subjected to repeated acts of aggression, and the occupation of their territories by the Zionist régime of Israel continues unabated. The people of Palestine have remained the target of designs aimed at their physical annihilation. A just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East and Palestinian questions, which pose a grave threat to international security, is still out of sight. The Libya Arab Jamahiriya has repeatedly been attacked by the United States naval and air forces, causing considerable loss of life and property.

In South-East Asia, pressure and attempts at destabilization continue against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic. The people of Kampuchea must still fight the remnants of a dark era that is deliberately being kept alive by outside forces. The peaceful proposals of the three Indochinese nations, which would pave the way to cordial and friendly relations among the States of the region and thus help strengthen peace and security in that part of the world, have yet to meet a positive response from some other countries of the region.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The proposals of the People's Republic of Mongolia relating to Asian security constitute another major contribution by the forces of peace and détente, which have not been given serious and responsible attention. The continued senseless war between Iran and Iraq has resulted in bloodshed and fratricide in the Gulf region. The amassing of the interventionist forces of the imperialists in the southern waters of our continent and their full-scale attempt to militarize the most reactionary régimes in the region - and to face others in the bleak pursuit of the arm race - are main subjects of legitimate concern for the peoples of our area.

The proposals of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar and other proposals on the security of the Indian Ocean, which are significant parts of global efforts for the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, have received a cool response in imperialist quarters.

Afghanistan, which broke away from the imperialist and reactionary camp as a result of its national-democratic revolution of April 1978, has remained the innocent victim of a cruel and dirty undeclared war unleashed by imperialists, hegemonists and other reactionary forces.

Since the victory of the April Revolution, and particularly following its new phase, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has endeavoured to establish and expand friendly and cordial relations with all countries of the world and, in particular, with our neighbours. In a sincere hope and desire to resolve all outstanding issues with our neighbours, we submitted the proposals of May 1980, which were further elaborated by the proposals of August 1981. Those realistic proposals provide an acceptable basis for a comprehensive settlement of the situation created around Afghanistan.

Very important and practical steps have been taken by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union to impart further impetus to peaceful efforts

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

in that direction. An equally responsible approach on the part of our neighbours and their allies would no doubt contribute to the restoration of conditions favourable to normal and even friendly relations among States and to the consolidation of security in the region. Regrettably, however, the attitudes of the other parties involved leave much to be desired.

In southern Africa, the peoples of Namibia and South Africa are subject to the most abhorrent racial policies and practices. The Territory of Namibia is still illegally occupied by the Pretoria régime, and apartheid is showing its abominable face more brazenly than ever before. At times, armed attempts at destabilisation and acts of aggression by the racist South African régime endanger one independent African State; at other times, another. The efforts for the abolition of apartheid and for the independence of Namibia are constantly impeded by the obstructionist designs of the racist and colonialist régime of South Africa, with the connivance and support of its imperialist patrons.

The United States policy of treating Latin America as its backyard and its attempts to impose unpopular régimes on the nations of the region have aroused the indignation of those nations. Continued armed interference in the internal affairs of Nicaragua and the resort to force and aggression by the United States against its sovereignty and territorial integrity have considerably affected the security climate, not only of Nicaragua, but of the whole of Central America. Plots against the political process initiated by the Contadora Group have hampered the prospects for a peaceful settlement in the region.

(Mr. Zairif, Afghanistan)

Given the • tnta of affairs that now prevails in the world, the task of establishing a comprehensive • yetia of international peace and security is of utmost urgency. That is precisely what the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have • nphulaod in proposing the consideration of the item entitled "Establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security". The far-reaching proposals ma& by the Soviet leader, M.S. Gorbachev, in Vladivostok in July 1986 were mother gigantic contribution to the search for peace and collective • emr j ty in Asia and the Paci Cfc region.

The Movement of the Non-Aligned Countries has consistently striven for international actions to strengthen peace and security. Of particular importance are the decisions of the Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries during their meeting in Harare, Zimbabwe, in September 1986. The Delhi Declaration and other proposals of the Six States also constitute a valuable and serious effort towards promoting peace and • ecurity.

The tense and dangerous character of the world situation brought about as a result of the imperialist policy of confrontation and arms races bringing humanity ever closer to the abyss of complete annihilation.

Greater interdependence among States and the absence of any reasonable alternative to the policy of peaceful coexistence and co-operation call for urgent and concrete action in favour of strengthening the foundation of universal security. The realities of our time reject the old and worn-out concept of security through accumulation of larger quantities of • . The new political thinking demands a fundamental reshaping of • ttitude towards questions of peace and security. Such an attitude has to be guided by the fact that security is indivisible and therefore has to be universal, embracing all countries, regardless of their size, stage of development or socio-political system.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The task of preserving and strengthening security is increasingly acquiring a political essence. At the same time the scope of security admittedly encompasses the military, political, economic and humanitarian aspects.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, together with the other non-aligned States, the socialist community and other peace-loving forces, vigilantly and strongly comes out in favour of better and improved international relations in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and based on the universally accepted principles of peaceful coexistence among different socio-economic systems, non-interference, non-intervention, respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States, good-neighbourliness and international co-operation.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): In the past four decades the United Nations has made a great contribution to the maintenance of peace and security in the world. Under its aegis was led the anti-colonial revolution which brought freedom and independence to many peoples and countries. It has made a considerable contribution to affirmation of the right to self-determination, independence and sovereignty, and many important international initiatives such as the international strategy for general and complete disarmament and a New International Economic Order have been defined at the United Nations.

Unfortunately, certain countries, still guided in their international relations by policy based on might, strive to negotiate from a position of force. This is the reason why, despite the great efforts made by non-aligned and some other countries within the United Nations, there has as yet been no relaxation of tension in international relations. The age in which we live is still bedevilled by bloc rivalry, pressure, aggression and intervention. There is no let-up in confrontation in a bid to attain supremacy and spread one's own influence in the

(Yugodjokic, v l a )

world. The independence and secure development of many countries, the non-aligned ones in particular, are in jeopardy.

Instances of the threat or use of force abound, and interventions and interference in the internal affairs of others are manifold. As a rule, the victims are most often non-aligned and other developing countries. Instead of addressing themselves to the promotion of their own development and prosperity, these countries are compelled to exhaust their energies and use their potentials to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The greatest danger is presented by the military presence, activities and manoeuvres of big Powers in the territories, air space and territorial waters of the non-aligned and other developing countries, or in their vicinity. The military disengagement of big Powers and blocs from the non-aligned regions of the world would constitute an important element in the strengthening of the security of non-aligned countries and of international security in general.

International relations are compounded by other problems as well, particularly those that arise from the deep-rooted and mutually interrelated contradictions in international economic relations. The dialogue between North and South is stalled, and international co-operation for economic and social development through multilateral processes within the United Nations is being eroded. The dramatic widening of the gap between the developed and the developing world threatens to erupt into incalculable turmoil and instability. The debt burden of developing countries not only obstructs their economic development; it also puts into question the process of world development.

The situation is further aggravated by the arms race, since the vast human, material and technological resources so necessary for development are being spent on arms.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

It is understandable that today mankind is so vociferous in its opposition to the arms race, which, however, continues unabated and is being spread into new areas. There are new threats to extend it into outer space. Yet the balance of fear does not, and never can, guarantee peace and security.

Crises around the world perpetuate instability, tension and the danger of larger conflagrations. Almost all of these crises are located in non-aligned regions. In the Middle East, the expansionist policy of Israel prevents any progress whatsoever, and that region remains one of the most serious hotbeds of crisis. The terror of the racists, the mass killings, the persecution of the black population, the occupation of Namibia and the aggression of the Pretoria régime against neighbouring countries have transformed southern Africa into one of the most explosive areas of crisis in the world.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

The United Nations has provided the basis and pointed to the ways of solving these crises, as well as the crises in Lebanon, Cyprus, Korea, Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Central America and the conflict between Iran and Iraq, and although the principles and plans for a peaceful settlement of those crises are generally

● the efforts to implement them continue to be obstructed.

Peace, security and disarmament concern the destiny of the world. Therefore, they can hardly be the monopoly of the super-Powers. Détente can bear fruit only if it is universal, if all countries are involved and responsible. There can be no stable peace and security if they depend exclusively on what the super-Powers and their bloc organizations decide or agree upon. Substantial and comprehensive relaxation should involve all countries and regions of the world.

The United Nations is an irreplaceable international forum for the maintenance of peace and security. The non-aligned countries have made their own contribution to the growth of the United Nations into a democratic forum in which all Member States participate in the consideration of vital problems of the present-day world on an equal footing. The current international situation calls for the

● strengthening of the role of the United Nations and for the undertaking of resolute and concrete measures for the realization of the goals contained in the declaration on the strengthening of international security.

We are therefore deeply perturbed that the United Nations, and multilateral co-operation in general, is subjected to deliberate pressure and attempts by some countries to reduce and limit its role and importance.

The role of the United Nations in international relations can be strengthened only by joint efforts to bring all vital international issues, including security, before the organs of the United Nations. By that we mean, first and foremost, the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretary-General.



(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

To this end it is necessary to strengthen the effectiveness of the Security Council in the fulfilment of its basic role of safeguarding international peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. The Security Council should occasionally meet to consider some of the problems and crises in the world. This would enhance its capability to launch preventive actions, to facilitate peaceful solutions to problems and, whenever necessary, to take effective measures, including those envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter.

As a European country, Yugoslavia attaches particular importance to security and co-operation in Europe. We are convinced that, with the necessary political will of all concerned the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) process may contribute considerably to the cessation of the arms race and to a general relaxation of tension. We are therefore encouraged by the successful completion of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

The initiatives for the establishment of zones of peace and co-operation, particularly in those parts of the world in which direct confrontation between blocs has occurred and in which their military presence is most evident, enjoy our full support. Together with other non-aligned countries of the Mediterranean, Yugoslavia is striving to transform the Mediterranean into a region of genuine peace and co-operation.

The existing problems should be solved by political means, through negotiations, based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We welcome the continuation of the dialogue between the two super-Powers. However, there should be no reason for slowing down or discontinuing negotiations in multilateral forums. On the contrary, the negotiations outside those forums should complement them.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

The seriousness of the situation we are facing calls for joint efforts of all the members of the international community to preserve international peace and security. From their recent Eighth Summit Conference, held at Harare, Zimbabwe, the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries addressed an appeal to the two super-Powers, in which they stated, inter alia:

"The Non-Aligned Movement is committed to the search for global stability and the development of equitable international co-operation in solving the main political and economic problems affecting the world today. We, its members, are prepared to continue to play an active part in the task of creating a secure international environment".

The importance of maintaining international peace today is second to none. The international community is following a course that may lead not only to accelerated development and progress for all, but to its self-annihilation. As stated in the above-mentioned appeal, the alternative today is not between war and peace, but between life and death. Therefore, the struggle for peace and security in the world is, first and foremost, the struggle for our common survival and for the survival of future generations.

Each and every proposal aimed at promoting international security deserves our attention. The promotion of the present system of international security, the strengthening of its effectiveness and the universality of its implementation are the goals we should forever aspire to. But consistent adherence to the system which we have created and enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations is the obligation of all, never to be discarded or lost sight of.

The proposal of the Soviet Union on the comprehensive system of international security is one of those documents that arouse interest. It is a comprehensive concept of a system of international security, which, in the opinion of its

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

proponent, would reflect more adequately the needs of the international community **at** the present level of development of international relations. **Its** comprehensiveness is indicative of its long-term nature, and its complexity calls for reflection.

At this stage, however, it begs more questions than it answers **and** requires further clarification as to content, goals and substance. **This** is understandable since answers **may come** only **as a** result of a systematic discussion and assessment of all the implications of each possible solution concerning the system of international security. For **its** part, Yugoslavia is prepared to participate in such an endeavour.

Mr. KEBIDI (Zaire) (interpretation from French) : **My delegation** has already had **occasion to congratulate you**, Sir, on your election to the important post of Chairman of the First Committee. We feel both pleasure and great **satisfaction in reiterating** our congratulations and in **stating** how much we appreciate your talents, skills and qualities which have been **amply** proved in your well-known diplomatic career. We know that you will lead the work of the First Committee with speed and efficiency.

The delegation of Zaire is speaking today on agenda item 141, on international peace and security, because we share **the** international community's concerns with regard to international peace and **security**.

(Mr. Kebidi, Zaire)

Indeed, it is a self-evident truth that without peace there can be no international security and that without international security there can be no peace. Indeed, without peace there can be no socio-economic development.

These are the terms of one and the same equation that must be taken into account if we wish to resolve the fundamental problems facing mankind. It is a truism to say that, following the failure of the League of Nations and the crumbling of moral values and the principles of law that then governed relations among States, after the Second World War the community of nations devised a new basis for relations among independent States, regardless of their size, their length of existence or their wealth or poverty. Thus, in San Francisco on 24 October 1945, the Charter of the United Nations came into being. Last year we celebrated the 'fortieth anniversary of our Organization, established to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind. We heard a vast number of speeches - speeches that form the best compilation of political eloquence in contemporary times. I shall not try to repeat all the brilliant phrases, but after 40 years of multilateralism, we must concede that, although international co-operation has registered important accomplishments, our world continues to live in fear of a possible nuclear holocaust.

For years now, the major Powers and other nuclear-weapon States have accustomed us to scenarios in which reductions are made in conventional and nuclear weapons. Beautiful statements bid us accomplish this, but, in spite of progress in bilateral and multilateral conferences, the military industry grows ever larger and increasing numbers of sophisticated weapons are manufactured to harm human beings.

We are in favour of disarmament, but mere statements of intent are not enough. International peace and security is not the monopoly of a few militarist

(Mr. Kebidi, Zaire)

**Powers. It is something that intimately affects all human beings, for mankind is always dreaming of a better world. Nuclear holocaust must be forever eradicated from our future.**

**For its part, Zaire believes that auctionr of international peace and security are so vital that they should not be left to the major Powers alone. They will follow their selfish interests or the interests of their prestige as major military Powers, which has put the world in constant peril and betrayed the noble principles enshrined in the Charter to which they have adhered. We call upon them to respect the sacri principles of the United Nations Charter governing the peaceful settlement of disputes, respect for the sovereignty of States, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and sovereign equality among all States.**

**Since its adherence to the Charter of the Organization, Zaire, which lies at the heart of the African continent, has made its modest contribution to building a better world, not only through its participation in United Nations activities, but by endeavouring to implement the principles advocated in the Charter. Good-neighbourliness and dialogue among States are priorities for U in our relations with all foreign countries, and in particular with our neighbours with which we share common borders. We have established agreements of co-operation with most of our neighbours that work to the satisfaction of all the States parties. With regard to South Africa, Zaire has never accepted any compromises in its attitude to the system of apartheid, which places the black majority in a situation of servility and subjugation that is incompatible with the dignity of every human being. Elsewhere on the African continent, Zaire has spared no efforts to meet the challenge of history and to show solidarity with national liberation struggles.**

(Mr. Kebidi, Zaire)

With regard to South Africa, Zaire calls for the implementation of comprehensive and mandatory economic sanctions against that country. In that connection, we call also for the implementation of all relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, in particular resolution 435 (1978), to resolve the painful problem of Namibia that poses such a painful challenge to good judgement, the universal conscience and international morality.

With regard to other regional conflicts in other parts of the world, my country's authorities have, from the United Nations rostrum, sought appropriate solutions in keeping with the relevant resolutions of the Organization. The establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security requires the creation of a new international economic order that will establish just relations between the industrialized countries and those of the third world that produce the basic raw materials. It requires also the elimination of international terrorism, whether by States or individuals, and the allocation of greater financial resources to international economic development, alleviation of external debt, and readjustment in the debt-servicing structure of the poorer countries, whose capacity for development is threatened. It calls for the elimination of poverty, illiteracy and disease. A world in which such things exist is not conducive to international peace and security. All countries, and in particular the nuclear Powers, must show a more tangible and resolute commitment to make that goal a reality.

Those are the basic principles of the statement my delegation wishes to make on this agenda item.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.