



**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 57th MEETING**

**Chairman:** Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

**later:** Mr. AOKI (Japan)

**later:** 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 3.10 p.m.

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

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

**Mr. ZAHID** (Morocco) (interpretation from French): The most pressing

threat to international peace and security today is the risk of nuclear war, a risk which continues to grow owing to the ongoing nuclear-arms race. Since no state is safe from this threat, the international community's most urgent task is totally and finally to eliminate all nuclear weapons, under effective international control. That is an essential task.

In the Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly rightly declared that

"Removing the threat of a world war - a nuclear war - is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation".

(resolution S-10/2, para. 18)

Faced with that choice, the international community does not appear to have hesitated to opt for the achievement of general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Zah id, Morocco)

This choice is al.1 the more proper, since it is part and parcel of furthering the more general goal of maintaining international peace and security the United Nation8 has sat for itself under Article 1 of the Charter. Fur thermore, this relationship between disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security that flows logically from the provisions of the Charter has been confirmed and reiterated by the international community on a number of occasions. In this connection, the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Harare last September, declared:

"The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed that disarmament, the relaxation of international tension, respect for the right to self-determination and national independence, the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the strengthening of international peace and security are closely related to each other. They stressed that progress in any one of these spheres has a beneficial effect on all of them; in turn, failure in one sphere has a negative effect on others." (A/41/697, p. 23, para. 3U)

Therefore, it is clearly necessary, if we are to strengthen international peace and security, for States to give up unilateral security based on the accumulation of weapons and instead switch to collective security based On disarmament. Indeed, any step taken to strengthen a State's security must take into account the ultimate goal of collective security and the vital need to avoid the ruinous pursuit of the arms race, its detrimental effects and the suicidal increase in violence.

In this connection we must, among other things, improve the Security Council's effectiveness as the organ primarily responsible under the United Nations Charter for the msintenance of international peace and security. The international community must seek ways and means to enable the Security Council to discharge

(Mr. Zah id, Morocco)

fully its responsibilities and take necessary steps to restore international peace and security. We trust that the hopes to which the Reykjavik meeting between the Heads of State of the two super-Powers gave rise will be realized and thus create the atmosphere needed to achieve that goal.

As a Mediterranean country, Morocco is gravely concerned at the ongoing tension that threatens peace and security in that part of the world. This concern was expressed at the current session of the General Assembly by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, who said:

"As a Mediterranean country, bordering on the important maritime navigation route of the Gibraltar Straits, Morocco attaches special importance to the maintenance of peace and stability in the Mediterranean. My country will spare no effort to transform the Mediterranean region into a zone of peace, security and co-operation, free from any tension or confrontation. In our view, co-operation and joint efforts among the countries in the north and those to the south of the Mediterranean are an excellent way to achieve that objective." (A/41/PV. 11, p. 129-130)

The transformation of the Mediterranean region into a zone of peace, security and co-operation is broadly supported by the international community, as recalled in the Declaration of the Eighth Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Harare last September, which states:

"The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed their support for the transformation of the Mediterranean area into a region of peace, security and co-operation, free from conflict and confrontation, and expressed firm support for the objective of strengthening security and co-operation in the Mediterranean Basin in accordance with earlier statements by the Movement and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly." (A/41/697, p. 98, para. 211)

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

Nevertheless, we consider that transforming that region into a zone of peace, security and co-operation cannot be achieved unless the Middle East conflict - of which the question of Palestine is at the core - is settled. Hence Israel must withdraw from all Occupied Arab territories, including Al-Quds Al-Sharif, and the restoration of the Palestinian people's inalienable rights, including their right to self-determination and to establish a State in their homeland, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, their sole authentic representative.

The international community, which bears a special historic responsibility via-b-vie the situation prevailing in the Middle East, should spare no effort to bring about a just and lasting solution to that conflict, thus contributing to ushering in peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean on a sound basis, guaranteeing the rights of all peoples concerned, while respecting the fundamental principles of the non-use of force and non-intervention in internal affairs of the coastal States.

Mr. RAKOTONIAINA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): The consideration of the implementation of the Declaration on the strengthening of International Security requires that we first take a quick glance at the world situation in all its various aspects. However, it would be superfluous to go over the ground that has already been covered in the General Assembly and in other Committees on the various issues which, in our view, have a more or less direct link with international security. Let me simply have recourse to an exaggerated caricature to give a picture of the international scene. In this illustration let us imagine lush hills where abundance seems to go hand in hand with nuclear arsenals.

(Mr. Rakotoniaina, Madagascar)

In the rocky valleys where despair and poverty prevail, millions of human beings are struggling to survive. The biggest irony is that here and there some of them are still crossing swords. These are only some of the most troubling scenes, but we feel that it is inappropriate to dwell on the matter further. We must recognize that our world has a super-abundance of arms. It is marked by a deep division between rich and poor countries. We live in a world of paradoxes, such as the squandering of resources by some, in shocking contrast with the needs and poverty of others. Moreover, differences in approach and conflicts of interest engender and encourage regional conflicts; elsewhere they exacerbate old hostilities of tension.

These are negative factors impeding the establishment of real security for all States. In such a context, no one feels secure - neither those who dwell in the lush hills nor those others who struggle in the valleys of despair, because we all look towards the same horizon, where we see the spectre of nuclear ruin. The debate on disarmament, which has just ended, and the resulting resolutions we have adopted have once again shown that the fear of mutual destruction which seems to be keeping the nuclear Powers from conflict between themselves is too fragile a thing to prevent a nuclear exchange. In other words, international security is closely linked to nuclear disarmament.

The persistence of underdevelopment has put the small countries in an untenable position, which is worsened by the debt problem and the problem of servicing that debt, to such an extent that the economic independence and political stability of those countries are seriously threatened. Since political security cannot be dissociated from economic security, the establishment of lasting peace and genuine security demands the elimination of underdevelopment and the establishment of a new international economic order. The present and long-term

(Mr. Rakotoniaina, Madagascar)

**vital. interests of all countries, both developed and developing, make it imperative to settle the serious economic problems in a way that excludes selfishness and short-term considrrationn.**

**Differences in outlook and conflicte of interest are at the root of the crises seriously affecting relations between States. Increased efforts should be made to solve those crises, which persist in southern Africa, the Middle East, Asia and Central America. It is clear that they cannot be eliminated without respect for the right to self-determination, the principles of sov' reignty, territorial integrity and independence, the principle of the non-use of force and non-interference and the right of each nation freely to choose its development path. Absolute respect for those principles and scrupulous compliance with the Charter would to a large extent strengthen the security of States. It is therefore evident that the most urgent task is to strengthen the United Nations and t make it the true centre where the efforts of ail nations can be harmonized.**

**In our interdependent world it is undeniable that peace is indivisible. There can be no international security an long an there is not equal security for all countries. It is therefore all the more true that the security of some cannot be provided at the cost of the security of others. Questions of common interest should be discussed and reolved hy all countries, at the United Nations or under its auspices. Negotiations held outside the Organization should complement and not be an ohatacle to talks within the framework of multilateral negotiations.**

**In thin statement my delegation has limited itself to expressing its views on some questions that it helieves to be closely linked to international security. However, we are perfectly aware that the problem of international security encompasses several areas of international life and relations. We believe that it would be appropriate to consider together ways and means to strengthen security**

(Mr. Rakotonirainy, Madagascar)

for all countries. Therefore, we very much welcome the initiative of the socialist countries on the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. We note that the ultimate purpose of the proposal is to democratise international relations, basing the security of peoples on a global concept and revitalizing the international security system. Since this involves many problems of international life, it follows that permanent dialogue between nations should be established.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is intended to contribute to implementing the purposes and principles of the Charter and to strengthen the Organization's role in maintaining peace and strengthening International security. In my delegation's view, it is still topical and its implementation requires energetic, specific initiatives to take into account the development of relations between States.

Our world is tired of living in a state of uncertainty, of alternating between hope and alarm. It should be ashamed of the poverty affecting hundreds of millions of human beings, while astronomical resources are squandered for purposes which do not contribute to improving the well-being and security of peoples.

Mr. BORG (Malta): My delegation wishes to focus its comments on agenda item 67, "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region".

Another year has passed since the Committee last considered that item. Yet again, the interim period has been fraught with a grave escalation of tension. Our region, the Mediterranean, has in the past 12 months witnessed an increase in incidents of confrontation and distrust which have exacerbated the situation.

The events in our region continue to occupy the mind of the international community. In turn, the small Mediterranean States have been put in a precarious situation, which needs to receive, and should receive, the attention of the United Nations as a whole.



(Mr. Borg, Malta)

Malta, a small country located in a region straddling the convergence of the European continent with the continents of Asia and Africa, is perturbed and very much concerned at seeing the commitments we all undertook to uphold when we became Members of this Organization not being adequately safeguarded. Unresolved questions like the situation in the Middle East, in particular the Palestinian question, and the question of Cyprus, as well as the turbulent situations which have led to serious incidents in the Mediterranean, have put in jeopardy the security and stability of the Mediterranean States and have increased the grave danger of direct confrontation between the most powerful nations.

The challenges which we are all facing, particularly the vulnerable States of the Mediterranean, make it all the more important to find support and refuge in the United Nations. For countries like my own, the United Nations remains the unique forum where all States have the same rights and privileges as well as the same duties and obligations. It is the place where no voice goes unheard, since in an increasingly interdependent world events in a small nation can affect countries all around the globe. Precisely, the events in the Mediterranean in recent months have again starkly revealed that fact.

It was because of its duties and obligations under the United Nations Charter that Malta undertook its first endeavours, in the early days of January of this year, mainly directed to ease tension, to fulfil its duty not only to the Maltese people but also to the peoples of all Mediterranean countries. The consultations held during those early initiatives were wide-ranging. We expressed to friendly countries our concern and our views as to how to resolve issues like acts of terrorism as well as the use of force to resolve issues created by acts of terrorism - not by resorting to the use of force or economic sanctions, but by means of direct or indirect talks, formal or informal discussions among all countries concerned.

(Mr. Borg, Malta)

Besides actively encouraging direct talks between the parties most concerned, Malta embarked on intensive endeavours to bring together the Prime Ministers of the Central Mediterranean countries to discuss the situation in the region and also to examine the Maltese Government's proposal that the 10 countries undertake the commitment to refrain from the use of force against each other or to permit military bases on their territories to be used against each other's countries. Unfortunately, the meeting could not be held, as only Libya responded positively to the Maltese proposal.

The Maltese Government took yet another initiative when it invited the foreign ministers of the regional non-aligned countries to a meeting to discuss the tense situation in the Central Mediterranean region and to draw up a common policy. This initiative also fell through, as it did not elicit the response it deserved.

The Maltese Government continued its efforts to reduce the already existing and increasing tension. Meetings were held with the Libyan and the Italian Governments. There was also direct and continual contact with the United States Government, in an attempt to find a solution to the already precarious situation. In spite of those efforts, the wishes of the Maltese Government to avoid trouble and conflict were not fulfilled.

The Committee will recall the incidents involving the use of force which arose in the wake of the manoeuvres held in the Gulf of Sidra. The Maltese Government had, prior to these incidents, expressed its feeling that it was not necessary to deploy military aircraft or warships in order to assert one's right in accordance with international law.

Furthermore, as soon as it was learned that as a result of other terrorist attacks the use of force was being contemplated, the Maltese Government made fresh efforts to avert further incidents. It conveyed to other Mediterranean Governments

(Mr. Borg, Malta)

its preoccupation and the ways which in its view could lead to international understanding in the Mediterranean region, favouring a peaceful climate, lessening the tension and increasing the prospects of peace in the Central Mediterranean.

It transpired however that, in spite of assurances that the situation was not thought likely to lead to the use of force, that actually happened. On the other hand, the Maltese Government had perceived the gravity of the situation and the necessity for a final effort to prevent the use of force.

Following the grave turn of events in the Gulf of Sidra when fighting broke out, Malta found itself once again in the unenviable position of being the country closest to the scene of hostilities,

Those initiatives, which as I have stated proved futile, were backed up by efforts made by Malta here at the United Nations, precisely through the Security Council. That highest international forum has time and again slowed the onrush of events, gained time for vital changes in direction, produced face-saving mechanisms and substituted talk for violent action. It has set important guidelines for the solution of complex problems and provided, with the co-operation of the Secretary-General, all manner of forms of conciliation, mediation, good offices, fact-finding, truce observation and quiet diplomacy.

Immediately Malta took the initiative and on 26 March 1986 it called for an urgent Security Council meeting, where it reiterated its appeal to the concerned parties to enter into consultations in order to resolve all the differences which existed between them; on the basis of the principles relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes. The representative of Malta also pointed out that

"The latest incidents have shown that the rejection of the peaceful approach advocated by Malta and agreed to by Libya in January has not helped to resolve the problems which exist. On the contrary, it has exacerbated

(Mr. Borq, Ma Lta)

them. My Government's **appeal for prudence and reason to prevail** therefore remains as earnest as it ever was. The reasons why this appeal should be heeded are more than ever evident. We stand ready to assist and co-operate in any action that could resolve the present difficult ~~ies~~ and open the way for their just and Lasting resolution". (S/PV.2668, p. 18)

Malta's efforts to achieve an agreement to avert a worsening of the situation and the cessation of those acts that gave rise to the tension were unsuccessful. The Council took no steps in this regard except for a number of meetings.

On Saturday, 12 April 1986, when in the Maltese Government's opinion the situation had become very serious, Malta again requested a Security Council meeting, to consider that situation. This time it presented a draft resolution calling on all parties concerned

"to desist from all further action which could lead to the use of armed force in the Central Mediterranean"

and entrust inq

"the Secretary-General to take immediate appropriate action with the parties concerned to ensure that only the peaceful means envisaged by the United Nations Charter are utilized to reconcile any differences between them".

(S/17984)

On Monday, 14 April 1986, while the Security Council was still considering the item and informal consultations were in process on the draft resolution submitted by Malta, a meeting was held in Malta between the Libyan Prime Minister and the Maltese Government. At the latter meeting, the situation in the Mediterranean was closely examined in order to plan measures that could be taken by the two sides to resolve all ~~auentiona~~ by peaceful means rather than by the use of force.

Unfortunately, that same evening we heard the news that Tripoli and Benghazi had been attacked. The worst, which Malta had predicted, had actually occurred.

(Hr. Borg, Malta)

The Security Council then entered a new phase. Malta, on 21 April 1986, again intervened and drew the attention of the Council to the initiatives taken by Malta this year in its strenuous efforts to avert the crisis in the Mediterranean. On that occasion the Maltese representative stated that the Malta Government had "at all times emphasized the need for preventive diplomacy and the use of negotiations to avoid the use of force. We tried it . . . twice with the Security Council. At no time did we try, even unconsciously, to lead anyone into a state of false expectations by presenting, or even hinting at, possibilities that did not even exist. We were at all times concerned with the true facts, and it was those bare facts of life that my Prime Minister explained to everybody, especially the partners directly involved in the dispute". (S/PV.2622, p. 21)

Notwithstanding all those calls aimed at promoting the methods of peaceful consultation in contrast to the resort to force, we found no response. This eventually brought in its wake the perils of increasing confrontation and polarization in our region. Ever since, Malta has continued its endeavour to bring peace and co-operation to the Mediterranean region. At every occasion which arises, Malta is in the forefront of the movement aiming at peace and disarmament.

For Malta, a policy for regional peace and co-operation is an integral part of the policies it pursues for its national development. Our status of neutrality and non-alignment, in directly contributing towards the lessening of tensions around us, helps consolidate our process of national development. On a wider level, we find that our status of neutrality and non-alignment permits us to take significant initiatives both at the bilateral and at the multilateral levels for regional peace and co-operation.

(Mr. Borg, Malta)

Malta's role in the Non-Aligned Movement, in the Commonwealth, in the Council of Europe and in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) has always been one that strives for peace, security and co-operation in the region.

The far-reaching initiative taken by the Mediterranean Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries at their September 1984 meeting at Valletta is in itself a milestone, tackling directly the issues that are themselves the cause of tension in the region. The Heads of State or Government, at the Eighth Non-Aligned Summit Conference, held at Havana in September of this year, welcomed the decision of the Mediterranean non-aligned members to hold meetings when they deem necessary at the foreign-ministerial level, the next to be held in Yugoslavia. The summit meeting also encouraged ministerial meetings to take place whenever necessary in order further to contribute, in a concrete manner; both to the stability of the region and to the promotion in the region of functional co-operation in various fields among the non-aligned Mediterranean members and between them and European countries. My delegation sincerely hopes that the Committee will indeed unanimously support and endorse such a decision, which is an ongoing and effective contribution towards peace, security and co-operation in the Mediterranean.

On another front, and precisely within the CSCE, Malta has worked assiduously in favour of the concept that the security of the Mediterranean is closely linked with European security. On 1 August 1975, when the Final Act of the Conference was signed, the Mediterranean process was launched. Malta, whose history has been built on acts of war and strife in an endless series of warfare and bloodshed, has dedicated itself to transforming the Mediterranean into a region of peace and co-operation.

The agreement reached at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe on measures for confidence and

(Mr. Borg, Malta)

security-building is important for the reduction of tension in Europe and in the Mediterranean and will serve as a basis for further elaboration at the third follow-up meeting that began a few days ago at Vienna. It is significant to note that the Maltese proposal to include naval activities in the Mediterranean in the system of measures to be adopted for greater security in Europe has been accepted by the Stockholm Conference. The 35 participants agreed that amphibious manoeuvres in European waters including the Mediterranean, as well as manoeuvres on the continent, were to be included in the new scheme of notification and observation of military activities. The Conference also agreed on a declaration on the use of Force between its members, and reiterated the participants' determination to apply that principle in a reciprocal manner in their relations with the Mediterranean States.

Encouraged by the results in Stockholm, Malta continues vigorously to pursue its goal of furthering and consolidating measures to enhance peace and security in the region within the CSCE process. In this regard Malta has called upon the Vienna follow-up conference to re-examine the Mediterranean document, which forms an integral part of the Helsinki Final Act. We believe that the time is ripe to review the achievements or failures in the implementation of the Mediterranean chapter since the adoption of the Final Act. Accordingly, we have proposed the convening of an expert group, to be composed of the 35 CS participating States, to consider this matter.

A second proposal submitted by Malta in this connection relates to the prevention and control of terrorism. Here again, we have proposed the holding of an expert-level meeting with the participation of the 35 States of the CSCE and of all the Mediterranean states.

(Mr. Borg, Malta)

Malta's efforts within the CSCE are being complemented by other efforts in the Council of Europe, where particular attention has been given to the serious developments in the Mediterranean and to the alleviation of terrorism, a scourge which had created havoc and brought international condemnation. On 22 April 1986, in line with Malta's efforts over the past few months in the Security Council, in the Non-Aligned Movement and in various bilateral contacts, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Malta went before the 21 States members of the Council of Europe and reiterated Malta's position that the problems of our region, including the problem of international terrorism, can be solved only through peaceful dialogue between European and Arab countries, and not through the use of force.

In this context the Foreign Minister of Malta stressed the willingness that exists on the part of various Arab countries to join in the fight against international terrorism and proposed that a contact group at ministerial level be formed, consisting of four States members of the Council of Europe and four Arab countries, to discuss all issues related to the question. There was agreement among ministers on the principle that a dialogue between European and Arab countries must be established. Malta's specific proposal for the setting up of a contact group was given detailed and serious consideration, and it was decided that further discussions were required to examine this idea. The ministers of the Council also decided that a conference of ministers responsible for combating terrorism should be held before the end of 1986.

It is to be pointed out that Malta's stand on the worst phenomenon of our times, which has touched many if not all countries of the Mediterranean, has been elaborately put forward by Malta's Prime Minister when he spoke at the inauguration of an Interpol European Regional Conference in Valletta earlier this year. The Prime Minister stressed Malta's total commitment to collaborate with all countries



(Mr. Borg, Malta)

in combating terrorism and other crimes. He stated that Malta would not conceal any information from any country on the preparation and perpetration of terrorist activity. He added that the sharing of information on terrorist activities should transcend all other political considerations and that that was the first step that should be taken if one wished effectively to deal with the plague of terrorist activities.

The Prime Minister emphasized that the Maltese Government was totally committed to discouraging the perpetration of terrorist activities emanating from any source. As an example, he mentioned hijacking, and he said that the Maltese Government's policy was that it would not subscribe to any request by hijackers, whatever the consequences and however high the price. Malta showed that firm stand when it strongly refused to give fuel to a hijacked Egyptian Airline plane and made it clear to one and all that its airport was not going to serve as a refuelling station in hijacking incidents.

In inviting other Governments to study this concept, Malta's Prime Minister has also stated that the Maltese Government does not believe that international terrorism can be overcome by military intervention, whether full scale or sporadic. Military intervention would only increase counter-reaction. Malta's position on this problem is on record. It is against all forms of terrorism, whatever their manifestations, be they perpetrated by individuals or be they irresponsible acts of States. The Mediterranean countries have been witness to many brutal and horrific acts of terrorism, and, with perseverance and determination, those same Mediterranean countries can be rid forever of this plague.

To give stronger effect to its position on terrorism, Malta signed, on 5 November 1986, the 1977 European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism.

(Mr. Borg, Malta)

The European-Mediterranean dialogue that Malta has been promoting in the political sphere has also been directed towards the promotion of stronger economic links with both the European Community and the Arab League. Economic security is an essential dimension of security in the Mediterranean. At the meeting of economic experts of non-aligned Mediterranean members, the view was expressed that non-aligned Mediterranean countries should be considered as full partners with the industrialized countries of Europe for the development of the Mediterranean region. It is the position of the Maltese Government that one way in which the European Community can enhance the political stability of the non-member Mediterranean States is through more dialogue between the Community countries and non-member Mediterranean countries. That could also be furthered were more emphasis and appreciation to be given to the Mediterranean policy of the Community. Important progress has been achieved in that regard, and the European Community is responding positively to those developments.

From the early 1970s it has been the Maltese Government's policy to establish strong relations of friendship and co-operation with European countries and with all Arab nations, especially those of the Mediterranean littoral States. The Arab League always supported Malta's efforts for peace in the Mediterranean region. In 1983, during the final discussion of the Madrid CSCE Meeting, the Arab League issued a declaration of support for Malta's efforts to organize a meeting of Mediterranean countries. The Arab League sent an observer to the September 1984 meeting of Foreign Ministers of Mediterranean non-aligned countries. We intend to strengthen our efforts to bring long-lasting peace and co-operation to that region.

(Mr. Borg, Malta)

Malta has worked towards a better future for its people. Together with other member States of the Non-Aligned Movement, it has endeavoured at the regional level to apply the goals and objectives of non-alignment, not only in the region itself, but world-wide. The linkage that exists between the political and the economic security at the littoral States of the Mediterranean is an inevitable dimension within which all peace-loving States of the Mediterranean have striven in these last few years. The difficulties and problems faced, or that will be faced, by those States are enormous. Yet the challenges posed by the political and economic realities can be taken up only if there is a genuine determination to move forward and act collectively. The Mediterranean non-aligned countries have a role to play in defining the destiny of their countries and their region, a region full of strife, crisis and tension.

The destiny of the Mediterranean must be decided by the countries of that region. In the same way that we reject terrorism, we also reject armaments, super-Power rivalry and confrontation, the use of military power and all other forms of insecurity, whether political, economic or social. The United Nations has an important role to play. We earnestly hope and expect that the endeavours of the non-aligned Mediterranean countries will find active and practical support and encouragement on the part of the membership of this Organization and by the United Nations itself.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French) : On 21 November the representative of the United Kingdom stated the views of the countries members of the European Community on international security items, and thus stated the views of my country as well. My delegation wishes to add a few comments we think to be important.

(Mr. Morel, France)

My first comment concerns how international security questions are presented in the United Nations. My delegation could not fail to notice both in statements and in the documents before the Committee a tendency to dramatize the assessment of today's international climate. Reference is made at random to heightened confrontation and to the growing danger of nuclear self-destruction. To be sure, we must not underestimate the seriousness of the present international situation; it is proper and desirable that, more than any other Committee, the First Committee should take the measure of what is at stake. But we have to see things as they are. We think that it is more useful to analyse the various aspects and the complexity of the situation than to give way to doom-saying.

We agree that the subject of this debate on international security is in fact a certain number of specific situations that take different forms: conflicts, the occupation of territories, repression, failure to respect human rights, or terrorism. Others involve economic imbalances and emergency situations with a direct effect on the security of States and their populations. We believe that the international community's efforts are best deployed on the basis of such a precise analysis of the situation. To increase anxiety is tantamount to encouraging fatalism, exacerbating misunderstanding and clouding judgement. More than anything else, we require a sense of responsibility.

My second point is that the international community possesses a matchless tool to that end: the Charter of the United Nations. We must constantly refer back to the Charter as the fundamental law of international relations. Nations have only one constitution; the international community has only one Charter. Obviously, the Charter cannot provide immediate and precise answers to all of today's problems, but because of the very universality of its purposes and principles it defines a

(Mr. Morel, France)

single and irreplaceable framework for the behaviour of States. We cannot fall to reiterate that lasting security requires that all adhere to those purposes and principles.

Therefore, we consider that ideas or proposals regarding the establishment of new systems of security - even if based on the Charter - can only imperil the central role of that Charter. On the pretext of supplementing the Charter, these would tend to establish competing systems, thus undermining its provisions. Such attempts are dangerous because they encourage irresponsibility in those who might be tempted to free themselves from the obligations incumbent upon us all.

Moreover, we must ponder the inherent implications of any reference to a new system - or, ultimately, to a new organization. Do we truly believe that the long and cruel experience of the international community during the twentieth century is a product of old systems of thought? Do we believe that on the basis of categories yet to be defined we can somehow classify the historical developments that led to the present situation? We think that is a very risky line of thought that could lead to ambiguities, conflicting interpretations and, ultimately, to the breakup of the international system.

The current difficulties of the United Nations system are obvious, and we are not seeking to deny them. Above all they reflect ideological, political, economic and social differences in the world today. We must base ourselves on that reality, which is neither new nor old, but which is quite simply inevitable. It is not that we should acquiesce in this. The entire policy of my country - its rejection of blocs, its steadfast encouragement of negotiation among the parties to a conflict, its quest for practical solutions to increase confidence - is aimed rather at transcending the divisions of today's world. But in order to have a chance gradually, step by step, to overcome those divisions, we must begin by acknowledging that they cannot be abolished through a miracle or a decree.

(Mr. Morel, France)

In this necessary work, requiring much patience, the United Nations has an ideal tool: the Security Council, a body for taking both decisions and action. Nothing seems to us more appropriate in this debate than recalling the need to respect the distinction among the respective functions of United Nations bodies, particularly between those of the Security Council and the General Assembly, and collectively reaffirming our support for the activities of the Secretary-General. If we truly wish to remedy the shortcomings of the United Nations system, let us begin by making better use of the means it provides.

In prescribing full implementation of the Charter - the entire Charter - we are not, of course, denying the changes that have occurred in the modern world and the interrelated way in which major problems must be handled. Security cannot be considered only from the military viewpoint; it is increasingly tied to the way in which States can respond to their development needs. It is well known that for many years now France has emphasized the relationship among security, disarmament and development; we would like to see that relationship occupy a growing place in the thinking of the United Nations.

It is recognized today that strengthening international security would also help create a political climate that could contribute to more effective international co-operation for development. Only in a context where security is assured can States freely and in full sovereignty select and implement the development methods they consider most appropriate in the light of their own situation. Many other examples of that relationship in the approach to current problems can be cited, but I do not wish to rehearse them in this more general debate on questions of international security.

(Mr. Morel, France)

My country's thinking on the subject before us is quite clear. It is based on respect for the Charter, on the cardinal factor of how States behave in practice and on consideration of specific situations. More complete and sounder security can be achieved not through a system that is defined in abstract terms, but through States fully shouldering their responsibilities in the framework they have freely chosen - the United Nations Charter.

Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): We are all aware of the special significance of our consideration of international security issues taking place at this time, during the International Year of Peace. It affords us an occasion for sober reflection and reassessment of the multidimensional aspects of international peace and security and their interrelationship with the questions of disarmament and development. This is also an opportunity to map out our further strategies for the realization of these cherished goals.

It hardly needs reiteration that the hopes engendered 40 years ago for a world order in which the United Nations would be the guarantor of peace and the protector of States against acts of aggression and other breaches of the peace have not been made a reality. Rather, the international security environment continues to be characterized by a preponderant reliance on military strength and the use or threat of force, domination, exploitation, and coercion. Consequently, there has been no slackening of international tension, mutual mistrust and insecurity.

Yet the dangers we face today are beyond mankind's experience, as the Past offers us no precedent on how to deal with the nuclear menace. The nuclear age has fundamentally transformed existing concepts of security and strategic thinking and notions of military superiority or tactical advantage. The objective of achieving unilateral security through armaments has also proved to be a dangerous myth. The fact remains that there are no effective defences against missiles armed with

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

nuclear warheads. Neither quantitative additions nor qualitative improvements to nuclear arsenals can diminish vulnerability or lead to absolute security. Thus neither East nor West, North nor South can be secure when the other side is insecure. There can only be either mutual security or mutual insecurity, and the only rational option lies in seeking common security through disarmament.

None the less, the concept of deterrence continues to be embraced as a logical and even morally defensible necessity, even though in reality it is inherently unstable, premised as it is on a perpetual state of fear rather than mutual trust, and it is especially frightening for those having no influence or leverage as to its operation. It must therefore be recognized that the avoidance of nuclear catastrophe cannot be ensured indefinitely by such doctrines. Genuine and lasting peace and security can be achieved only by the effective implementation of the collective security system embodied in the Charter, the reversal of the arms race and substantial reduction of armaments, particularly nuclear weapons. At the same time, the causes of the arms race and threats to peace should be reduced and eliminated through, inter alia, the peaceful and just resolution of conflicts and disputes.

Every year has brought advances in the technology of warfare and of weapon-systems and their spread to more and more nations, assuring that future wars will be even more destructive. Every year we have witnessed the immense suffering that even conventional weapons can cause - which should remind us of the unspeakable horrors of nuclear war. Every year global military expenditures have continued to escalate, and they are now approaching \$1 trillion a year. Hence, the more we strive for security from external threats through ever-increasing military budgets, the more vulnerable we become to the internal threat of economic failure and social disruption leading to political instability. The impact of an increase



(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

in armaments on the developing countries is disturbingly different from that of the advanced, industrialized nations. It often results in increased human deprivation of the poorer sections of their societies. It also enlarges the risk of falling into new dependency relationships and subtler forms of neo-colonialism.

It is also generally recognized that security concerns and security problems often have regional sources. It is most distressing that practically all the wars of the past 40 years - some 150 of them - have been fought or are still raging in the regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The persistence of apartheid and colonialism in northern Africa and the aggressive and expansionist policies of Israel in the Middle East, as well as the focal points of tension and strife in South Asia and South-East Asia, the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, have been the main causes of insecurity and conflict, and many of them have been further complicated by the superimposition of strategic East-West rivalry and contention.

In this situation, the dilemma facing the developing non-aligned nations is not so much one of acquiring more armaments as of attaining security through alternative means, especially by participating in an effective system of collective security in which the obligations and responsibilities for making the world safe for all are shared by all. For these nations, and indeed for the rest of the international community, the realization of the vision of collective security envisaged by the Charter is not mere idealism, but an urgent practical necessity.

It is equally necessary to strengthen the role of regional organizations in resolving their particular security concerns and in contributing to viable and cohesive structures of economic and social development. We are particularly gratified by the growing interest in regional approaches to deal with security issues, as it has always been Indonesia's conviction that regional organizations are uniquely placed to propose solutions to local conflicts and thereby minimize

**(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)**

the possibility of great-power involvement, with all its attendant risks. In this context, I reaffirm the determination and commitment of the Member States of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) to continue to work assiduously for the enhancement of peace, security and common prosperity in their own region.

ASEAN co-operation is grounded on mutual respect of the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity and national identity of all States in our region. We have recognized the right of every Member State to lead its national existence free from foreign interference, intervention, subversion or coercion. We have solemnly renounced the use or threat of force in the conduct of our relationship. And, with a view to strengthening national and regional resilience, we have developed ever-expanding co-operative endeavours in the economic, social and cultural fields. All these have fostered a growing convergence of perceptions in the field of security as well. Consequently, a common view has evolved on the basic nature of the threat to security in south-East Asia and on the essential requisites for regional harmony and peace, without which national development cannot proceed.

This inevitably led to the promulgation of the concept of a Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality that, would encompass all States in the region. ZOPFAN, as it is now known by its acronym, embraces a set of guidelines which would constitute a code of conduct governing relations between the States within the zone as well as with those outside it.

(Mr. Alatae, Indonesia)

It lists the measures and voluntary restraints to be commonly agreed upon and undertaken by the regional States and the external Powers, especially the major Powers; and, as a matter of course, it reiterates the call for strict observance of the basic principles of Inter-State relations that govern ASEAN as a whole and to which I referred.

Ever mindful of the nuclear threat that confronts our strategically significant region, my Government has long advocated the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South-East Asia as part of our regional approach to security and disarmament. It is our ardent hope that the proposed South-East Asian zone will become a reality in the 'near future, thereby forming a natural extension of the South Pacific nuclear-free zone.

We share the belief that if the international community is determined to achieve true security a profound reassessment is necessary of the essence and implications of the interrelated issues of disarmament, development and security. We also agree that in this nuclear age the concept of security cannot any longer be confined to the military aspects alone, but needs to be broadened to include the political, economic, social and humanitarian dimensions as well.

In that context, my delegation has noted with interest the initiative by the socialist countries for the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security. The proposal, as outlined by the representative of the Soviet Union and others, deserves our careful consideration. We particularly note their assurance that the thrust of their initiative is not to substitute, revise or duplicate the United Nations Charter but, rather, to provide more detailed implementation of its provisions in the context of contemporary realities and that the Organization would indeed play a key part in its realization. We welcome that, for Indonesia is firm in its belief that the Charter

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

continues to provide the single appropriate system for the maintenance of international peace and security. Hence, what needs to be done first and foremost is to • strengthen the Charter's mechanism<sup>6</sup> for peaceful conflict resolution and ensure the faithful implementation of its collective security provisions.

While new approaches to international peace and security would indeed require new thinking and new concepts, at the same time existing problems and challenges must be met and resolved. Intensified efforts to achieve genuine disarmament and arms reduction, especially in the nuclear field, need to be exerted as a priority task. What is also required is the comprehensive and just resolution of the many conflicts and disputes in various regions of the world which are the legacies of past policies based on power, military domination and coercion. The non-military threats to national and international security - for example, mass poverty, hunger, underdevelopment, and inescapable structures and modalities in the present international economic system - should clearly be tackled as well. Indeed, if the major Powers were to allocate even a small portion of their resources now being spent on weapons towards enhancing international economic security the world would already be safer and more secure for all. The improvement of North-South relations and the establishment of a more democratic and just international economic order thus constitute key elements in any comprehensive approach to international peace and security.

It is on the basis of those universally shared objectives, as well as the indispensability of international co-operation in efforts towards their attainment, that my delegation considers a continuing dialogue on various new approaches and new efforts towards strengthening international peace and security to be of substantial merit.

Mr. IMMERMANN (United States of America): The United States delegation wishes to share its views with other delegations on the subject of strengthening international security, and particularly on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89 - a proposal to establish a so-called 'comprehensive system of international peace and security'. Since the draft resolution and the accompanying letter from its sponsors were first circulated on 14 August in document A/41/191, the United States has examined this initiative closely, and we have objections both to the draft resolution and the underlying premises on which it is based.

The sponsors of draft resolution L.89 claim that the complexities of the contemporary world require new political thinking on the part of all countries, large and small, developed and underdeveloped. Yet, the more our delegation looks at this proposal and its rationale the more the phrase 'old wine in a new bottle' comes to mind. What the sponsors have submitted here is a repackaged compendium of old, familiar and shop-worn ideas that have been heard before and discredited.

To begin with, What is the purpose of this exercise? The draft resolution itself is commendably short and, on first reading, seems innocuous; its preambular paragraphs contain apocalyptic language about the self-destruction of mankind. However, we agree with one point: the need to strengthen the foundations of international security on the basis of the United Nations Charter. The United States is proud to have helped draft the Charter and has always fully supported the principles enshrined in it. The Charter has successfully provided the basis for collective security and the peace-keeping activities of the Organization intended to secure such security.

The sponsors of this draft resolution, however, appear to believe that the concept of collective security enshrined in the Charter needs to be redefined. They propose to do this through the establishment of some new, amorphous "comprehensive system of international peace and security". The United States

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

would argue that, rather than elaborate a new system or document, the sponsors of draft resolution L.89 should work on a priority basis for the full implementation by their Governments of the carefully worked-out and very flexible document that we already have - the United Nations Charter.

The United States delegation believes that the underlying reason for international tension and feelings of insecurity is that Member States have not fully utilised the existing system of collective security embodied in the Charter. The thrust of this initiative, however, is that the Charter somehow needs to be supplemented or even replaced entirely by a new and undefined "system". Is it the intent of the sponsors to rewrite or replace the United Nations Charter? My delegation can state categorically that the United States is unalterably opposed to such an effort. The Charter has served all of us well for over four decades; it does not need revision on the basis of so-called "new political thinking". In my delegation's view, it is irreplaceable.

Careful scrutiny of the letter contained in document A/41/191 offers revealing insights into the intention of the sponsors of this proposal; it also provides some striking contrasts between their hyperbolic rhetoric and the grim reality of today's world.

First - and I shall quote from the letter - the sponsors hold that States should not rely on "military or technological means" to resolve disputes; rather, they insist that the maintenance of international security is a "political" task, to be undertaken collectively by all States, regardless of size, stage of economic development or political system. The United States draws the attention of delegations to the stark contrast of that supposition with contemporary reality: a client State of the principal sponsor of this draft resolution continues to shore up a puppet régime in a formerly non-aligned country in south-East Asia with over 100,000 well-armed "tourists".

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

Another client State of that co-sponsor has tens of thousands of its own well-armed "tourists" playing "advisory" roles in several strife-torn African States. Yet another client State is engaged in destabilizing activities in Central America. Indeed, that very same co-sponsor has for nearly seven years now occupied and propped up the unpopular and unrepresentative régime in Afghanistan, formerly a non-aligned State, by force of arms and the presence of its own soldiers. For the last seven years, most recently in the resolution adopted on 5 November, the General Assembly has by ever-increasing majorities deplored this forceful occupation.

The lesson to be learned is clear. The turmoil afflicting these countries can hardly be termed 'peaceful conditions'. The prolongation of this turmoil through the actions of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89 and their surrogates is starkly inconsistent with the so-called maintenance of international peace and security by "political means".

The United States delegation also notes that document A/41/191 makes pointed reference to non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries as one of the principles for strengthening international security. Here again, the rhetoric of the sponsors bears no relation to their behaviour in the international arena. I have already noted the physical presence of well-armed "tourists" from certain States on the territories of other States. There are other, more subtle, ways by which the principle of non-interference is being ignored. Through the provision of arms and other forms of support, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89 and their surrogates are fomenting destabilization and civil strife in various parts of the world, including Central America, Africa, the Middle East, and South and South-East Asia. The United States believes that only through strict compliance by all States with the principle of non-interference can conflicts in these "hotbeds

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

of tension" - to use the sponsors' terminology - be reduced and, ultimately, eliminated.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89 purport to place substantial emphasis on the concept of "economic security". However, document A/41/191 ignores the advances achieved at the General Assembly's historic special session on Africa earlier this year, which discarded ideological dogma in favour of serious, practical and non-polemical consideration of the problems of indebtedness and underdevelopment. Economic issues should be dealt with on their merits, rather than being forced into a rigid mould of thinking. It would hardly serve the interests of developing nations in Africa or elsewhere if the dialogue on economic issues at the United Nations were to be repoliticized.

The United States also strongly rejects the biased and baseless premise that "neo-colonialist exploitation" of developing countries contributes to international instability. A brief review of the record will prove that the Western democracies far and away outstrip the sponsors of this draft resolution in supporting economic development in the third world.

For example, in 1983 total net deliveries of economic assistance from the Warsaw Pact countries to developing nations was only one tenth of that provided by the industrialized countries of the West. Even more revealing statistics are contained in General Assembly document A/41/461 of 16 July this year. This document notes that in 1984 Western industrialized democracies provided approximately 86 per cent of the voluntary contributions received by the United Nations system for operational activities for development. In contrast, the Governments of Eastern Europe combined provided exactly 1 per cent of such contributions. The remaining 13 per cent was provided by the developing nations themselves. The same document also notes that the Western democracies and the developing countries together contributed over \$472 million to the refugee,



(Mr. Immerman, United States)

humanitarian, special economic, and disaster relief activities of the United Nations in 1984. On the other hand, the Governments of Eastern Europe contributed not a single cent to these activities.

The United States notes with surprise the description in document A/41/191 of humanitarian issues as a key factor in the maintenance of international security. We are intrigued by the sweeping assertion in the sponsors' letter that

"The security of States is inseparable from the struggle for the full implementation of human rights in all fields". (A/41/191, p. 3)

Indeed, we wonder what is meant by this phrase, just as we wonder about the real motives of the sponsors of that other notable document, A/C.1/41/L.89.

Do the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89 contend that States whose citizens are in full possession of their civil and political rights are less belligerent, and therefore less likely to engage in destabilizing their neighbours? If that is so, then the United States is in complete agreement. History has repeatedly demonstrated that democratic Governments do not attack their neighbours.

However, the United States suspects that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89 seek to link the security of States and human rights under the dangerous premise that the human rights of citizens of a State can be guaranteed only after the security of the State has been assured. This premise is unacceptable to members of the democratic community of nations. It permits Governments to justify aggressive policies toward their neighbours on the pretext of ensuring internal security and, allegedly, of securing the human rights of their citizens. The United States rejects any such formulation. States that guarantee the human rights of their citizens do not provoke war. States that ignore the human rights of their citizens, on the other hand, do.

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

The United States agrees that neither world nor regional security can be taken for granted. Collective security is a plant which must be cultivated and watered regularly. The United Nations itself has made numerous contributions to the maintenance of security through its peace-keeping forces.

Moreover, the United States affirms that strengthening international security is not the exclusive preserve of Governments. Private groups and individual citizens should be permitted by their Governments to offer their views on ways to strengthen collective security. The United States had a record of strong support for freedom of opinion and self-expression. We stress the primordial importance of freedom of speech, a free press and government tolerance for expression of political dissent. These are among the essential human rights guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a document which regrettably goes unmentioned in the sponsors' letter. In keeping with the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we call upon all States not to interfere with the civil and political rights of their citizens, including the right to group affiliation and the right of all people to organize and meet freely in order to express their views on international security issues. Specifically, such groups as Charter 77 and the Helsinki Monitoring Group, both of which are being repressed by many of the sponsors of this draft resolution, should be allowed to share their views and contribute their opinions in open dialogue with their fellow citizens on the important international questions confronting the international community. \*

---

\* Mr. Aoki (Japan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Immerman, United States)

Finally, ... ~~is~~ period of financial stringency, the United Nations should manage ~~its scarce resources~~ responsibly. Adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89 may lead to a malignant growth eating away at the Organization. The United States believes that the most immediate way for Member States to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations system is not to embark upon a fruitless exercise to create some new organization of unknown goals. This can only result in waste and needless expenditure of time, money and political goodwill. Rather, the single most effective means for enhancing the collective-security provisions of the Charter is for all Member States to comply fully with their responsibilities under the Charter. The Organisation should not permit itself to be directed toward elaborating any document or mechanism that would only be duplicative of, and inimical to, the Charter of the United Nations - a document that has served us all well for more than 4 years.

Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): My delegation welcomes the inclusion in our agenda at this session of the General Assembly of Item 141, "Establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security". We believe that the underlying reasons that led the 10 socialist countries to request the inclusion of that important item should also be considered at this session. The international community has turned its attention to the fate of the world and human civilization in this nuclear age. Nuclear self-destruction or survival - that is the fateful choice men must make today. It is a truth of which everyone is aware.

Thus both the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries, in the final Documents of their Eighth Conference, held last September at Harare, and the Leaders of six countries from five continents at their last meeting in Mexico, aware of the serious danger of the military threat hanging over mankind, emphasized the extreme urgency of adopting

"immediate measures for the prevention of nuclear war and for nuclear disarmament". (A/41/697, p. 24)

Unfortunately, however, some States continue to take a dangerous approach to the problems of arms limitation and disarmament. They continue to attempt to achieve security by force, by deterrence or by a balance of terror rather than by disarmament. This is obviously a highly dangerous and unrealistic doctrine, for in today's world no State, however powerful, can hope to strengthen its own security to the detriment of others or believe that it will remain invulnerable in the event of a nuclear conflict. Security cannot but be comprehensive and equal for all States and peoples on the planet, whatever their political and social régime, whatever their size and whatever their level of development. Such new political concepts, if I may so describe them, stem from common sense and realism and demand that States shoulder their responsibilities towards mankind. To be comprehensive

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

and genuine, security must take into account military, political, economic and humanitarian aspects. In those various fields of human activity, States must in their international relations show goodwill and sincerity in their desire to contribute to the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security as they do in the promotion of international economic co-operation for development and so on.

With regard to military aspects, the Lao Government pays tribute to the Soviet Union for its initiatives and specific actions in the cause of peace, security and disarmament. Here we note that the overall programme for comprehensive security through disarmament put forward by the Soviet Government on 15 January of this year entails the progressive elimination between now and the end of this century of all nuclear weapons and all other types of weapons of mass destruction. It is to be regretted that that body of concrete and realistic proposals based on that broad programme suggested by Mr. Gorbachev at the recent Reykjavik summit meeting were not accepted by President Reagan. It must be recognized that on the Soviet side tremendous concessions and sacrifices have been made in the higher interests of mankind. Under those proposals, in 10 years all strategic and offensive nuclear weapons would be eliminated from the face of the earth. Unfortunately, however, as everyone knows, that historic opportunity to ensure the advent of a nuclear-free world has been lost because of the refusal of the other side to abandon its apocalyptic, so-called star wars, programme.

At the same time, we pay tribute to the Soviet Union's noble and courageous decision to prolong for a fourth consecutive time, until 1 January 1987, its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. It would be highly desirable were the United States and the other nuclear Powers to join in that courageous and responsible action by the Soviet Union, for we must recognize that the cessation of

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

nuclear testing is a first, decisive and effective step towards halting the increased sophistication of nuclear weapons and, thus, the nuclear-arms race. Similarly, we believe that the body of proposals and constructive initiatives of the countries of the Warsaw Pact would lead to the strengthening of peace and security, both in Europe and in the rest of the world. With regard to the political aspects of security, it is incumbent upon all States to carry out, scrupulously and in good faith, their obligations under the United Nations Charter and other international instruments, particularly with regard to respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States, the non-use of force in international relations and the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

The Lao People's Democratic Republic has placed those cardinal principles at the heart of its foreign policy, but we must point out that the imperialist and warring forces, in defiance of the fundamental principles enshrined in the Charter and in the many United Nations declarations and resolutions, are continuing to perpetrate acts of aggression and destabilization against many sovereign countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America whose domestic and foreign policies are not to their liking. Those same forces have prevented and are still attempting at any cost to prevent peoples in the developing countries from enjoying their right to self-determination and impeding their independence, thereby creating and exacerbating hotbeds of tension and regional conflict.

In Central America the Nicaraguan people, in South-West Asia the Afghan people, continue to be the victims of an undeclared war of aggression and a policy of State terrorism being waged by the warmongering imperialist forces and by the forces of regional and international reaction. In the Middle East, Libya, Syria,

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

Lebanon and other countries are also the victims of acts of aggression and terrorism perpetrated by the Zionist forces with the blessing of their imperialist protectors. In South-East Asia, the imperialist and expansionist forces and the forces of regional and international reaction continue to pursue their subversive and destabilizing activities against the peoples of Indo-China whose external and domestic policies are not to their liking. That policy of provocation, destabilization and subversion has also created an extremely tense situation in that region. The three countries of Indo-China have spared no effort in attempting to contribute to the search for a comprehensive, just and lasting political solution to the problems that prevent peace, co-operation and stability in South-East Asia, including the so-called problem of Kampuchea. A series of fair and constructive proposals to that end have been made by Laos, Viet Nam and Kampuchea, but, unfortunately, the adversaries of the sorely tried Kampuchean people have attempted at all costs to interfere in the internal affairs of that country and to prevent them from exercising their sovereign, sacred and inalienable right to self-determination.

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

Thanks to the support and active solidarity given to them by their socialist brothers, friendly countries and peace-loving peoples, those favouring justice and freedom throughout the world, as well as international organizations, the sorely tried and long-suffering people of Kampuchea, under the firm guidance of their authentic representative, the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, is at present carrying out its Herculean task of reconstruction and national consolidation. We have always advocated a political and negotiated solution to international and regional disputes and conflicts and we favour any proposal that would lead to the establishment of zones of peace, stability and co-operation, free of nuclear weapons in the various regions of the world.

With respect to Asia and the Pacific, the Lao Government favours establishing and guaranteeing a lasting peace and an effective security system in this highly strategic region of the world. It would be desirable for all States of the region to redouble their efforts and co-operate actively and sincerely to achieve this noble task. In this context, Laos warmly welcomed the historic proposals made by the Soviet leader, Mr. Brezhnev, at Vladivostok last July.

We are also convinced that these important proposals will be favourably welcomed by all States of the region because they clearly respond to the legitimate aspirations of their respective peoples to live with each other in peace, security and friendship, in an atmosphere of harmonious and mutually advantageous co-operation, which is precisely the purpose of the proposed comprehensive system of international security.



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

**Comprehensive** and genuine security **has** no meaning for people<sup>8</sup> who hope to enjoy it unless it is accompanied by economic guarantees. It **is** no secret to anyone that States and peoples today **do** not enjoy the same **level of economic** and **social development**. The **gap** continues to widen between the haves and the have-nots, and the reason **for this is well** known to all. It is to be found in the stark **injustice** which is characteristic of the present structures of international economic relations.

We know that a **number of resolutions** and relevant **Declarations of the United Nations** have been adopted in order to redress the situation. Unfortunately, these important documents, which in particular deal with the establishment of a new international economic order and the Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States, have so far remained dead letters, because the imperialist States have refused to give up their egoistic privileges and their neo-colonialist policy of exploitation and plundering of the natural and human resources of the developing countries, as well as their policy of economic coercion against the developing countries for political purposes. The present world economic crisis has simply made the situation of the developing countries and of the least developed countries all the more precarious.

I shall now deal with the humanitarian aspect of comprehensive security. Although it may be ironic to speak of security for a people whose human rights are being blatantly violated and whose fundamental freedoms are also being denied, including the right to life and the right to live in peace, the international community must nevertheless condemn and banish all doctrines that preach hatred, mistrust and racial separation between peoples. It is regrettable that certain

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

State8 continue to condone the criminal systems of apartheid and Zionism, which victimize the majority of the black population of South Africa and Namihia, as well as the Palestinian people and the people in the occupied Arah territories. In thie context, my delegation endorses the constructive proposal of the Soviet Union calling for the convening of a conference in Moscow, within the framework of the Helsinki process in order to discuss the humanitarian questions which encompass human contacts, information, culture and education.

Those are the general comments that came to mind during the consideration of the question of the establishment of a comprehensive and general system of international peace and security, a system whose purpose is not intended to weaken the United Nation8 Charter hut, on the contrary, to reinforce it. The establishment of such a system would contribute decisively ta the advent of a safe world, a world free from nuclear weapons, where all States and peoples, whatever their political or social system, would finally be able to live in peace, security, friendship and mutually advantageous co-operation. In pursuit of this noble task, the United Nation8 will of course be called on to play a major role. Indeed, a unique role, one which we must all commit ourselves to strengthen.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Ierael): I would like to limit my short remarks to agenda item 67, entitled "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region". Last week we all heard the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union make an eloquent appeal for the establishment of a reliable system of global and regional security. He stated very rightly, that

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

"A reliable system of global security is impossible without a sound moral and psychological atmosphere, without openness of policy and actions, without the promotion of a spirit of peace in the peoples of the world. The heart of such a system is a spirit of tolerance and mutual respect, and the introduction throughout the world of a political mentality making it impossible to cultivate militarism, hatred and violence." (A/C.1/41/PV.52, p. 38)

Nowhere in the world is that spirit of tolerance more needed than in the Middle East. There are many other international conflicts, both in our region and elsewhere, but in no other case has the animosity and hatred been expressed in such virulent terms and over such a long period. In no other conflict have all the channels for discussion or negotiation been so finally closed by one side to the conflict. This attitude of the Arab neighbour of Israel and the action emanating from it is a major source of one of the major conflicts in the Mediterranean area - the Arab-Israel conflict. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that all the Arab States, with one important and courageous exception, still consider themselves at war with Israel, a situation which is a blatant violation of the United Nations Charter, and which has continued ever since Israel's Arab neighbours invaded it on the very day of its Declaration of Independence. When this war ended to their great surprise in Israel's victory, they did not accept Israel's heartfelt invitation to enter into peace talks to transform the temporary armistice agreements into final peace treaties. Not only did they not make peace but they initiated three more wars, an economic boycott, and an unparalleled campaign of terror against Israeli citizens at home and abroad. In spite of this record, Israel showed itself eager to sit down and negotiate with any of its neighbours, as

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

it did in response to the initiative of the late President Anwar Sadat of Egypt in 1977, which culminated in the Camp David Agreement and the Israel-Egypt Peace Accord.

Thus for the first time a channel of normal communication was opened between Israel and one of its neighbours. It is true that Egypt and Israel do not agree on all subjects, but in stark contrast to all the other Arab States these disagreements are discussed through diplomatic channels. This is the normal manner of settling affairs between States and peoples. Thus a change, which so many speakers in this debate have emphasized is the crux of establishing an area of peace and security anywhere in the world, has been initiated. And yet these agreements, instead of being praised and emulated by other Arab States, are denounced by them. Egypt is attacked for its statesmanship, as when President Assad of Syria in a broadcast on Radio Damascus on 27 February 1986 stated:

"I call on President Mubarak of Egypt to stand before the masses and tear the Camp David Accord to shreds."

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

In spite of continued rebuffs by its neighbours for the last 37 years, Israel has not given up trying to achieve peace. Former Prime Minister and now Minister of Foreign Affairs Shimon Peres, addressing the General Assembly on 21 October 1985, explained what, in his view, should be the basic principles of a peace initiative in the Middle East. He said,

"Let all parties to the dispute facilitate a new phase in the Arab-Israeli peace by renouncing and putting an end to the use of violence.

"This new initiative should be based on the following principles:

"First, the objective of these negotiations is to reach peace treaties between Israel and the Arab States, as well as to resolve the Palestinian issue.

"Secondly, neither party may impose pre-conditions.

"Thirdly negotiations are to be based on United Nations Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and on willingness to entertain suggestions proposed by other participants.

"Fourthly, negotiations are to be conducted directly, between States.

"Fifthly, if deemed necessary those negotiations may be initiated with the support of an international forum, as agreed upon by the negotiating States." (A/40/PV.42, p. 59)

Again this year, Foreign Minister, now Prime Minister, Shamir, in an address to the General Assembly at its forty-first session, on 30 September 1986, said

"we cherish peace; we pray for it and we teach its blessings to our children. Our entire people rejoiced when, after decades of war which were forced upon us, we were able to build a bridge of peace with one of our Arab neighbours.

" ...

" ... To hasten the coming of that day we call on all countries interested in peace in the Middle East strongly to support direct talks between Jordan and Israel". (A/41/PV.16, pp. 67, 69-70)

(Mr. Zippori, Israel,

Again, later this year, in the general debate in this Committee, I stated:

"I would therefore urge our neighbouring States to think about our proposal to enter into free and direct negotiations in order to examine the possibilities which exist in the concept of a Middle Eastern mutual balanced force reduction; even a serious discussion between the States concerned of such a possibility could contribute some of the confidence so badly needed".

(A/C.1/41/PV.26, p. 4)

What has been the Arab response to these overtures?

President Assad does not even attempt to hide his territorial ambitions. In a speech on the sixteenth anniversary of his rule, he once again referred to "greater Syria", a favourite concept of the Syrian dictator, when he stated that "historical Syria" stretches from the Taurus mountains in Turkey to Gaza.

President Qaddafi of Libya is even more ambitious and bloodthirsty. He openly calls for war as the only solution. One quote, as an example, can be found in his interview in the Kuwaiti newspaper Alqabas of 19 September 1985. There he said that

"The solution for the Palestinian problem is war from the [Jordan] river to the [Mediterranean] sea. Nothing else is a solution".

To ensure peace and security is not only to prevent war between States in the Mediterranean region, but also to have an area where innocent tourists can take a tour without having terrorists hijack their ship, where yachts can anchor in a harbour without being murdered by terrorists, where planes flying in the skies over the sea are not menaced by terrorist bombs.

To our great sorrow, Syria and Libya have turned themselves into bases of international terrorism. Ambassador Rein, in a statement to the General Assembly on 20 November, detailed Libya's close involvement in financing, training and masterminding acts of international terrorism. The recent terrorist attacks in London and Berlin only highlight once again the Syrian role.

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

I would mention also the **tragic** history of Lebanon, partially occupied by a terrorist organisation, the PLO, which used it not only **as a base** for launching attacks on Israel but **also** as a training ground for terrorist groups from all over the world. There **is** hardly a single terrorist organization in existence whose members have not been trained in PLO-run camps in Lebanon. The PLO **headquarters**, wherever they are, are still important terrorist centres spreading death and destruction in all Mediterranean countries, whether it **is in** an airport in Rome, a synagogue in Istanbul **or** a restaurant in Paris. It would be **a** mistake to believe that only Israel is the victim **of** this terrorist activity; other States in the **region**, whose **régimes** do not find favour with the rulers of **Damascus** and Tripoli, have also been the victim<sup>8</sup> of Syrian and Libyan terrorist attacks.

A number of speakers have called for an international conference. The Permanent **Representative** of Israel, speaking in the General **Assembly** on 21 November 1986, referred to that proposal in the following terms:

**"One such** attempt to derail a genuine rapprochement . . . is **the move to** convene an international conference **which** would dictate terms to Israel, rather than allow a direct and **unfettered exchange between it and its neighbours.**

Currently that effort is concentrating **on** a preparatory conference of the permanent members of the Security Council. The idea **smacks of** an imposed settlement and Israel will **oppose** it. As Vice-Premier Peres put it recently,

**"This** is akin to bringing the mothers-in-law to a wedding **without** bringing the bride **and the groom'.**

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

\*And what is **more**, two of the **permanent members** - the Soviet union and the **People's** Republic of China - do not **have diplomatic** relations with **Israel**. The **Soviet Union even voted** against accepting **Israel's credentials** at the United Nations. How **can** it **seriously** talk about a **peace conference** under United **Nations** sponsorship involving **Israel** when **it joins** in an effort **that effectively calls for the expulsion of Israel from the United Nations?**"

(A/41/PV.80, pp. 74-75)

I should like **to** note in passing that **most** of those **who** proposed that conference also do not maintain diplomatic **relations** with **Israel**.

There can **be** no **peace** and security in **the** Mediterranean area so long as **States** in the **region** aid and **abet** international **terror** on a **large scale** and refuse to fulfil their **basic** obligations **under the** Charter.

Mr. HONG (Singapore) : The debate on agenda **item** 141, entitled 'Establishment of a **comprehensive** system of **international peace and security**', reminds me **of a** story about an **old** and experienced **Eskimo** hunter who came one **day** **into** the store of the 'Hudson's **Bay Trading Company** near the **Canadian Town** of Churchill. **He** was looking at the items on display, **shaking** his head and mumbling to **himself**, The store **manager** went up to **him** to **try to** convince him to buy something. **He** showed him **various** items, **but the** old **Eskimo** was not interested. **Finally**, the **store manager** showed him a beautiful hunting knife. The old **Eskimo's** eyes glittered, then he said, "**Sir**, you showed **me a rifle**, but I already have **my** harpoon. Then you showed me a winter **coat**, **but I** already **have** my polar bear fur **coat**. What was **really** interesting **was the** steel **knife**, but look here: **I** have **my** old hunting knife, **It** is made of bone; it **is** 41 years old and a bit blunt, but it still cuts. The best **thing** is that **it already** belongs to me and **I** do not **have** to **pay a high** price to buy your flashy new **fancy knife**."



(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

The old Eskimo turned to walk away, then came back and whispered, "However, if you want to trade **your** attractive lady assistant for a whale, **you might** have a deal".

The point of the story is simply that it is better to deal with the Organisation we already **have** and know well than to discuss and **invent something new**, untried and potentially dangerous. The United Nations is **41 years old**, creaky at the **joints** and short of financial **wind**, **but it works** fairly well. Whatever faults exist are due to **non-compliance** by States with already **established** and **well-known** principles. The condition of **the United Nations** is a **true reflection of the messy state** of world affairs. Correcting the **sorry state of** our planet would certainly help improve the United Nations; **the remedies needed are** well known **to all of us**.

In that connection, we may find it useful to **turn to a** study published by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), entitled "**The United Nations and Collective Management of International Conflict**", by Ernst B. Baas. The author was interested in **investigating** how useful or effective **the United Nations was**, and in studying the impact of the United Nations in comparison with that of regional organisations. He studied disputes **that occurred between** July 1945 and September 1984; he defined "**dispute**" as a specific grievance between two or **more States about** a specific subject **involving** an allegation **that a** provision of the United Nations Charter or a major resolution of an **authoritative United Nations organ had been violated**.

**(Mr. Hong, Singapore)**

A total of 319 disputes were identified, of which 96 were not referred to any international organization; 137 came onto the United Nations agenda; 30 went to the Organization of American States (OAS); 27 to the Organisation of African Unity (OAU); 24 to the Arab League and 5 to the Council of Europe. The study has this to say about the United Nations:

**"It is simply not true that the UN has lost all relevance with respect to conflict management. Ever since the drastic downturn in the early 1960s, the UN succeeds in abating about half the disputes referred to it."**

Another important conclusion is the following:

**"However, before concluding that the UN system has not worked and either a new system ought to be devised or we must do without one, the question must be explored whether governments have learned anything about peace and conflict avoidance despite the prevalence of competing values during the last 40 years. If they have, then the lessons have shaped the volitions of governments and overcome some of the constraints of the dilemma of insecurity, despite the continued imperfection of the UN. One could conclude that the world could live with an imperfect conflict management system, provided the actual state of insecurity today is not worse than it was in 1945 or 1950 or 1960."**

**"The conclusion is offered that something has been learned. Governments have stumbled onto the lesson without changing their basic values, and without practicing technical rationality. They have stumbled into the mutual recognition of serious constraints on their freedom of action to make war under circumstances which, in the past, did lead to hostilities. Systematic learning has taken place, though it has not been cumulative, nor equally internalized by all States, and is subject to reversals."**

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

The conclusions of the UNITAR study are illuminating. In our view, it shows the following facts.

First, no matter how imperfect the United Nations is, it functions well enough, and its level of functioning is directly linked to the state of world peace, which in turn depends on all Member States' political will to maintain peace and preserve international law and order. So those who talk of peace should first examine their collective conscience and their actions to see how well they have tried to help preserve international peace and security. Nations are no longer so naive as to be taken in by clever propaganda and repeated half-truths or outright fabrications.

Secondly, Governments have learned how to cope, but the important point is that they have learned to cope within the framework of the existing United Nations system. For 41 years all Member States have adapted themselves to the present United Nations system, imperfect though it may be.

For small States in particular the United Nations is vital as the single international forum to conduct the world's business and is an excellent arena to expose the misdeeds of aggressors and oppressors. If this United Nations system is changed in substantial ways, then all the gains of the last 41 years will be lost, and small States will have to learn a whole new ballgame where the rules may not be written to their advantage. Small States will certainly regret the diversion of intellectual resources, time and effort into this relearning process, in view of the pressing and numerous demands of their own socio-economic development.

Certain United Nations principles are particularly important to small States. They are: first, the right to self-determination; secondly, the principle of one nation, one vote - the equality of nations; thirdly, non-interference in internal affairs; fourthly, non-use of force, or the peaceful settlement of disputes; fifthly, the rule of international law.

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

Taken together, these **five basic principles** form **the armour of protection** for **small States** against the **bullying, aggression and oppression** of greater Powers. Together they form **a basis for a more orderly, more tranquil and peaceful world**. With the **present United Nations system**, at least **small States** know for a fact that **these principles are preserved in the Charter**. Once we venture **into uncharted waters**, we can never be sure what dangers lie ahead. Our **question is therefore very simple: why is there a need to establish such a comprehensive system of international peace and security?**

We are convinced that **all the necessary principles and framework already exist** in the Charter **and the United Nations system**. **All possible topics and sectors are covered by existing** conventions, agencies, committees, **international agencies and institutions**. **We feel that what is needed is the effort to make these existing conventions, agencies and institutions function better through greater political good will and co-operation, less aggression and less resort to force.**

We are struck by the **vagueness and confusion of thought** in some of the **speeches** of those who advocate **the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security**. **First** there was mention of **a basic document**, then this was mutated into **"basic ideas"** and an invitation to discuss. Indeed, we would be happy to sit down and discuss, but our agenda would be: **"How to improve the existing United Nations Charter and the United Nations system with better political good will and co-operation, and implementation of existing United Nations principles"**.

However, we **suspect** that at the **end of these proposed discussions** a new document **will emerge**. We feel that it may not be to our liking. We are inclined to ask: **"In what way would it differ from the United Nations Charter?"**

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

There is a hint that the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter are "insufficient". We would like to know in what way they are insufficient and what new principles are being suggested for any new document envisaged. Would these command consensus? We are not inclined to think so. In a phrase, we feel that this whole exercise is not only unnecessary, but, more important, dangerous, as it would undermine the Charter and the United Nations system.

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

It might be instructive in this context to remember the words of a great leader on the important principles of the right of self-determination and non-use of force, principles which are so dear to the hearts of small States:

"In accordance with the sense of justice of democrats in general, and of the working classes in particular, the government conceives the annexation or seizure of foreign lands to mean every incorporation of a small or weak nation into a large or powerful State, without the precisely, clearly and voluntarily expressed consent and wish of that nation, irrespective of the time when such forcible incorporation took place, irrespective also of the degree of development or backwardness of the nation forcibly annexed to the given State, or forcibly retained within its borders, and irrespective, finally, of whether this nation is in Europe, or in distant overseas countries."

The leader was none other than Lenin, and the quotation comes from the Decree on Peace, drafted by Lenin on 8 November 1917 and approved by the second Congress of Soviets. This principle seems particularly apt for great Powers in their initial stages of expansion and growth when they perceive themselves to be still vulnerable, and is forgotten when those nations become mighty and powerful.

When we remember Lenin's words and contrast them to the behaviour and action of certain States we cannot but be struck by the supreme irony and the wide chasm between theory and practice. All of us are tired of professions of peace when the speakers' actions are aggressive and warlike. We are convinced more by peaceful actions than by peaceful words.

In our view, our precious time and effort is more profitably spent on remedying the malaise and flaws of our existing United Nations system. Since the Second World War, many small States have achieved independence and come into being in an international system based on the United Nations. This system has given them a certain amount of protection and confidence that if there were any conflicts with

(Me. Hong, Singapore)

neighboura, there was a peaceful alternative other than war. They understood that the United Nations was their window to the world, a forum where they could air their views and complaints, and focus world attention on the misdeeds of aggressors and oppressors. The United Nations system provided an assurance that the rule of international law would prevail. While small States would, of course, strengthen their regional relations and, at the same time, enhance their internal security and means of self-defence apart from relying on the United Nations.

Thus small States, such as Singapore, are comfortable with the United Nations. What we see as major United Nations problems are the following: first, the non-compliance with basic United Nations principles, such as the right to self-determination, non-interference in other people's affairs, the peaceful settlement of disputes; and secondly, the financial crisis of the United Nations which cripples the efficient functioning of the United Nations.

We feel that if we focus attention on these problems, then the United Nations is more likely to be effective and respected, and more States would come to the United Nations to obtain a real resolution of their problems. Accordingly, they would have more respect for it, instead of resorting to the use of force, and only after that option failed, would they then try to involve the United Nations in resolving an already messy and intractable situation. The United Nations has been unfairly blamed for being unable to resolve many conflict situations. However, to be fair to the United Nations, by the time these conflicts and issues are put on its agenda, many of them are already beyond salvation.

Thus, looking for a comprehensive system of international peace and security is a mirage and a chimera. It reminds one of Lewis Carroll's poem called "The Hunting of the Snark" - here we understand the snark to be the elusive creature called international peace and security. I shall quote one verse from this poem:

(Mr. Hang, Singapore)

"They sought it with thimbles,  
They sought it with care,  
They pursued it with forks and hope,  
They threatened its life with a railway share,  
They charmed it with smiles and soap."

In order to make it clearer and understandable, per hap I will mention the Eskimo version, which goes:

"They threatened it with a resolution,  
They talked of fretting Up a committee,  
Wherein they could discuss the evolution  
Of international peace and security."

In Lewis Carroll's poem, the Snark was a mythical creature with the strange and mysterious quality that the nearer the hunters got to it, the mae they were in danger of disappearing. That is a wonderful lesson for small States. Also, in the same poem are two wonderful lines:

'What I tell you three times is true:  
If you believe in me, then I'll believe in you."

The first refers to the art of propaganda whereby by constant repetition by friends and allies, the message is drummed in, and by sheer repetition, we begin to believe in the meeeage that we really need a new comprehensive system of international peace and security. The second line stresses the need fa mutual confidence without which the United Nations cannot function properly. Another equally applicable quotation from Lewis Carroll is:

"The rule is jam tomorrow and jam yesterday,  
but never jam today."

This tells us that we should not rely on or be enamured with false promises that never come true. What we have, that which exists, is better and much more



(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

precious than illusions and ☐ iracpa, brave new worlds which hold untold dangers for small States like Singapore. We are already confronted with a moveable feast; let us not be seduced by the prospect of a shimmering illusion which could in the end disappoint us and leave us disillusioned.

In conclusion, we may remind ourselves of the wise old Eskimo who resolutely refused tempting offers for which he had to pay a high price and stuck to his trusty old tool, namely, the United Nations. What we want, for which we are prepared to trade even a whale, is the strict compliance with the basic principles as spelt out in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. DORN (Suriname): As we have entered the last phase of our work for this session, my delegation wishes to compliment the Chairmen on the wisdom and skill he has demonstrated during the period now behind us. His decisions were wise and firm, an attitude which guarantees a successful outcome of our deliberations.

The general debate of the past few weeks has clearly demonstrated the serious concern of the international community at the threat of peace and security in the world, which is due not only to the escalation of the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race, but also to the use of force in international relations, interference in the internal affairs of States and intervention. All States have the right to live in peace, with respect for their freedom and independence and territorial integrity.

(Mr. Dorn, Suriname)

It ~~is also~~ the duty of ~~all States~~ to abide by the ~~mentioned~~ principles. which are embodied in the Charter of our Organisation and reaffirmed in its relevant resolutions. These principles constitute also the pillar~~8~~ for the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which my country is a member.

One of the important resolutions which the United Nations has adopted in the past is the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the implementation of which has been reviewed annually since its adoption in 1970. This Declaration, which can be considered supplementary to the Charter, provides guidelines for the strengthening of the United Nations as a mechanism to ease tension and to create conditions conducive to a just and lasting peace.

As stated before, the General Assembly adopts, as an annual exercise, a resolution which reaffirms the validity of the aforementioned Declaration and calls upon all States to contribute effectively to its implementation. My delegation doubts the practical usefulness of this exercise, since we still witness flagrant violations of the provisions of the Charter as well as a continuing deterioration in international relations, threats against the independence of States, their national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

My delegation regrets that many countries failed to submit their views to the Secretary-General on the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, as requested in resolution 40/158 of 16 December 1985.

My delegation, furthermore, regrets that the consultations conducted by the President of the General Assembly, in accordance with resolution 40/159, with the purpose of establishing an Ad Hoc Committee on the Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter to explore ways and means of implementing the

(Mr. Dorn, Suriname)

aforesaid provisions, have been to no effect due to a difference in opinions of the regional groups with regard to the allocation of seats.

Since the Ad Hoc Committee could not be established, no progress report could be submitted to the Security Council for consideration. We earnestly hope that the regional groups may overcome their differences and that the Ad Hoc Committee will be established forthwith.

The serious international situation of today's world calls for the concerted action of the international community in order to strengthen international security. We regret that the decisions concerning peace and security remain unimplemented, a situation which is not conducive to the authority of this organ. What we need is an effective Security Council and we must therefore spare no efforts to enhance its authority and role in maintaining international peace and security, as envisaged by the Charter. In doing so, we will also enhance the credibility of the United Nations.

In this respect, my delegation is in total agreement with the observations of the Secretary-General in his annual report to the forty-first session of the United Nations concerning the enhancement of the collective security provisions of the Charter. He stated:

"I have sought in my previous annual reports to the General Assembly to suggest measures which might make the United Nations - and one must speak in this regard primarily of the Security Council - more effective in dealing with the threat, as well as the reality, of armed conflict. Essentially two requirements must be met: first, the permanent members of the Security Council, especially the two most powerful, must perceive that, notwithstanding bilateral differences and distrust, it is in their national interest to

(Mr. Dorn, Suriname)

co-operate with the Security Council and, within this framework, to apply their collective Influence to the resolution of regional disputes. Secondly, all Member States must perceive in far greater measure that the existence of an authoritative and representative international organ capable of maintaining peace and security in in their individual as well as the common interest and that, therefore, its decisions must be respected. (A/41/1, p. 2)

The implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is particularly being frustrated by the persistence of conflicts in different regions of the world. As a country in the Latin American and Caribbean region, we are disturbed at the negative development in Central America and the danger it represents for international peace.

My delegation regrets that, in spite of the commendable efforts of the Contadota Group, the situation in Central America has remained one of the hotbeds of tension in the world. Military actions have intensified, acts of interference and intervention have continued, while the process of dialogue between two of the States directly involved has stalled. My delegation hopes that a speedy resumption of the negotiations will result in a total solution of this problem. In our view, dialogue and negotiation can be considered as indispensable conditions for the settlement of disputes.

In southern Africa, it is the racist apartheid régime that continues illegally to occupy Namibia and causes a serious threat to peace and security in this region, with its military and economic acts of aggression against the neighbouring States. My delegation has consistently supported the courageous struggle of the people of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and it is looking forward to an early implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

(Mr. Darn, Suriname)

My delegation favours the idea of establishing a zone of peace in the Caribbean. A zone of peace is a region or subregion where the States concerned agree to promote co-operation among themselves, taking into account the characteristics of the region. In this context, I also wish to state the support of my Government for the proposal of the King of Nepal to declare Nepal a zone of peace.

Within the framework of the International Year of Peace, the week of 24 to 31 October 1986 had been proclaimed "Week of Peace" by my Government. During that week lectures were delivered on peace, films presented and an exposition on peace was organized.\*

At this point, I wish to inform the Committee about the latest development in my country. As a small developing State, my country has not been spared of destabilizing activities, with the aim of overthrowing the Government. These activities have been initiated by local criminals aided by mercenaries, and financed and recruited by interested parties abroad. The reason for bringing this up in the Committee is not only because peace and security is in jeopardy, but foremost because of the loss of innocent lives which are involved, let alone the disruption that is taking place in the whole society. The criminals and mercenaries operate primarily in the eastern part of the country as well as in the interior, applying hit and run tactics, causing the National Army difficulties for defence and counter-attacks.

Apart from seizing two aircraft which maintain domestic connections, they also burned down district schools, offices as well as factories, blew up bridges and took innocent people hostage.

---

\* The Chairman returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Dorn, Sui iname)

As a result of the guerrilla activities, hundreds of people have had to flee their homes and seek sanctuary elsewhere. My Government appeals to the Governments of other countries not to permit recruitment, training and financing of mercenary activities in their territories.

If peace and security are to be strengthened, then we have to rededicate ourselves to the purposes and principles of the Charter, which include respect for the political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, refraining from the use or threat of use of force in international relations, and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Adherence by those principles will not only lead to an improvement in the present situation but will also enhance international understanding and co-operation.

Mr. MANDA-LOUNDHET (Congo) [interpretation from French]: Since the Second World War, which brought so much sorrow to mankind, commendable bilateral and multilateral efforts have been made to try to maintain international peace and security. The United Nations was born in the aftermath of the War; today it is the most appropriate forum for the peaceful settlement of the questions of concern to the peoples. But the efforts of our Organization have been negated by the hypocritical behaviour of some of its Members, which despite their brilliant oratory at our meetings indulge in activities that, unfortunately, dangerously promote insecurity throughout the world.

This year, 1986, proclaimed the International Year of Peace, it cannot be asserted that we have realized the noble ideals prevailing at the creation of the United Nations, including, in the words of the Charter,

(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

"to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small".

It is disappointing that the survival of mankind is in greater jeopardy than ever, because mankind, far from having learned the lessons of the past, is bent on manufacturing the very engines of its own destruction.

The world today is paralysed by fear of the senseless arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race in which unprecedentedly high qualitative and quantitative levels have been reached. Notions of greatness and their concomitant selfishness have led the major Powers to seek constantly to extend their zones of influence. Outer space is fast becoming an arena for shows of force. If the international community does not take care, it will regret it in a few years, when the threat will have become inevitable and when it will be too late to react.

Any assessment of the current international situation is immediately depressing. While for the past 40 years the super-Powers and their allies, relying on dangerous systems of alliance, have had no war on their territories, we must recall that in those years 150 conflicts have taken place in developing countries. It is easy to see that the precarious balance of alliances among the strong has been maintained to the detriment of the weak. Is that not the best way to try and dominate the world?

Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries, meeting from 1 to 6 September 1986 at Harare, Zimbabwe, expressed their "grave concern at the deteriorating world political and economic situation" and noted that "Conflicts, disputes and instability persist in many parts of the world". They stated too that

(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

"Many non-aligned and other developing countries face an increasingly critical economic situation and the gap between developed and developing countries continues to widen. Great Power policies and practices of domination and intervention, as well as the increased resort to the threat or use of force, aggression, occupation, pressure, economic coercion and interference in flagrant violation of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations have aggravated the international situation". (A/41/697, p. 18)

The situation in southern Africa, they indicated, continued to be the object of great concern, owing to

"the perpetration of genocide at home and the practice of aggression and terrorism abroad [which] are inherent in the system of apartheid" (p. 42), a shameful system which has been declared a crime against mankind. Apartheid is not only a threat to peace and security in southern Africa; it is a threat to international peace and security. It is curious and disquieting to see that "certain Western nations, themselves former victims of Fascist aggression" (p. 43), continue perversely to aid and abet apartheid economically, financially, politically, diplomatically and militarily.

It is thus easy to understand the stubbornness of the racist Pretoria régime, which despite repeated condemnation by the international community, persists in its policy of aggression against neighbouring independent States in order to destabilize their régimes.

Ignoring Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and other relevant United Nations resolutions and decisions, South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia. The atrocities visited by the South African régime upon the courageous Namibian people are beyond comprehension. It is high time for Namibia to rejoin the community of free nations as a free and independent State. Congo will never flag in its efforts to bring about that goal.



(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

The deterioration of the situation in the Middle East cannot but be of concern to my delegation. Since the Palestinian question is at the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the international community should strive for a settlement of the question so that a just and comprehensive peace can prevail in the region.

As recognized at Harare by Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries,

"the Latin American and Caribbean region is among those which have been more directly affected by the acts of aggression of colonial Powers and imperialism". (pp. 102-103)

The threat of intervention facing some countries of the region should be removed.

(Mr. Manda-Loundhat, Congo)

The emergence of a growing aspiration on the part of the Latin American countries to solve their own problems is conducive to security. That is why the People's Republic of the Congo fully supports the diplomatic efforts of the Contadora and Lima Groups which can help to preserve peace in that region.

The situations in South-East and South-West Asia are also disquieting for peace and security on earth. Adequate solutions have to be found to the problems that continue to beset that part of the world.

The division of Korea is without doubt a potential threat to world peace. The legitimate aspirations of the Korean people to the peaceful reunification of their homeland, without any foreign interference and through dialogue between the North and the South and harmonization of their views, in conformity with the three principles - independence, peaceful reunification and nationwide unity - spelled out in the North-South Declaration of 4 July 1972, deserve our support.

As demonstrated by the studies carried out on the relationship between the lack of security and underdevelopment, there can indeed be no substantial degree of development without a minimum of peace and security. In other words, the fact that regional conflicts persist forces States to invest in weapons a considerable share of their resources, to the detriment of development.

The delegation of the Congo believes that it is essential to put an end to regional conflicts, and calls on Member States, particularly those that have large arsenals of weapons, to implement the resolutions adopted by our Organization on general and complete disarmament.

If the \$900 billion expended on armaments in the world could be rechanneled towards development, the world would be given a new breath of life.

The Congo earnestly hopes that the international community will shortly find a solution to this important question.

Mr. GBPHO (Ghana) : The last time I took part in a debate in the First Committee, I was unfortunate enough not to have you, Mr. Chairman, presiding over the meeting. Therefore, the personal tribute that I had planned to pay to you was cruelly ~~shorted~~. Today, I am fortunate to have you - an old friend, an experienced diplomat and someone very much acquainted with, and an authority on, the issues before the Committee - presiding over our deliberations. My country and yours enjoy the closest of friendship, which enabled us to contribute to our maximum to international peace and security. I am gratified, therefore, that so distinguished a Person as you are piloting our deliberations today and I trust that at the end of our work, your wisdom and guidance will have made all the difference.

I have the honour to state the position of the Government of Ghana on the items relating to international peace and security now before the Committee, from the perspective of an African country.

As a small developing country, Ghana has a stake in international peace and security. Ghana has therefore spared no efforts, both in this forum and in others, in supporting practical measures aimed at the promotion of peace and security among States. To that end, we are in a position to agree with many of the ideas and proposals contained in the statements of various delegations during this debate.

We believe, however, that regional peace initiatives are not automatically transferable. It is also our belief that such regional initiatives should be voluntary and should be based upon the peculiar circumstances and aspirations of the States in the region. In Africa, where there are no rival military blocs, the promotion of peace and security should focus, in our view, on the elimination of want and poverty in addition to friendly relations between States. That does not mean that we attach any less importance to arms control and disarmament, the

(Mr. Gbaho Ghana)

establishment of zones of peace, or the numerous constructive proposals which several delegations have made in this debate. The fact of the matter is that abject poverty breeds frustration, which in turn creates tensions and political instability. For that reason, a realistic approach to the issue of peace and security in Africa should primarily address this core problem. This implies, in our view, the strengthening of the existing multilateral and bilateral institutions to broaden the basis of socio-economic co-operation.

Ghana therefore attaches great importance to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the subregional body for co-ordinating economic policies in West Africa. In spite of the current strains and stresses - inevitable for a nascent multilateral institution - ECOWAS offers a practical forum for States in the subregion to adopt a common approach to evolving programmes for broadening the basis of economic co-operation and growth. It is also a clearing house for resolving sensitive political issues which otherwise could create the basis for mistrust, suspicion and even conflict.

As a complement to ECOWAS, the Government of Ghana has established Permanent Joint Commissions of Co-operation with a significant number of sister African countries. These instruments of co-operation, extending beyond Ghana's immediate neighbours, have provided a framework for the promotion of bilateral co-operation in socio-economic relations and other areas of mutual concern. For a long time to come, the promotion of peace and stability in Africa would evolve within the framework of such multilateral and bilateral regional institutions; they offer practical opportunities for the pooling of resources for tackling the pervasive and common problems of want and poverty. Regional, multilateral and bilateral institutions in Africa therefore could serve a dual purpose of, first, promoting

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

regular contact and dispelling mistrust and suspicion and, secondly, providing the solid basis for economic co-operation and political stability.

But, in an increasingly interdependent world the rest of mankind is bound to be affected by Africa's misfortunes. The hardships in Africa concern us all. It is a moral and political challenge of supreme magnitude. We have no doubt at all of Africa's resolve to face this challenge.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

There is no disputing the fact that there is the need for the international community to exercise a greater political will and to transcend ideological differences to create the appropriate environment to enable Africa to tackle its external indebtedness, the elimination of which is fundamental to the promotion of peace and security in the region and the world in general.

The activities of developed countries in fomenting insecurity within countries in our part of the world deserves scrutiny. For reasons of ideology or hegemony, certain States in the developed world have habitually sought to prejudice peace and security in third-world countries by promoting violence. That is a policy that must be firmly deprecated, for it augurs poorly for the promotion of international peace and security among States. The United Nations admits the coexistence of different ideologies and systems and confers no inherent right on any Member State to undermine the sovereignty of another State because of systemic differences.

while the Ghana delegation therefore welcomes the conclusions reached by the Stockholm Conference last September, the significance of that event in terms of the reduction of tension, mistrust and the risks of military confrontation in Europe may be seriously diminished as long as potential threats to peace and stability exist in other regions.

I shall now turn to the question of the effectiveness of the Charter as an instrument for the promotion of peace and security, which has been raised by a number of delegations. Like all human creations, the Charter of the United Nations cannot claim perfection. We ourselves, as a developing country, are not happy with the acknowledgement of the apparent inequality of States and the assumption that the most powerful and important States should have special status in international organizations. Generally speaking, however, the Charter, in our view, has adequate machinery for strengthening international peace and security. The nagging problems

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Of regional conflicts have persisted precisely because of the failure of Member States to adhere strictly to their Charter obligations. The Security Council, the good offices of the Secretary-General and, indeed, the General Assembly, are available organs that can play important roles in developing conditions for regional and global peace. In his report to the forty-first session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General again underscores the validity and relevance of Charter provisions in dealing with the threat, as well as the reality, of armed conflict. He stated:

"Essentially two requirements must be met'. first, the permanent members of the Security Council, especially the two most powerful, must perceive that, notwithstanding bilateral differences and distrust, it is in their national interest to co-operate within the Security Council and, within this framework, to apply their collective influence to the resolution of regional disputes. secondly, all Member States must perceive in far greater measure that the existence of an authoritative and representative international organ capable of maintaining peace and security is in their individual as well as the common interest and that, therefore, its decisions must be respected." (A/41/1, p. 4)

At this juncture, my delegation would like to advert to the continuing lack of resort to the Charter provisions for enhancing international peace and security. We are witnessing an increasing number of unilateral measures to settle disputes, all of which have severely prejudiced international peace and security. Quite apart from the failures of Member States to utilize the Charter provisions, there are certain institutional weaknesses in our United Nations that indirectly contribute to this sorry state of affairs. There is a need, therefore, to study this phenomenon in detail with a view to finding an acceptable solution. To that end, my delegation regrets that the international community has been prevented from

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

studying the matter through a resort to procedural chicanery by the developed countries. We hope that it will still be possible to address the issue.

In effect, the United Nations will work well if we maintain a flexible attitude and wish it to work well. The amiable settlement last July of the dispute between France and New Zealand over the Rainbow Warrior affair was a classic example of two Member States exercising flexibility under Chapter VI of the Charter. Similarly, China and the United Kingdom, two Permanent Members of the Security Council, were able to reach an accord without any recrimination over the future of Hong Kong. But perhaps deserving a special mention is the United Nations peace-keeping operations. It is a technique evolved by the United Nations to contain volatile situations while the parties are persuaded to resort to the negotiating table. The Government of Ghana attaches great importance to the concept and practice of peace-keeping operations. Ghana has therefore been associated with the United Nations peace-keeping operations since the former Congo crisis in the 1960s. There are currently Ghanaian contingents serving under the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). It is a matter for regret that this noble experiment of quiet diplomacy is now in serious jeopardy owing to the non-payment of assessed contributions by some Member States.

Over the years, States which, for various political and ideological reasons, object to peace-keeping operations have been withholding operating funds. Such actions have created serious deficits in the United Nations peace-keeping accounts, resulting in cuts in reimbursements to the troop contributors. Perhaps what is needed at this juncture is a reaffirmation by all Member States of their commitment to the United Nations peace-keeping efforts. A practical demonstration of those commitments, in our view, would be the full discharge by Member States of their financial obligations.



(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana]

In conclusion, the United Nations has accomplished much in the area of decolonization. It has, through the intergovernmental agencies, recorded a number of successes in the field of health, resulting in the eradication, for example, of smallpox. Similarly, some global or regional environmental matters have been addressed, and much could be made of the humanitarian relief programmes, particularly the assistance to refugees and the recent emergency food-relief efforts.

Those are all issues that touch fundamentally on the promotion of global peace and security. The Ghana delegation is open to constructive suggestions and proposals that would ensure international peace and security. Perhaps what is needed is the exercise of greater political will within the framework of the Principles and purposes of the Charter.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.