



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 58th MEETING

Chairman: Me. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE, CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS
(continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/41/PV.58
8 January 1987
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 6 p.m.

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

GENERAL DEBATE, CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

Mr a. CODE (Liberia): We are once again dealing with matters on our agenda concerning international peace and security, and my delegation is pleased to participate.

For much of the world, genuine peace represents an objective still to be achieved, and at best, unfortunately, extremely slow progress is being made. Where does the responsibility lie? "With the United Nations" is the answer which I am sure many representatives would immediately give. In recent years we have heard, and even today we still hear, endless recitals of things said to be wrong with the United Nations. Many of us have misgivings and feelings of disappointment because of our Organization's inability to do everything we had expected it to do.

There are those of us who feel that the big-Power unity of 1945, the basis of the Charter, has disintegrated, making it impossible for the United Nations to function as originally intended. Instead of its being able to deal effectively with major issues, we have often heard mumblings - and have even ourselves said - that our Organization has degenerated into a mere debating society and a forum for the propaganda blasts of East and West, on many occasions involving allies of both camps.

But an alternative explanation of where the responsibility lies would seem, in our view, to be the apparent confusion as to what the United Nations actually is and what it can do. Indeed, we have regarded our Organization as the answer to all international problems, overlooking the fact that Member States can themselves become stumbling blocks to the resolution of those problems. This may be getting nearer the truth.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

We have often been reminded that the United Nations was born out of anguish and suffering, and was based on the conviction that a supreme effort should again be made to organize the nations of the world to prevent a catastrophe similar to that of the Second World War. It was because of these considerations that the Organization's aspirations for collective security, international peace and justice, economic and social welfare and human rights reflected the deep hopes and ideals of mankind. It is timely to recall the following statement of the late Mr. Trygve Lie, then Secretary-General, in the 1952 edition of "Your United Nations", published by the Department of Public Information:

"[The United Nations] was created out of the suffering, the needs, the hopes and ideals of the peoples of the world.

"What it achieves or fails to achieve depends on the faith of all human beings expressed through the representatives who meet in these halls.

"This building is anchored forty feet deep in the solid rock of Manhattan Island. But the true foundations of the United Nations are in your faith and support.

"All that the United Nations is and can become belongs to you, the peoples of the world.

"Cherish it as your most precious possession." (United Nations Publication, sales No. 1952.1.33)

Can any one of us quarrel with those sentiments? The aspirations which led to our Organization's founding were noble, and they are as valid today as they were when they were first entertained. Each founding father strove to help realise the United Nations dream. Whether from Asia, Africa, Latin America, North America or Eastern or Western Europe, they made their contributions, and the fruit of their labour - the United Nations - came to occupy a prominent place in the history of the world, a place which I dare say can never be destroyed.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

If our forefathers could carve for our Organization a name and place in history that will always endure, cannot we, their descendants, within the Charter Of the United Nations, build something grander on the foundations which they laid? Why, then, does a chronic fatalism seem to be weakening our Organization? We have heard over and over again that the problem with the United Nations is the United Nations itself.

If our international problem is we ourselves, then each Member State, by solving the problem in itself, would in that instance be solving the international problem. Therefore, those who complain about our problems when they should be solving them have themselves become the main problem.

Regrettably, the United Nations is judged primarily in terms of what it does and does not do regarding the more spectacular world events. For example, the negotiations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, particularly with regard to disarmament issues, have completely overshadowed other pressing matters and whatever gains have been secured by the Secretary-General at the United Nations in this and other fields. And because the resolution of all world problems - be they national or international - rests upon those two super-Powers, more often than not they are blamed for all the ills of the world.

Liberia has always borne in mind that the first purpose of the United Nations is the maintenance of peace and security, but we have also considered that relationships within our Organisation indicate that peace and security mean different things to individual States and groups of States. The meaning of peace takes on a highly subjective character and becomes closely equated with the national and ideological outlook of different States and, I must not fail to add, of national liberation movements.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

As we approach the close of 1986, the International Year of Peace, it is not unfair to say that we have hardly observed anything near a semblance of peace for most parts of the world. Indeed, this year violence and terrorism have been on the upsurge, as if to ridicule the meaning of the word "peace" as Liberia translates it.

Regrettably, Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Central America, South Africa, Namibia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon and the Mediterranean have not been spared interference, intervention and military hostilities. In other parts of the world, how long will things proceed somewhat smoothly? Let us not forget that the mere absence of military hostility can sometimes be purchased by a weak State's submitting to the demands of a powerful one, and thus accepting considerable restrictions on, or complete loss of, its political and economic freedom and liberty as a whole.

Within the framework of peace, how many States honestly feel confident that their respective interests and claims can be considered and adjusted either through the process of negotiation and conciliation or through impartial judicial settlement, if they do not belong to any group or alliance?

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

of course, this assumes not only the availability of certain procedures for adjusting international differences, but also adequate agreement or consensus among States as to certain fundamental principles governing their relations with one another, in particular, with recalcitrant States.

we consider economic development, which is so closely linked to disarmament and to international peace and security, to be crucial in both the military and the economic senses. The eagerness with which we in Africa are today undertaking programmes of economic development is an eloquent testimony to the significance we attach to our position in international relations.

Although we are not all economic and military equals, we must face the fact that all Members of the United Nations are sovereign equals, which consequently entitles them to assume certain obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. Our obligations under the Charter are extensive and could, if completely observed by all Member States, assure the peaceful resolution of international differences and the steady improvement of political, economic and social conditions throughout the world. Yet, we are all aware that the United Nations has no independent power of its own to enforce these obligations.

This leads me to say that it is left to each State Member of the United Nations to decide when and how it will observe its obligations under the Charter, a fact which demonstrates that the United Nations does not have the power to force its Members to do things in the same way as our national Governments do.

It is fair to say that the United Nations at best offers its Members certain useful facilities for co-operative action when they feel it to be in their best interest to employ them. The Organization, in the final analysis, is no stronger than its individual Members are willing to make it.

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

I doubt seriously **whether** any Member State here will volunteer to say that **it**, at one time or another, has not adhered to the Charter of the United Nations. And we **have** all heard the **persistent** argument by some States about issues being **essentially** a **question** within the domestic jurisdiction of States, and that the United Nations has no right to interfere in such matters. We have been hearing this argument since the inception of our **Organization**.

As I assumed earlier, genuine **peace requires** more than an international **police** force and procedures of negotiation and conciliation. It depends also on **steady** progress towards the reduction of **poverty, illiteracy** and disease, and on the improvement of the economic and social well-being of the world.

In the course of our debate, **we have** heard extolled the virtues of the implementation of **the** collective security provisions **of** the Charter of the United Nations, which, I recall, became **an** item included in our agenda in 1982 at the **request** of Sierra Leone. Yet this subject, **as** with others - namely, "Consideration of guidelines for confidence-building **measures**" and the "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament" - has not received the attention and support they deserve in this Committee at the appropriate time.

If I may be permitted to say so, there seems to be in our **deliberations** and consultations the idea that a certain group or an individual State must **always be** the **forerunner** or spokesman in disarmament affairs. **My delegation** begs to differ. And, concerning the collective security provisions adopted as resolution **40/159** in **1955**, the Committee may recall that the resolution was adopted by a vote of 114 to 21, with **16** abstentions. Liberia voted for its adoption.

When we speak **about** **collective** security, let us first **start** by implementing **resolution 40/159**. It is out of these considerations that we are apprehensive

(Mrs. Osode, Liberia)

about the wisdom of new approaches to international peace and security. However, if such approaches were, ad seems to be intimated, a panacea for the shortcomings in international relations - economic, political and military, diplomatic and other fields - we would be willing to study sarefully any proposal circulated by any Member State and, if it so deserves, to give it our endorsement.

In the meantime, all peoples and Governments should devote their time and energy to making the United Nations a success by adhering to its Charter, rather than pursuing a plan that could divide and even complicate our efforts.

Finally, we should be reminded that our main function as diplomats is to remove unfounded suspicions and avoid speculating about the intentions of others, thus decreasing international tensions. Our diplomatic efforts will serve this end more than any move towards what could he misinterpreted as a grand scheme.

Mr. ESZTERGALYOS (Hungary) : I would like briefly to inform members of this Committee about the results of the informal contacts and consultations the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.89 have had with a number of delegations, both Western and non-aligned countries. Concrete suggestiona and remarks were made by the delegations of, among others, Pakistan, Tunisia and some Western countries. In a true spirit of co-operation, we tried to accommodate these suggestiona and proposals. The following are the changes we have made as they will appear in L.89/Rev.1.

The first change is the insertion of two new paragraphs after the first paragraph of the preamble, both of which are based on a suggestion of the Pakistani delegation. They would therefore read:

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

“Deeply concerned at the numerous threats to international peace and security resulting from the persistent violations of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations,

“Also concerned at the continuous escalation in the global arms race, specially the nuclear-arms race and the consequent threat posed to the security of all States”.

The fourth, fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs are identical to the third, fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs of the original text.

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

On the basis of a suggestion by the delegation of Tunisia, the next paragraphs should read:

"Having in mind the necessity to strengthen international co-operation on the basis of existing consensus, in view of promoting the well-being and economic development of all countries, in particular developing countries,

"Having discussed the question of a comprehensive system of international peace and security".

Based on suggestions by the Western countries, operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution will read:

"Solemnly reaffirms that the collective security system embodied in the Charter of the United Nations continues to be a fundamental and irreplaceable instrument for the preservation of international peace and security".

Based on a suggestion by Pakistan, operative paragraph 2 will read:

"Also reaffirms the need to adhere strictly to the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, especially respect for the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of states, non-intervention and non-interference in their internal affairs, non-use of force in international relations, peaceful settlements of disputes and the right of all Peoples to self-determination".

Based on a suggestion by Pakistan, operative paragraph 3 will read:

"Recognizes the invariable role of the United Nations in the preservation of international peace and security, harmonization of the policies of Member States and the imperative need to strengthen and reinforce the United Nations;

'Calls upon States to focus their efforts on ensuring security on an equal basis for all States and in all spheres of international relations;

(Mr. Esztergalyos, Hungary)

Operative paragraph 5 is based on suggestion 8 by Western countries:

"Calls upon Member States to make their contribution to practical measures to ensure compliance with and implementation of the provisions of the Charter, with particular regard to the crucial and interrelated areas of disarmament, the peaceful settlement of international conflict, economic development and co-operation and the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms".

Based on suggestion 8 by Pakistan, operative paragraph 6 will read:

"Further calls for the implementation of resolutions of the United Nations".

And, based on the original operative paragraph 2, operative paragraph 7 will read:

"Decides to continue consideration of this question at the forty-second session under an agenda item entitled "Comprehensive system of international peace and security".

As can be seen from the foregoing, the draft resolution has been expanded in a rather significant way, which might indicate the degree of flexibility the co-sponsors have shown. During the consultations, other interested delegations evinced a spirit of co-operation, which we appreciate very much. We are convinced and hopeful that, with that kind of co-operative attitude prevailing in the future, we will be in a position to move closer to those common goals identified in the draft resolution.

Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): The maintenance of international peace and security is an obligation incumbent upon all States, which must live together under the principles of law, and particularly those set forth in the Charter. The United Nations, and particularly the Security

(Mr. Gumucio Granter, Bolivia)

Council, bear responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Last year in the Committee my delegation stated that the dimensions of international security were changing in a dynamic fashion beyond what could have been foreseen by those who drafted the Charter in San Francisco. Beyond the threats to security arising from the arms race and mistrust between the great Powers, there are new phenomena that affect Member States, particular small States. My delegation noted the existence of a new problem of growing international significance that had not yet been debated by the Security Council, although it poses a potentially grave threat to States, one stemming not from other States but from entities that represent transnational criminal organisations responsible for the illicit trade in narcotics.

The threats created by the illicit trafficking in drugs, as well as of weapons, inhibit the development and injure the economies of small and vulnerable countries since they tend to create false and illusory economic improvements and to play a socially and economically destabilizing role.

Many developed countries that already possess a social and economic infrastructure and modern police and legal systems have nevertheless been unable to suppress the growing demand for narcotics, the probatation of which leads to the development of the international drug traffic and criminal networks that frequently become involved also in illicit trading in weapons. Owing to the difficulties inherent in containing such a proliferation of threats, there is a corresponding strengthening of criminal organizations that do not hesitate to resort to unorthodox methods to achieve their nefarious ends.

The scale of economic resources and the power of the groups trafficking in narcotics is now so great that they pose a serious threat to the security of

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

democratic institutions in small States, into which they are infiltrating in an attempt to establish bases of operations. Thus, States should join forces to ensure that international efforts to curb the demand for and production of narcotics are concurrent, simultaneous and co-ordinated under United Nations auspices with effort to preserve the domestic security of States.

Accordingly, multilateral cooperation to achieve positive control over the traffic in narcotics, as well as present efforts being made to reduce that evil, must at the same time include consideration of the implications of the use of armed violence, the use of mercenaries and other related methods that pose threats to the security of many Governments and the sovereignty of States.

Last year, my delegation expressed its conviction that in the near future the Security Council and other relevant United Nations bodies should consider the threat and transnational danger posed to the security of States by the illicit trade in narcotics. In other words, pursuant to the United Nations Charter, States Members should consider and suggest measures to deal with this new international threat, one that was not foreseen in San Francisco, since in those days there was no prospect of threats to the security of States other than those coming from other States.

Forty years later, in our modern world in which amazing advances in technology and apparently inexhaustible financial resources are in the hands of powerful transnational entities, it is necessary that international forums face up to and study these new threats to the security of national or Government institutions. These threats emanate not from other States but from criminal entities in confrontation with and even seeking to usurp the powers of States themselves.

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

In a letter dated 5 August 1986 addressed to me Secretary-General (A/41/191), a group of Member States proposed the inclusion in the agenda of the forty-first session of a supplementary item, entitled "Establishment of a comprehensive system of international security". That item is now under consideration. My delegation congratulates the 10 States signatories of that letter, because their proposal reflects a concern that the United Nations take full cognizance of the dimensions of security and that States contribute to the formulation of a comprehensive system of international security.

Document A/41/191 contains basic considerations that should be included in a system of security, not only those that in keeping with the classic model have a political dimension but also others with an economic dimension, including the grave situation in international economic relations as a result of unjust terms of trade and of heavy debt • uencing on foreign indebtedness, and many other considerations reflected in underdevelopment in many parts of the world. The document also takes into account the humanitarian dimension of peace and • ecurity, which is threatened by serious human rights violations, especially those of a massive character, whose most reprehensible manifestation is the apartheid system. The point is that international security must be considered together with the welfare of mankind.

The proposal by those Member States partially responds to the concerns my delegation expressed during the fortieth session. Moreover, it takes a more comprehensive approach allowing for the inclusion of other factors that should be considered in the establishment of a broad system of international security.

In that connection, my delegation will • upport all initiatives that could be adopted by the international community to • nsure that the various multidimensional facets of international security can be included in a new framework to be constructed by States to improve international relations and make possible the

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

creation of a **comprehensive** system of peace and security, **complementing** the **provisions** of the **United Nations Charter**.

Mr. SOB (Cameroon): My delegation would like to **express its views** on **agenda items 67, 66, 69 and 141**, currently **under consideration** by the **Committee**. We believe that those **items** relate to the heart of our **collective preoccupations** concerning the prevention of all war and for the achievement of peace and **security**.

Security is a sensitive and subjective issue. **Peace**, another component of **stability and progress**, tends to be **elusive**. Yet the **pursuit of both**, in the interest of **survival and development**, must continue, and **must be intensified**, within the **framework** of the **United Nations Charter**. It is in the face of **heavy odds** against **survival** that **man's creative imagination** at its finest has **always** been fired. The Charter is an **example of man's achievements** in the struggle for **survival**.

My delegation believes that since **every** institution created by man is what its **members** make of it, what is truly being tested at **this stage** is, in the final analysis, **man himself**. **Nations** are made up of people. **Constitutions** are **elaborated** and the **laws and procedures** of human conduct proclaimed in order to define a **constitutional consensus** providing a **framework** for peace and security. These **values** and attitudes are an **important component** of every nation's fortunes.

A people's indifference to the **necessary** conditions for peace and security will inevitably lead to war and strife. Those **who** by their **conduct and values** reject **belligerency** and **strife** will **build** strong, prosperous nations. Time spent in consciously building peace and **security** is time well spent. On the other hand, **vanity and arrogance** provide an **opportunity** for **miscalculation** and for the exercise of power by an individual or by a **select few**. These truths are evident in **international relations**, because **international relations** are, in the final analysis, **conducted** by human beings.

(Mr. Sob, Cameroon)

What is dreadful is that mankind, ta all i ta enlightenment, doe8 not appear to have grasped the true content of the tranquility of order. Al though we all claim to be seeking peace and security, the leader ship of many nations gives the impression that it prefers to halt the process of building peace and security, a process in which they themselves are key actors. Some leaders appear to be motivated by the desire to reconstruct peace in a pattern that suite them alone, attempting to impose their own subjective valuer cm the rest of mankind.

We live in dangerous times. What we do here must reflect our expert knowledge of our wald. The institutions we establish must help to ensure our survival and must incorporate our endeavours, our ambitions and our attitudes towards universal norms. Objectivity must be our guiding princ'ple.

Given Cameroon's commitment to upholding the principles of the United Nations Chartu, my delegation, in all true conscience, values certain cardinal principles. These are the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, the principle of respect for sovereignty, and tie principle of the non-use or threat of force in international relations. If those principles are violated, the result can only be mistrust, tension and conflict among Member States. Cameroon therefore disapproves of any action that violates those fundamental principles.

My delegation has taken a very careful look at the Provisions relating to un iversal peace and security embodied in the Uni ted Na tions Char ter. we truly believe that through the Charter we can indeed share that universal constitutional consensus that alone can guaran tee in tuna tional peace and securi ty and enhance development and change in an otherwise cruel world. Between the written words of the Charter and the acts perpetrated in purported pursuit of the principles they exress, there is an alarming gap which, politely speaking, casts doubt on the

(Mr. Rob, Cameroon)

credibility of some States regarding their attitude to the Charter and to a strife-free development-oriented world.

For us in Africa there are certain fundamental principles, certain basic elements that a serious comprehensive security strategy must include in order to be credible and viable. Africa stands for peace. Indeed, Africa urgently needs peace. The Organization of African Unity (OAU), in its quest for peace, security and progress in our region, has always taken an unwavering stand in favour of a general and complete disarmament that would promote peace and security for all and would enhance the prospects and opportunities for development and for constructive, co-operative relations among States.

But Africa does not accept peace at any price. We cannot accept terms dictated to us imposed upon us on our knees. The right to security and self-defence is an indispensable ingredient of genuine peace. Our region faces the grim challenge of trying to maintain peace and security without further weakening our already fragile economies through the increasing diversion of our limited resources to defence requirements.

In that connection, my delegation believes that no matter what is done in the name of change, reform, efficiency and effectiveness, every effort must be made to prevent the demise of the United Nations Charter. It would appear that the best beginning would be for all States to meet their obligations under the Charter. That might be considered a change of attitude, but it is fundamental to the ability of the Organization to fulfil its mandate, which includes the implementation of the collective decisions of Member States. We cannot afford to demean the Organization while we debate the rudiments of change. No State or group of States, big or small, rich or poor, can afford to design the world around it without observing the principles of the United Nations Charter.

(Hr. Sob. Cameroon)

Our country's attachment to the ideals, purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter can be attributed, *inter alia*, to the special historical ties that bind Cameroon to the Organization. As a Former Trust Territory, Cameroon has always trusted - as have its people - in the ideals and original goals of this Organization. Moreover, the United Nations gave a practical illustration of those ideals and goals in the role it played in Cameroon's accession to independence.

In my delegation's view, the Charter system of collective security and the peaceful settlement of disputes allows for the process of democratization and broad participation. What is required, therefore, is political will by States to utilize effectively the Charter's provisions in their conduct of international relations.

(Mr. Sob, Cameroon)

Any genuine progress in this connection requires the co-operation and participation of all interested parties in order to ensure security for all, and no longer just for some at the expense of others. The growing militarization of the concept of security, the ensuing violation of the rules of international law and the frequent use of violence in the settlement of disputes pose a real threat, particularly to small, non-aligned and militarily weak countries.

It is in this context of widespread concern for the maintenance of international peace and security that my delegation believes that the over-all question of security must be considered in its broadest context, including its non-military aspects. Over the past 40 years, the world - in particular the developing countries - has experienced untold destruction as a result of conflicts using conventional weapons in particular and, in some instances, chemical weapons. Whether triggered by border or territorial disputes, foreign occupation or intervention, violations of human rights, or denial of the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination, these conflicts, although localized, have resulted in various kinds of death and destruction.

Similarly, from the internal socio-economic crisis which increases military spending, particularly in the developing countries, to the suspicion and acute tensions among States which result from increasing militarization and the arms race, my delegation sees a climate of generalized insecurity, which in turn encourages military spending. This creates a vicious circle to which most of our countries are unfortunately forced to accommodate themselves. It is precisely this unstable situation which fosters the arms race at the expense of development and increases the risk that local conflicts will be transformed into broader conflagrations, thereby threatening international peace and security.

My delegation believes that the key problem is to find ways and means for the effective utilization, and States' commitment, obligations and implementation, of

(Mr. Sob, Cameroon)

the United Nations Charter. To this end, States can safeguard their security without resorting to the arm race which, in the final analysis, leads to generalized insecurity, even for the most heavily armed States.

There is thus a very close link between disarmament and international security. There is an urgent need, therefore, in my delegation's view, for the effective utilization of the United Nations Charter, in order to make practical and realistic efforts to implement the mechanisms of collective security. These two parallel approaches, like the questions of disarmament and security, are closely linked. Any progress in one area could have positive consequences for the other. Conversely, any setback in one could have a negative impact on the other.

My delegation believes that, in establishing a realistic order of priorities between these two closely interrelated objectives, it is extremely important that the Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security as defined in the Charter, should be able to address all the necessary concerns. In the final analysis, any positive step in this field will have to be based on the fundamental truth that, without security; it would be illusory to expect any progress whatsoever in the field of disarmament and development. Conversely, any progress in disarmament and development is likely to create conditions conducive to the enhancement of security.

Any initiative aimed at safeguarding international peace and security would have the enthusiastic support of my delegation, particularly in view of the resurgence of the cold war, the arms race, the hegemonistic designs of big and small countries, the flagrant intervention in the internal affairs of States, and direct and indirect subversion. The legal format of the proposed comprehensive security system, as envisaged by my delegation, is of secondary importance; what is decisive is the political will of States to implement the Charter provisions in

(Mr. Sob, Cameroon)

good faith. If the strengthening of the principle of non-use of force is to concretize itself in a solemn system acceptable to all nations, it would, in our view, first find factual expression in international life, in political action resolutely and clearly oriented towards the same goal and objective.

My delegation would have hoped that the proposed new system of comprehensive security would also focus on the strengthening of the general rule of the prohibition of the use of force in all its forms and the strengthening of international institutions, universal, regional and subregional, for the implementation of measures for the strengthening of the peaceful means for the settlement of disputes.

In this context, the Government of Cameroon is fully aware of the numerous international instruments already in force embodying the principle of the non-use of force in international relations, such as the Charter of the United Nations; the Charter of the Organization of African Unity; the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement (the Pact of Bogotá); the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; the Definition of Aggression; the Pact of the League of Arab States; and the Inter-American Mutual Assistance Treaty (Rio Treaty).

Consequently, we trust that the authors of document A/41/191 will take into serious consideration all of the above when elaborating further on a comprehensive security system. These regional and universal instruments complement one another and, in particular, the Charter of the United Nations. We uphold the principle of non-use of force as enshrined in Article 2 (4) of the Charter and we also recall the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and, at the regional level, the Final Act of Helsinki, which, in our view, re-enforces the Document of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

(Mr. Sob, Cameroon)

Accordingly, special attention should be focused on the intimate relationship existing among the principles of non-use of force, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and the system of collective security. In that connection, my delegation would have expected that any proposed system of international security would revolve around those three subjects, examining, with respect to each of them, their legal constituents, their form or manifestations and, if appropriate, the institutional means for their implementation existing within the Organization.

Finally, the oral amendments just made by the representative of Hungary, my delegation will now elaborate on a few main concepts.

First, in reference to the collective security system, we would like to examine a detailed and practical approach relating to: (a) the action of the Security Council in cases of threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, or acts of aggression, especially the provisional measures provided for by Article 40 and the definitive measures provided for by Articles 39, 41 and 42 of the Charter; (b) the role of the General Assembly in those cases where the Security Council is unable to act due to the lack of unanimity among its permanent members; (c) the machinery set up in accordance with the Charter for the conservation of peace-keeping situations where there are international tensions; (d) and the contribution of the Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security as provided for in Articles 43 to 47 of the Charter.

Secondly, in accordance with the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, it is respectfully submitted that additional clarification would be necessary in the light of: (a) principles of independence and the sovereign equality of States and of the free choice of means; (b) enumeration of the means of peaceful settlement in the light of the appropriate international legal instruments; and (c) the duty and compliance with Charter provisions concerning the

(Mr. Bob, Cameroon)

principle of abstaining from all acts or measures which might aggravate international disputes, with reference in particular to the Security Council, the General Assembly, the International Court of Justice, and regional organizations.

Thirdly, conversely, with regard to the principle of the non-use of force, we would sincerely appreciate a comprehensive examination of : (a) the definition of the terms "force", "threat of force", "intervention" and "self-defence", the latter within the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter ; (b) the forms of manifestations of the use or threat of using force, delimiting their scope and content and reaffirming, if appropriate, their lawful and unlawful character ; (c) the general principle of non-intervention; (d) the use of force, including cases where foreigners are subjected to coercive measures by a local government and the right of the State of their nationality to intervene on their behalf, having recourse, if appropriate, to the use of force under Article 51 of the Charter; and (e) the non-recognition or nullity of situations emanating from the threat or the illegal use of force.

(Mr. Sob Cameroon)

On the basis of those instruments and principles, my delegation would caution that apparent ● nbavoula to supplement pcwiaiona of the Charter □ lght create confusion md legal ● mbiguities if all Member States did not adhere to them. If interpretations of the Charter differed, action might result in discrepancies which would be all too eay to exploit.

Security would therefore seem to be an ● xtremaly complex objective, consisting simultaneously of a variety of ● ocio-economic, political and military elements. Traditionally, however, it hu generally been peratved only in nil nry terms. Thia narrow approach to ● eaucity problems tends to enwurge the arms race on the pretext of the illusory quest for increased security, which ultimately leads to the outbreak of war. I t is therefore imperative that Member States conduct themselves by adher inq to and complying with ● xiating commitments and obligations as enshrined in the Charter.

Mr. CAPPAGLI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The

strengthening of security in all its ● mpeotu - not only military - is in present circumstances ● aentiel for inter national coexistence. National and inter national secur ity are closely linked. Security should not be invoked to justi fy th inga that hwe nothng to do with it. The United Nations wntinuee to play a fundamental role in promoting and ● tcengthaning Intornational peace and security, by reaffirming the basic principles that ● hould govern relations between States and by drawing up and complying with provisions on the following matters: international law; developmen t in its var ioua ampecte - social and economic; the difficult, fundamental process of decolonization; respect for all aspects of human rights; the el mination of racial discr imlnaton; the struggle aga inat apartheid; and all questions relating to disarmament and arms limitation.

(Mr. Cappagli, Argentina)

In all major areas the Organization can show undeniable concrete results, reflected in many General Assembly resolutions and declarations recommending various approaches to a solution. Nevertheless, international security requires the support, participation and political will of States.

The United Nations has to its credit considerable achievements, including the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes and the Final Document adopted at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1978.

In that Document the international community considers that disarmament and the limitation of arms, particularly in the nuclear field, are essential factors to prevent the danger of nuclear war, to strengthen international peace and security, and promote the economic and social progress of all peoples, thus bringing closer the establishment of a new international economic order. The Document, which was adopted by consensus, undoubtedly constitutes the best framework for disarmament efforts.

International peace and security cannot be based on accumulating arms. The Declaration in the Final Document points out, with characteristic clarity, that "Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces, by international agreement and mutual example, leading ultimately to general and complete disarmament under effective international control." (resolution S-10/2, para. 13)

(Mr. Csppaql i, Argentina)

My delegation, representing a non-aligned country, accordingly wishes to highlight the important Contribution our movement has made to international security, in particular the security of the non-nuclear States. Here I wish particularly to mention the recent Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, held in Harare.

The Heads of State or Government of Mexico, Tanzania, India, Greece, Sweden and Argentina have made a number of appeals, the latest being contained in the Mexico Declaration, stressing their determination to help to facilitate agreement between nuclear-weapon States and to join forces with them, and with all other countries, to bring about the security of the human race and to achieve peace.

Article 1 of the Charter declares that the maintenance of international peace and security is one of the main purposes of the United Nations. Furthermore, Chapter VII gives the Organization a mandate to take measures to confront threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression. Despite this, in practice the security system has not shown itself to be very efficient.

Strict compliance with the basic principles of the Charter by all Member States would undoubtedly help to improve security and consequently to make the international situation less tense. Implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter, especially those relating to sovereignty, refraining from recourse to the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, the peaceful settlement of disputes, non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and complying in good faith with obligations entered into are essential prerequisites for international security.

Clearly, the Organization's effectiveness depends above all on the willingness of States to abide by their obligations under the Charter and to co-operate in the

(Mr. Cappagli, Argentina)

search for solutions, particularly when international peace and security are at stake. The security system needs the political will of the States concerned.

The Charter has given the Security Council primary, although not exclusive, responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. We believe it is vital that the Council be able to act speedily and effectively in order to live up to that responsibility. Nevertheless, it is to be regretted that in many cases the Council has not been able to carry out its specific functions because of certain structural weaknesses in the decision-making process. In many cases the absence of political will and the abuse of the rule requiring the unanimity of the permanent members has paralysed the Council and deprived the international community of its main instrument to confront crises that threaten international peace and security.

(Mr. Cappagli, Argentina)

The essential contribution to a system of security should be provided by a Council active and sensitive to its responsibilities under Chapters V, VI and VII of the Charter. My delegation therefore believes that in this regard a very important role belongs also to the General Assembly and the Secretary-General. We share the view of those who believe that both the General Assembly and the Secretary-General may act on their own initiative in specific cases.

Similarly, we cannot but agree with the comments made here a few days ago by the delegation of the United Kingdom on behalf of the 12 members of the European Community about the important role played by the Secretary-General in the process of the peaceful solution of disputes.

On this point, we would express our sincere good wishes for success whenever the Secretary-General offers his good offices. My Government attaches prime importance to the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The exchange of views that has occurred in the First Committee has convincingly demonstrated that the idea of a comprehensive system of international peace and security has met with widespread understanding and support. This is of fundamental and prime importance in evaluating the initiative of the socialist countries.

The joint initiative of the socialist countries is based entirely on the Charter of the United Nations and, in fact, finds its very beginnings in it. It is aimed at making a reality of the purposes and principles of the United Nations and all the potential implicit in the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security throughout the world under present conditions - due account being taken of the realities of our nuclear-space age, with the new inherent dangers of this era for all peoples and States, together with its unprecedented prospects for development.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

In underscoring the equality of nations, the Charter combines military security and democracy in international relations. What does this concept of security and democracy deriving from the Charter mean today? First of all, it means, under present conditions, the elimination of the threat of nuclear catastrophe. We do not associate our prestige with the possession of nuclear weapons. Our ideal is not the policy of force, but rather the force of policy. The dignity of a major Power today is proved by its readiness to strive for the equal security of all, rather than to strive to obtain advantages and cling to privileges, including the dubious privilege of possessing nuclear weapons or developing outer-space weapons. Such attempts are things of the past, the error prior to the nuclear age, a way of thinking that dates back to the Stone Age.

In submitting the proposal for the establishment of a system of international security, the socialist countries have predicated their position on the fact that the issues upon which the survival of mankind depends must not be resolved by a small group of nuclear Powers. The problem of comprehensive security can be resolved through the joint efforts of the entire international community.

It would appear that there is no need to demonstrate in our Committee the general benefits and advantages of security and democracy in international relations. This would seem to be axiomatic. But, given the differences that have emerged in our Committee, I should like once again to underscore that our proposals are not aimed against any specific state or group of States. In an equal manner they take due account of the interests of both individual members of our Organization as well as the entire international community as a whole.

The socialist countries have put forward their proposal in a spirit of new political thinking which calls for overcoming the remnants of enmity and suspicion in the interest of the survival of mankind. We should like, at this time, to state openly that we have considered the deliberations in our Committee on the

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

proposal for the system of international security as an experiment of co-operation, whose absence has been strongly felt in the work of our Organization. It is precisely for this reason that we will not allow ourselves to be provoked and we will not be diverted into engaging in polemics or confrontation. However, we have heard echoes of this in some of the statements we have heard today.

We are proposing a rivalry, not in mutual accusations, but rather in a striving for genuine answers to vital problems that face all countries. The present atmosphere in which the world finds itself - an atmosphere of confrontation and enmity - should be replaced by an atmosphere of trust, involving a system of comprehensive security that would promote civilized and equal relations among States in all spheres, as is called for by the Charter of the United Nations. That is what we favour.

The idea that we have put forward is not a set of ready answers; it is rather an invitation. In fact, that is exactly what it is: an invitation to an open dialogue, to joint work, in determining the ways and means of achieving a democratic and secure world. Only in an open, democratic and collective discussion on the part of all States Members of the United Nations of the problems addressed can we define the approaches that need to be taken and how we should proceed to implement them.

Like any new endeavour, the proposal for a comprehensive system of world security does pose questions. That is natural. If there are questions and problems, then let us try to find answers to them together.

It has been said that the initiative of the socialist States here could allegedly run counter to the Charter of the United Nations and the system of the collective efforts of States for the maintenance of international peace and security. In this connection, we should like, with all due respect, to say that the inviolability of the Charter and its defence has been one of the fundamental

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

policy objectives of the socialist countries throughout the whole history of this international organization. This is a policy of principle that we intend to pursue. However, the Soviet delegation, by the same token, fully shares the ideas set out in the report of the Palme Commission entitled "Coherent Security: A Programme for Disarmament" (A/CN.10/38), which was prepared by such political leaders as Miss Brundtland from Norway, Cyrus Vance, the former Secretary of State of the United States, and many other leading statesmen.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

How, **this** report directly **shows what is necessary** when it states:

'We are convinced of the need to strengthen the **security** of the United Nations. A new conceptual **approach must be developed** in order to promote common security in the world at large." (A/CN.10/38, p.161)

Let me remind the Committee that the **report of this Commission** has already been considered in one United Nations study and, as I remember, these conclusions did not lead to **my serious objections from my quarter**.

For our part, we **propose a practical approach** to achieving this very responsible objective, an objective **connected** with the very viability of our Organization: the **prevention of the use of the Organization for confrontational purposes** and converting it into a genuine centre *for* co-operation among States, as was the original intention of **its Charter**. For this we have proposed the **establishment of an appropriate climate and corresponding guidelines for action**.

Actually, I can say that in this approach there is nothing extraordinary. I **should like to recall that**, even in the period of the relaxation of international tensions in the 1970s, the United Nations **also** felt the need for co-operation, the need for new, **productive approaches**, and it enacted **many useful decisions**, including the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which is being considered today **concurrently** with the proposal of the socialist countries.

We consider that **to&y also**, if we free **ourselves** from the burden of confrontation, the United Nations **can** completely fulfil the **tasks** imposed upon it by the Charter.

It is clear that in the 1970s the author of the document I mentioned earlier did not have as their objective a review or amendment of the Charter. At stake then, as now, **was**, on the basis of a collective and joint analysis - and one can remember all the very interesting ideas put forward by representatives of States in

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

our very intensive discussion - and on the basis of a collation and comparison of the experience that has been accumulated in the United Nations on the dynamic development of international relations, to seek new frontiers and not to content ourselves merely with what had already been achieved.

On the basis of the Charter and in the light of everything that has been done and that is being done by our Organization, the socialist countries have proposed that we take yet a new step looking forward into the future and together seek to develop secure approaches to a new world, free of weapons and coercion. This would not involve the adoption of yet another resolution or the issuance of a compilation of previous resolutions.

We are pleased to note that, already in the course of the present discussion, significant areas of agreement have been identified as to what the basis for a comprehensive system of security should be in accordance with the United Nations Charter. There has been unanimity to the effect that these problems of security should be viewed from the angle of the growing interdependence of States, which calls for a multilateral approach, oriented towards an over-all system of human values. I think it is very important that in our discussions for the first time ways and means were identified to resolve the multilateral crisis, which is a subject of great concern to many Members of the Organization, who see no alternative to our Organization in the world at large today.

In underscoring the fact that today international security could be reliably guaranteed on the basis of co-operation and on the basis of the principles of the Charter, many delegations participating in the debate correctly pointed out that the key to a comprehensive system of security is disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. No one can doubt that attainment of a secure world would require the

(Mt. Petrovsky, USSR)

elimination of the hot-bed and sources of tension that are responsible for hostility among States, regardless of their political or other orientation.

In that regard, everyone has recognised that particular responsibility must be borne by the permanent members of the Security Council. Hence, even now, I think, we can justifiably assert that our discussion has, on the whole, developed in a constructive spirit. It has identified the presence of many interesting ideas and proposals, whose introduction into international relations could promote general security. There are points of agreement and mutual understanding that can serve as a point of departure for the continuation of a constructive, non-confrontational dialogue so that this experiment of co-operation may become a model for the United Nations in all other areas and so that our Committee, which has vast experience and has gathered together very highly qualified people, may finally demonstrate palpably that the United Nations can promote co-operation rather than confrontation.

We are very grateful to the delegations that have declared their readiness to embark on a open dialogue at the present session of the General Assembly and we should like to emphasise them that the objective of the socialist proposal is the promotion, development and strengthening of this dialogue in all spheres of international relations. We hope that the new revised draft resolution (A/C.1/41/L.89/Rev.1), introduced by the representative of Hungary on behalf of the socialist countries will meet with the over-all support of the members of our Committee contributive to that spirit of constructivism which is expected from the Members of our Organisation and from the entire international community.

Mr. PITARKA (Albania): The developments that have taken place in the Mediterranean basin during this year are evidence of the grave situation and insecurity which continue to prevail in this area and of their further complication and aggravation. Last year, too, there was much talk here, at the United Nations, of the dangers the aggravation of the situation in the Mediterranean poses for the peoples of the region, as well as for world peace and security. It was also pointed out that the presence of the fleets of the two super-Powers - United States imperialism and Soviet social imperialism - in that region, as in other regions, constitutes the main cause of this situation, the permanent source of new and ever more dangerous developments. If last year that presence was considered a potential danger, now it must be said that the danger materialised in the aggressive acts of United States imperialism committed against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The arrogant violation of the sovereignty of a Mediterranean country, such as Libya, and the constant brandishing of arm against it, are proof of the permanent danger the hegemonistic and expansionist policy of the two super-Powers in that region poses to the Mediterranean countries and peoples.

(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

We are witnessing an ongoing process of militarization of the Mediterranean by the super-Powers. The facts testify indisputably that the waters of that Sea have now been turned into aisles for the warships that criss-cross the haalm. Certain points have been turned into real navigating centres for the numerous warships that the two super-Powers have deployed there. What draws attention is the high intensity of the military exercises, which exceed by far the limits of conventional drills; they have been transformed into demonstrations of force and power. It has been difficult of late to tell whether the warships and aircraft are moving for manoeuvres or for aggression. Libya is a case in point, explicitly supporting much evidence. After successive manoeuvres in the Mediterranean, the United States of America turned one of those big manoeuvres into an aggressive air-raid against Libya.

The demagoguery and pretexts resorted to by the super-Powers in an attempt to justify the presence of their military fleets in the region have long since been denounced, and have become so stale that no one really believes them. For those fleets have never been used to ensure the security of any people or world peace.

The super-Powers pretend that they keep their fleets deployed in the Mediterranean to preserve stability in the region and far beyond it. The question rightly arises of who is destabilizing the situation in the Mediterranean if not the super-Powers, their policy, the presence and activities of their fleets, and the presence of their military bases. It is very clear that it is not the Mediterranean peoples and countries that are destabilizing the region and disturbing the waters of their sea. That has never been and could not possibly ever be in their interest. Another pretence of the super-Powers is that by means of their military presence they are preserving the so-called balance of forces. By what right do the United States and the Soviet Union seek to transfer the centre of

(Hr. Pitarka, Albania)

gravity of that imperialist balance to the Mediterranean, thousands of miles away from their territories and national waters, and at the expense of the sovereignty, security and peace of the Mediterranean peoples and countries? The "balance of forces" of the Super-Powers involves the strengthening of their military potential, and it is precisely that "balance" that has brought about an uncontrolled increase in the number of United States and Soviet warships in the Mediterranean basin. On that pretext they will continue on this road in the future as well.

When talking about their presence in the Mediterranean, the super-Powers refer to the notion of defending their 'spheres of interest'. On that pretext, far away from their countries, they have become permanent residents in a quite different geographical zone - the Mediterranean. Their warships go in and out of the Mediterranean as though it were one of their lakes. But what place in this picture is occupied by the vital interests of the Mediterranean countries, the shores of which are washed by that sea and for which the Mediterranean has been a vital sea transportation route? In the schemes of the super-Powers those interests are as good as non-existent. What matters everything else are their imperialist interests; the others must subject their own interests to those of the super-Powers. Moreover, according to the super-Powers, the Mediterranean must be turned into a place d'armes for expansion towards Africa and Europe and, first and foremost, to place under control the oil resources and the strategic position of the Middle East.

The intensification of the military activities of the super-Powers in the Mediterranean bears on the accentuation of regional tension and confrontation. By stirring up conflicts left over from the past or by inciting fratricidal ones, the super-Powers aim to make it possible to preserve their pre-eminence, which in turn helps vitalize their hegemonistic policy.

(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

The People's Socialist Republic of Albania, as a Mediterranean country, is following with concern the developments taking place in the Mediterranean basin and their consequences for peace and security in the Mediterranean, in the world at large, and in our country. The Albanian Government strongly condemned the aggressive acts of United States imperialism against Libya, not only for their brutality and savagery as crimes perpetrated against the people of a sovereign country, but also for the fact that they further aggravated the situation in the area and opened up new ground for fresh conflicts, thus increasing the probability of greater explosions and setting the Mediterranean countries against one another.

As at previous sessions the Albanian delegation confirms again that the military presence and activity of the super-Powers is the main cause of the tension existing in the Mediterranean basin. Their policy is what is disturbing the situation. At the same time, the granting of bases and port facilities to the United States and the Soviet fleets constitutes a great danger not only for the countries that grant them but also for neighbouring countries, and even more distant ones.

Numerous proposals have been and continue to be made for conferences and other activities on the demilitarization of the Mediterranean Sea and on transforming it into a sea of peace and co-operation. Many proposals initiated by the Mediterranean countries originate both from concern about the existing situation and from good will. We hold the view that real proposals for turning the Mediterranean into a sea of peace and for removing the fleets from the basin cannot be made by the super-Powers, those who militarized it. The biggest division in that basin - bigger than the division of the territorial waters - is the political division caused by the permanent presence and the activities of the war fleets of the super-Powers. We are of the opinion that, before such action is undertaken,

(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

effective measures should be taken by all the Mediterranean countries, primarily by those countries which have foreign military bases on their territory, to force the super-Powers to remove their military bases and bases. Such measures alone can pave the way, creating the conditions necessary for turning the Mediterranean into a sea of the Mediterranean. That would set even such serious problems as the pollution of the Mediterranean on the road to a constructive solution.

Meanwhile, our view is that the grave situation in the Mediterranean is closely linked with the tense situation prevailing in Europe and, particularly, in the Middle East. Therefore, the security of the Mediterranean and its transformation into a region of genuine peace cannot be achieved apart from the security of Europe, the Middle East and the world in general. There never has been and never can be partial security without general security, because international peace and security are one and indivisible. It is quite true that the Mediterranean countries desire to live in peace, but irrespective of that desire the super-Powers, with their military presence amounting more to aggression, are torpedoing those aspirations.

In conclusion, the Albanian delegation would like to reiterate that it shares the concern of the other Mediterranean peoples and countries over the situation in the Mediterranean basin. As the leader of the Albanian party and people, Comrade Ramiz Alia, said at the ninth Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania,

"Opposition to the military presence, bases and fleets of the super-Powers in the Mediterranean has become even more urgent and indispensable. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania long ago declared that their removal constitutes the first decisive condition for turning the Mediterranean into a sea of peace, communication and civilization. Neither

(Mr. Pitarka, Albania)

the United States of America nor the Soviet Union should be allowed to kindle the flames of war in the Mediterranean, threatening the peaceful life, independence and national sovereignty of countries on the shores of that basin*.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to bring to representatives attention certain technical corrections that should be incorporated in document A/C.1/41/L.89/Rev.1, which appears in blue form. Operative paragraph 2 should read "Also reaffirms" rather than "Also reaffirming". In the last line of the same paragraph, after the words "international relations" the following words should be added: "peaceful settlement of disputes".

In operative paragraph 3 the words "including in the peaceful resolutions of conflicts, peace-keeping functions" should be deleted. Paragraph 3 would then read as follows:

"Recognizes the invaluable role of the United Nations in the preservation of international peace and security, harmonization of the policies of the Member States and the imperative need to strengthen and reinforce the United Nations;"

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply, I once again remind members that in accordance with the General Assembly decision Me number of interventions in exercise of the right of reply by any delegation at a given meeting is limited to two. The first intervention in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes and the second to 5 minutes.

I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of the Zionist entity this afternoon dragged the name of my country into the issue of terrorism. This is not the first time, and it will not be the last. The representative of the Zionist entity has never stopped trying to embroil my country in that issue. Representatives of the Zionist entity have been doing

(Mr. Far tas, Libyan Arab Jamahir iya)

jut that in this Committee and in wry other Committee. They have dare the same in this session just Like any previous session.

There are those however who feel that the representative of the Zionist entity should be the last to speak of terrorism. while I describe to that point of view, I feel however that the Zionists can do nothing but hash md rehash the same old lies in a desperate attempt to project their guilt onto others in a vain attempt at

*If-tbfana.

I shall review a few of the Zionist gangs terrorist operations in the past and the present, in order to demonstrate the depth of the ingrained terrorist propensity of that entity. The Hagganah and the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the stern gmg have been claimed by the Zionists with unprecedented effrontery to be the greatest ever liberation movement in history, while they have never been anything but terrorist gangs, whose leaders were at each others throat in their search for power. In occupied Palestine, their major asset was their criminal past and their readiness to practice terrorism against innocent civilians.

This is how David Ben-Gurion, Menachen Begin, Yitzhak Shamir and Ariel Sharon rose to power in the Zionist entity. David Ben-Gurion himself confessed in a letter he sent to his family on 14 May 1942 that he was the head of an armed gang of terrorists and that he had been accumulating an arsenal of weapons at his father's house in Plonsk before he went to Palestine. In part Of that letter he said:

"After the massacre . . . the young ones of Plonsk formed a clandestine group. We were able to acquire arms clandestinely. I was at the head of the group and I hid the arms in our home. My father knew that. However, he did not interfere, despite the fact that he was aware of the grave si tua tion that would arise if the weapons were discovered and of its implications for him and his status in the town. On the contrary, he was proud of his son's actions."

(Mr. Far tas, Libyan Arab Jamahic iya)

After Ben-Gurion migrated to Palestine among the Zionist invaders, the first terrorist act he perpetrated was against his Jewish adversaries. He gave orders to sink the ship Altalena, which was carrying many Jewish immigrants. He did so because he suspected that it was also carrying weapons for the competing Irgun Zvai Leumi organization. This is stated in a book published just a few weeks ago under the title "1949: The First Israelis" by Tom Segev. I wish to quote from that book concerning this terrorist operation, as follows:

(spoke in English)

"A few weeks after the proclamation of the State, the Altalena, a ship carrying immigrants and arms to the dissident right-wing, anti-British terror organization Irgun Zvai Leumi (IZL) appeared off the coast, and Ben-Gurion, who claimed it had been sent 'to destroy the Israeli army and murder the state', ordered it to be shelled (after most of the immigrants had been removed to safety). The ship went up in flames and sank, taking a painful toll in dead and wounded."

(continued in Arabic)

The same author refers to another terrorist act - the assassination of the international mediator, Count Bernadotte, by the Stan Gang, led by Yitzhak Shamir, in 1948. That international mediator lost his life just because he made peace proposals, as Tom Segev affirms in the book. He states the following:

(Mr. Fartas, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

(spoke in English)

"During the same period, the right-wing anti-British underground, was still operating in Jerusalem. And in September members of the Lehi, the w-called Stern Gang, ■ urdsred the United Nations mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte, for having drawn UP a proposal for a peace settlement that would have deprived Israel of some of the territorial gains it achieved as a result of its War of Independence".

(continued in Arabic)

In 1944 the Steen Gang assassinated Lord Moyne, the British resident minister in Csito. Yitshsk Shamir then liquidated his fellow-terrorists, who had become conscience-stricken and dvided to denounce thst act. Shamir also murdered his colleague Elishu Ghilad, Whom he considered a threat to the clandestine terrori: t operations in which Shamir was ● nqsged. That was confirmed by Yaakov Eliav in his book "Wanted", published in New York in 1984.

The lint of terrorist acts perpetrated by the Zionist entity is too long for me to cite hut a fw. One example was the downing, vith air-to-air missiles, Of a Libysn commercial airliner en route from Benqhari to Cairo. That was the first time in history that a military aircraft had fired missiles at a civilian commercial airliner. All the civilian passenge 's on board died for no reason other thsn Israel's blind hatred.

While on the subject of security in ths Mediterranean, I would mention this year's case of a military aircraft intercepting a Lihyan civilian aircraft over the Mediterranean, forcing it to land in occupied Palestine. The crew were interrogated and harassed because they had flown from the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. That action was condemned by the members of the Security C' cil. That Council would have condemned it in a rewlu .ion but for a certain country's veto tO obstruct thst condemnation.

(Mr. Fartas, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

In addition, a Lebanese civilian airliner belonging to Middle East Airlines was forced to land in occupied Palestine. It was detained there for several hours, during which its passengers were interrogated.

The barbaric bombardment of residential areas in Tunisia claimed many civilian casualties. The Security Council debated that brutal aggressive, terroristic air-raid, and condemned it in an unambiguous resolution -

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, but before I called on delegations wishing to speak in exercise of their right of reply I underlined that the first intervention in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes and the second intervention to five minutes. I therefore ask the representative of Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, who has been speaking for 10 minutes, kindly to conclude his statement.

Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): The surprise aerial bombardment of the Iraqi nuclear reactor, which was devoted to peaceful purposes, could have resulted in nuclear contamination had not the Iraqi authorities taken the steps necessary to prevent such a tragedy.

I shall return to the rest of these terrorist acts in my second statement in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel) : The hour is very late, and I think it would take much more time than any of us have at our disposal to correct the misstatements and falsifications of history that we have been listening to recently from the representative of Libya. It will be noticed that I call his country by its name, and not a fanciful title.

Libya is a State which prides itself on being the homeland of terrorists. Its President prides himself on organizing an international army of terrorists to go around the world carrying out what he calls "acts of liberation" against every

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

civilized country in the world. Libya is a country which uses its diplomatic embassies as bases from which its terror groups and hit squads operate, not necessarily against Israelis or against Jews - although they operate against them as well - but mainly against dissident Libyans who do not agree with the Government of Libya.

I should just like to provide one or two examples of the fanciful use of history by the representative of Libya. The first Prime Minister of Israel was denounced as a terrorist. I would suggest that the representative of Libya turn to his Soviet friends and ask them to explain to him what the Jewish defence groups in Tsarist Russia in 1904 and 1905 were doing in organizing self-defence by Jews against pogroms by fascist Tsarist anti-Semitic group* in Russia at that time, a thing that was supported by all the socialist groups which later became the Communist Party. That is the kind of activity the Libyan thought was a "terrorist act", and in typical of the kind of "terrorist acts" which Israel and parties in Israel have been carrying out. The same thing is true of the Hagana and the action against the Altalena, which was an act by the Government of Israel to prevent a group which at that time was a dissident group from obtaining arms illegally.

That is the kind of falsification we have heard. I do not think there is any sense in wanting the time of this Committee by going into all these charges and accusations. I think the important thing to remember here is that we are talking about peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean. We are talking here about an attempt, about the need, in keeping with the position taken by my representatives, to open dialogue. That was one of the key words used in the debate during the past day and a half: dialogue. There was talk of a dialogue for peace, a dialogue in the context of negotiations, a dialogue for co-operation.

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

When Israel offers dialogue, **the speech made by the Libyan representative exemplifies the answer. That is the kind of dialogue which Libya carries on: invective, falsification and terror.**

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic); I **shall not respond to the words just spoken by the representative of the Zionist entity in his statement in tight of reply. They do not deserve an answer. As to anti-Semitism - which is always his excuse and about which he sheds crocodile tears - I remind him that we Arabs are Semites, but also the victims of other Semites.**

His talk of peace **and** dialogue is **not** alluring, not important. His **country's notions of peace and security** are well known: **everyone knows who bombed the Palestinian refugee camps, killing women - some of them pregnant - and children at Sabra and Shatila.**

That representative made certain comments this afternoon about my country. It appears that he has no understanding of these issues whatsoever. I shall therefore mention certain incidents, supplementing what the representative of Libya said, which reveal the truth about Israeli and Zionist terrorism.

(Mr. Al-Attassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

The history of Israeli terrorism does not bear elaboration. It is Israel that planted both individual and collective terrorism in the Middle East. The greatest terrorist operation in history, however, is the uprooting and dispersal of millions of Palestinians. If there was such a thing as an international conscience, that representative should have never been allowed to sit here among us in this Hall.

In this connection, I would like to refer to document 3/16520 of 1 May 1984, which gives a resumé of Israel's history, before and after its creation. I believe that whoever refers to that document will clearly understand the terrorist background of that country. I would like to recount that background briefly:

It was Israel that introduced air piracy into the region when it hijacked a civilian Syrian air craft in 1954 and forced it to land in Israel, where it was detained while the passengers were interrogated and humiliated.

My colleague the representative of Libya has already mentioned the downing of the Libyan airliner with its toll of more than 100 lives, including the Foreign Minister of Libya, the late Mahmoud Boudia and all of the French crew.

It was Israel that, in 1973, hijacked a civilian Iraqi airliner after it had taken off from Beirut, forced it to land in Israel and interrogated its passengers under the pretext of looking for a Palestinian.

Israel is the one that this year engineered the mid-air hijacking of a Libyan aircraft with a high-level political delegation on board and then interrogated the passengers in a most humiliating fashion.

With regard to assassinations, I shall mention only a few of Israel's terrorist acts. It was Israel that in 1973 pushed its forces into Beirut and assassinated three Palestinian leaders in their sleep, among whom was the well-known Palestinian poet Kamal Nasser. It was Israel, as my colleague stated earlier, that assassinated Count Bernadotte, a Swedish citizen who was in Palestine on a mission of good offices. Yitzhak Shamir has admitted that he was ordered to

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

murder Count Bernadotte. According to the Herald Tribune, Shamir was one of a gang of three who had even tried to assassinate Anthony Eden. My Lihyan friend has already mentioned the Cairo incident in which the British minister was assassinated. I would like to add that at the time, Churchill attacked Zionism for the murder of Lord Moyne and described the Zionists as a gangster organization similar to the German Nazis. In 1972, Israel assassinated the Palestinian author, Ghassam Kanafani, in Beirut, and murdered Al-Zeliter in Rome, in 1972. Israel assassinated Hahmoud El-Haahary in Paris, in 1972, by placing a bomb in his home telephone. Israel also assassinated Hassan Abul-Kheir in Cyprus, in 1973, and it assassinated Bassel El-Qubassy in Paris, in 1973. Israel has also assassinated the militant Mohammed Bu-Zhia with a car bomb in the Paris Latin Quarter in 1973, and assassinated the Moroccan worker Bosheiki in Oslo, Norway, because it suspected him of being a Palestinian militant. Last but not least in the field of assassinations, it assassinated Yehia El-Meshadd, the Egyptian nuclear scientist, in Paris. The list is endless.

I should also mention the Mossad terrorists who kidnapped the Israeli technician Vanunu from a London hotel because he had revealed some of Israel's nuclear secrets. It would seem that the Thatcher Government has condoned that act, and that it knows of another incident at London Airport 'involving a Nigerian official.

Let us turn to theft. In 1968, Israel stole 200 pounds of uranium and Israeli agents stole secrets of the United States Department of Defense through its agent Pollard. Israel has also stolen secrets of the American Congress and the American Ministry of Defence through its agent Stephen Brann. Israel also stole 810 electronic switches used in detonating nuclear devices.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Lastly, I would like to mention **massacres** carried out by the Zionists against Jews to force them to leave their Arab countries and migrate to **Israel**. **Here I** would mention the bombs thrown at the synagogue in Baghdad. **It was Israel** that threw the bomb in the Istanbul synagogue to create an **atmosphere** of terror. **It was Israel** that, in collusion with **British** agents, cooked up the **scenario** of the so-called hijacking of the **EI-Al Aircraft**. But that will suffice for the moment. I reserve the right to return to the subject later, if **necessary**.

The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to speak for the second time in exercise of the right of reply. I remind delegations that the second statement in exercise of the right of reply is limited to five minutes.

Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): **We** refer to the Zionist entity as such because it lacks the attributes that would entitle it to bear the name its representative wishes us to use. That **entity has** not so far delineated its borders. In a meeting between Ben Gurion and the then Minister of Justice Rosen, David Ben Gurion said:

(spoke in English)

"It cannot be ignored. In governing Israel, everything is possible. If we decide here that there is to be no mention of **borders**, then we will not mention them. Nothing is a priori."

"Rosen: 'It is not a priori, but it is a legal issue.'

"Ben Gurion: 'The law is whatever people determine it to be.'"

(continued in Arabic)

Those were his words. With regard to borders as being characteristic of an entity, Ben Gurion said:

(Mr. Fartas, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

"It is an open-01 ~~led~~ matter. In the Bible, as well as in our history, there are all kinds of definitions of a country's borders. So there is no real limit. No border is absolute. If it is a desert, it could just as well be on the other side. If it is in a sea, it could also be across the sea. The world has always been this way. Only the terms have changed. If they should find a way of reaching other stars, well then, perhaps the whole earth will no longer be sufficient."

That entity does not recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and calls it a terrorist organization. It does not recognise the Palestinian people, nor does it recognize that people's right to return to its homeland or its right to self-determination and the establishment of its own State.

The ugliest human massacres in all history have been perpetrated* by Zionist gangs. Foremost among those are the massacres of Deir Yassin and Kafr Qasem, as well as those at Rahr El Bakar and Ahu Zaabal and those at Sabra and Shatila, all of which were planned and incited and supervised by Zionist gangs - not to mention the destruction of the King David and Semiramis Hotels.

Many politicians and writers, such as the poet Kamal Nasser, the writer Ghassan Kanafani, Kamal Kdwan, Abu Youssef, Ezzeldine El Qalaa, El Hamsary, Said Hamamy, Lt. Colonel Ahu-Ghszala and Colonel Khaled Al Nasal have also been assassinated by that entity.

(Mr. Fartas, Libyan Arab
Jamahir iya)

They were physically liquidated, in a covert terrorist operation by the Mossad, the terrorist arm of the Zionist entity. The Israeli magazine, Haolam Hazeh has described Shamir as "as bloodthirsty, ruthless and spiteful as Meir Kahane, although he does not show it".

The terrorist history of the paratroopers led by Sharon is well known in the Golan Strip, Lebanon and elsewhere. No one who has served in that force can deny its terrorist history or evade responsibility for the terrorist acts it has committed.

Is there any need to repeat that the Zionist entity is not peace-loving? Is there any need to mention the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 9 February 1982, in which the Assembly exposed the aggressive nature of the Zionist entity? Is there any need to speak of the racist character of the Zionist régime? Is there any need to recall General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) of 19-5, affirming the racist nature of the Zionist entity? All this is well known to everyone.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Israel to make his second statement in exercise of the right of reply, which should be limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel): I am certainly not going to try to compete with my two eminent colleagues in their falsification of history. Let us remind ourselves of the kind of States whose representatives are speaking here. Syria is a country which has just been shown, in an impartial court in London, to have used a pregnant woman as a living bomb to try to blow up a civil airliner with 450 innocent people aboard. Thank God the plot was aborted. The case was proven impartially in a British court; the Syrian Government was involved up to its neck: the Director of Air Force Intelligence and the Ambassador in London and his whole Embassy.

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

The Libyan Embassy in London also has a very nice record. Members of the Libyan Embassy managed to kill a British policewoman while firing on Libyan anti-Qaddafi demonstrators outside the Embassy.

There is talk about massacres here. A few years ago there was unrest in Syria. President Assad put down that unrest: 40,000 people were slaughtered in the city of Hama. The world did not hear very much about it because there is censorship in Syria, one of the countries that have a very low rating in any list of countries with freedom and civil liberties: almost as low as Libya.

But the main point, I think, is that we have again seen illustrated here the intransigence of this kind of Arab country in opposition to any sort of move towards peace. For these are the countries that opposed President Sadat, that threatened to kill him - and may have had a hand in his murder: we do not know, but I would not doubt it or dismiss the possibility - that threaten with assassination any Arab who looks for peace; that back those elements among the Palestinians who are intransigent and kill other Arabs. People should try and remember: we talk about PLO terrorism; we talk about it a lot. More Arabs than Jews have been victims of PLO terrorism. The first people they kill are people within their own ranks, their own people, who went to make compromises, who want to make peace, who want to live in peace.

If this conflict has been going on for 40 years - and it looks as though it will be going on for another 40 years - it is because of States like Syria and Libya and their representatives here in this room.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to make his second statement in exercise of the right of reply, which should be limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): May I assure the Zionist representative through you, Sir, that the Arab-Zionist conflict will not last only another 40 years: it may last for 400 years. It will last until our territories are liberated, until the Palestinian people return to its home land.

I shall not respond to his claims and his falsifications. I wish only to reaffirm my country's position. If he takes pride in the justice of British courts he has no call to engage in name-calling. We consider that the El-Al aircraft incident was concocted by the Mossad together with the United States Central Intelligence Agency and the British intelligence service. I wish here to reaffirm my country's position on the issue of terrorism and what I am going to say is taken from the words of the highest authority in my country, namely President Hafez al-Assad.

We in Syria strongly condemn terrorism very strongly, for many reasons, among them the fact that we ourselves are victims of terrorism. We unhesitatingly support liberation. We stand by the liberation movements fighting against occupation and colonialism anywhere in the world. At the same time, we are against terrorism everywhere in the world. The distinction is clear to us: there is a very clear line between terrorism and liberation, between terrorism and resistance. A terrorist is a criminal, a mercenary - like the Zionists and like the representatives of Israel in this room.

In a speech to our federation of trade unions, President Assad said that countries that accuse us of terrorism should agree to the setting up of an International Commission under United Nations auspices. We call for the setting up of such a commission and are prepared to discuss that question so that the world may decide for itself who the real terrorists are.

(Mr. Al-Ataai, Syrian Arab
Republic)

In that connection, I challenge the Zionist representative to say that he recognizes the Palestinian people and its rights, which have been recognized by the General Assembly.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: As I stated earlier, tomorrow, Wednesday, 26 November 1986, the Committee will take action on draft resolutions on international security agendas: draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.89/Rev.1, L.90/Rev.1, L.91 and L.92/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 8.15 p.m.