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

Mr. PEREZ RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Once again we have seen in this Committee how those principally responsible for the spiralling arms race continue to vote against or abstain in the votes on draft resolutions under the vast majority of disarmament agenda items. For that reason, and given the growing accumulation of all types of weapons of mass destruction, the strengthening of international security becomes more important every day.

Our delegation wishes to stress the unquestionable importance to the strengthening of international security of respect by all States for the right to self-determination, independence, equality, sovereignty, the territorial integrity of States, the inviolability of frontiers, as well as the right to determine freely and without outside interference the economic, political and social system most in keeping with the interests of the people.

Yet along with their inflexibility and insistence on dictating terms intended to avoid disarmament negotiations in all forums, some Governments continue to resort to a policy of threats and blackmail on the pretext of defence of so-called vital interests or what they term their national security – which, we would say in passing, appears to encompass all areas of the globe.

The fraternal people of Nicaragua continues to be subjected by the Reagan Administration to a blockade and to all manner of aggression. In the address delivered by President Daniel Ortega Saavedra during the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, we heard an account of the acts of aggression which have been directed against that nation. In view of those facts, my delegation wishes to alert the international community to the dangerous acts of
intervention directed against Nicaragua as a result of the obvious deep hostility of the Reagan Administration, whose avowed purpose it is to destroy the Nicaraguan revolutionary process, violating all norms of international law and hampering the peace efforts under way to find a peaceful solution to the problems of the Central American region.
It is fitting to mention that the representative of the United States, Vernon A. Walters, recently requested the circulation of the report annexed to document A/40/858, entitled "Revolution Beyond Our Borders: Sandinista Intervention in Central America". The distortive, arrogant and aggressive content of that report immediately reminded us of document A/4725 of 6 April 1961, transmitted by the then representative of the United States, Adlai E. Stevenson, entitled "Cuba", which, as part of an attempt to reach international public opinion, accused our country of "posing a serious, imminent threat to the Western hemisphere and the inter-American system".

What turned out to be imminent was not any alleged threat by Cuba, but - only 11 days after the issuance of document A/4725 - the military intervention against my country by Brigade 2506, mustered, trained and led by the United States Government's Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and Pentagon. We hope that document A/40/858 will not be the precursor of a further escalation of military intervention against heroic Nicaragua. If it is, we are certain that the interventionist troops will once again be defeated, as they were on the sands of Giron beach, or - to make myself perfectly clear to the gentlemen concerned - the Bay of Pigs.

To show how different views of the same problem can have an effect on international security, I wish to cite the December 1985 issue of Armed Forces Journal, which contained an interview with General John R. Galvin, head of the United States southern command, which stated:

"Now, we have to remember that when one looks to Latin America one sees as one of the important historical points the struggles between countries over border problems. There are at least five separate border problems in the area at the present time."
"When you look at Mexico, you have to remember that they had a 'slight' border problem with us: the one over Texas, Arizona, New Mexico and California."

If that was a "slight" border problem to General Galvin, I should not like to see what he would call a major problem.

Although it is well known, it is important to reiterate that no Central American or Caribbean country poses a threat to the security of the United States. The sole threat to peace in that region continues to be the hostile aggressive policy of the Washington Government, which must be faced by our people as well. We would note that this year the current United States Administration began subversive radio broadcasts to Cuba. They began on 20 May, the date of the conditional independence of Cuba, with the imposition by the United States of an interventionist provision in the Constitution granting to the United States the right to intervene in Cuba at will and to maintain naval bases such as the naval base at Guantanamo, which even today is maintained illegally, against the will of our people and our Government.

Naval manoeuvres, intended to threaten and intimidate, continue in the Caribbean Sea, near our coast, and our airspace continues to be violated. In recent months alone SR-71 Blackbird aircraft violated our airspace on two occasions, flying completely across our national territory from west to east and then from east to west. In our Government's 1 November note of protest to the United States authorities, we stated:

"Although there is ample evidence that the current United States Administration behaves with the mentality of the watchman over the most spurious interests and with a cynicism reminiscent of Hitlerite practices, the
Government of Cuba is convinced that it has a responsibility to the Cuban people and to the international community clearly and officially to declare its deep contempt for such villainy by the United States Government.

"With this gross violation of Cuba's sovereignty - the sixth during Ronald Reagan's tenure - the United States adds new testimony by which international public opinion can judge the unique hypocrisy of a Government which is attempting to play the innocent victim while it follows a world-wide policy of unprecedented State terrorism, arising in fact from the moral bankruptcy of the United States and its inability to put forward any alternative to the problems and dangers facing mankind. For their part, the Government and the people of Cuba consider that the Reagan Administration is acting outside the law, since it continuously behaves like a criminal, violating all norms of international law and scorning respect for the sovereignty of nations.

"We know too the despicable acts of which they can be capable. Arrogant actions such as the latest violation of Cuba's airspace lead us to the obvious conclusions regarding the imperative need to continue to prepare ourselves to defend in the face of anything and at all costs our sacred homeland and the revolutionary endeavour which ennobles it.

"The persistence of the United States in these acts of intimidation reveals at the very least the ineptitude of its poor attempts at espionage, which continue to seek an explanation for the unswerving determination, the courage and the firmness of the Cuban people, which the brazen outrages committed by Mr. Reagan only serve to increase."
In southern Africa, the ongoing situation at the southernmost tip of the continent show that there will be no peace, stability or security in that region until apartheid is completely eliminated in South Africa and until Namibia becomes independent. It is well known that the racist régime of Pretoria - the strategically ally of the United States - persists in its policy of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and other countries of the region, and is impeding a negotiated political solution of the problem of Namibia. At the ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held last September, the Ministers strongly condemned the Pretoria régime for its continued military occupation of part of the territory of the People's Republic of Angola, and expressed the view that that situation constituted an act of aggression against the Non-Aligned Movement itself. They called for the total and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory, and decided to increase material support to the Angolan Government to assist it in consolidating its national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.
While the People's Republic of Angola pursues a flexible policy allowing of a negotiated peaceful solution to the problems of southern Africa, the Pretoria régime attempts cowardly actions, such as those it planned to destroy the oil installation complex in Cabinda province, a deed which was condemned by the Security Council in its resolution 567 (1985). That régime carries out air and land attacks deep inside Angolan territory, and has concentrated more than 20,000 men in the border areas.

The United States has continued its aggressive policy by revoking the Clark amendment, which had been adopted in 1975 to end United States interference in the internal affairs of Angola. That unheard-of action by the Reagan Administration was condemned by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) summit, recently seconded by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of non-aligned countries.

On the question of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region, my delegation wishes to reaffirm that there can be no security or true co-operation in that region so long as Israel - with the well-known military, political and diplomatic support of the United States - continues its aggressive policies against the Arab peoples and does not withdraw unconditionally from all occupied Arab territories and countries.

As indicated in the reply of the Government of Cuba to the Secretary-General, as set out in document A/40/448, the establishment of an atmosphere of peace, security and co-operation in the Mediterranean Sea will not be possible unless the ongoing conflicts in the region are solved, most particularly those arising from the aggressive policy of the Zionist State of Israel and the hostile military presence of imperialism in Mediterranean waters. The deployment of nuclear weapons in the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States of the region is likewise inimical to the aspiration of the Mediterranean States and the international community.
Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): This Committee's recent debate and adoption of draft resolutions on disarmament problems underscored the concern of States at the enormous quantities of weapons, in particular nuclear weapons, built up all over the world and at the dreadful unceasing arms race. Increasingly destructive weapons and the feverish competition in their manufacture have a harmful effect in all areas of society; but more than anything else they run absolutely counter to efforts to maintain and strengthen the security of all States.

Any analysis of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security compels us to recognize in all honesty that the objectives of that important document are far from being achieved. Certainly, the contemporary international scene is in no wise reassuring. The danger of war, even of a new world war - which would inevitably become a nuclear catastrophe resulting in the destruction of the very conditions for life on earth - remains. In Europe, the situation has become particularly bad, owing to United States deployment in certain Western countries of medium-range missiles and to the nuclear counter-measures taken by the Soviet Union.

The policy of retaining spheres of influence or domination and of creating new ones and the policy of force, diktat and interference in the affairs of other countries have become virtual facts of life. Old conflicts between States have grown; the symptoms of the economic crisis which affects nearly all States, especially the developing countries, have worsened, further intensifying world economic and political instability.

In our view, any responsible approach to the problems of modern-day international security must begin with the need to make every effort to halt the arms race and achieve arms reductions. The military balance required for the stability and security of all States should not be sought through the continued build-up of new weapons - which can only increase the threat to general security -
but through reducing existing weapons to ever lower levels. That is why the fundamental problem of our time is to halt the arms race, to take substantive disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, measures, and to safeguard the overriding right of individuals and peoples to existence, life, freedom, independence and peace.

Like other countries, Romania welcomed the recent meeting between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the President of the United States of America, Ronald Reagan. There is no doubt that the meeting led to positive results. The two sides agreed that there are no winners or losers in a nuclear war and that neither side aspires to nuclear supremacy. The meeting also held out the prospect of continued talks on the problems of nuclear weapons and the non-militarization of outer space.

But we must say frankly that basic problems remain unresolved.

It is thus justified that the Romanian people, along with other peoples, should ask the following questions: What will the future bring? Will the deployment in Europe of medium-range missiles be stopped? Will the manufacture of new nuclear weapons continue? Will nuclear tests be halted? Will it be possible to reduce nuclear weapons and today's exorbitant military expenses?

As President Nicolae Ceausescu recently said,

"Only under conditions when, in a relatively short time, agreements acceptable to both parties have been implemented and when we have moved on to nuclear disarmament will we be able to say that the Soviet-United States summit meeting held at Geneva was truly of historic significance, that it met the expectations of all regarding disarmament and peace, and that the two great Powers are shouldering their responsibilities towards their peoples and towards mankind at large."
Halting the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and turning to disarmament demand that all States - first of all the European States and first among them the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Treaty - shoulder a greater direct responsibility and step up their action to convince the two great nuclear Powers to take concrete action to reach mutually acceptable agreements and to lend new impetus to international activities, bodies and conferences on disarmament.
In this nuclear age, when all peoples share a common destiny, it is the duty of all Governments, all Heads of State and all political forces to take action before it is too late to save mankind from nuclear catastrophe. That is the main principle for action to maintain and strengthen international security: urgent action is needed to preserve society, and that must be the basic premise of any approach to international security.

Parallel with efforts to halt the arms race and achieve disarmament, the maintenance and buttressing of international peace and security make it more vital than ever that relations among all States be based on strict, constant respect for the principles of sovereignty, independence, equal rights, non-interference in internal affairs, mutual benefits, non-use of force, and the peaceful settlement of all disputes between States.

Like other countries, Romania is deeply concerned by continued armed conflicts, acts of aggression and tension in various regions, by the emergence on the international scene of new sources of conflict and tension, and by the danger posed to independence and security and to international peace and security by the use or threat of use of force in relations among States.

Those conflicts and wars continue today to cause enormous loss of human life and material resources and to wipe out or diminish—lastingly and irreversibly—the fruits of development efforts. Such conflicts and wars, whether contained or wide-ranging, exacerbate the international situation and only weaken the countries involved and serve the imperialist policy of domination and subjugation. In the present international situation we must make every effort to put an end to existing conflicts and resolve them, solely through negotiations.
We share the view of other States which addressed the General Assembly during its commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, and of the Secretary-General as set out in his annual report, that the solution to existing conflicts and tension is at present essential for the strengthening of international peace and security. In that connection, we view as very important the General Assembly's adoption by consensus of the solemn appeal submitted by Romania and addressed to States in conflict, calling on them to resolve their problems by solely political means, through negotiations.

It is high time for States in conflict to act in accordance with that solemn appeal and put an immediate end to armed action and to move on to the resolution of their disputes through negotiations and other peaceful means. That appeal also calls on all States fully and immediately to carry out the commitments they have undertaken, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, to settle their conflicts and disputes by peaceful means, and to refrain from the threat or use of force and from all interference in the internal affairs of other States. We are convinced that the adoption of that appeal and, above all, its implementation, could make a major contribution to policies encouraging détente, improving the world situation, strengthening international security, and promoting disarmament, independence, co-operation and peace.

Generally speaking, we believe that Member States should be more determined in making full use of the United Nations and its machinery and measures to resolve their conflicts; the United Nations should be more determined in undertaking new measures and initiatives to resolve those conflicts by peaceful means through negotiations.
My country's position in that respect was manifested in the proposals and initiatives which led to the adoption in 1982 of the Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes and to the Sixth Committee's consideration of the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States. We continue to attach the greatest importance to improving United Nations machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes, within the framework of the possibilities of the Charter of the United Nations.

Romania has proposed that a procedure be defined within the framework of the United Nations for the use of good offices, mediation and conciliation to help prevent new armed confrontations and to settle conflicts and all other problems between States peacefully, through negotiations. In the event of conflict or dispute, the Security Council must act without delay to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of conciliation, including the appointment of United Nations representatives, to settle peacefully disputes between States, to eliminate situations of tension and conflict, and to establish relations of understanding, cooperation and peace among all States. At the same time, the General Assembly's important role in the sphere of the peaceful settlement of disputes and the maintenance of international peace and security must be affirmed more vigorously, and the Secretary-General should be encouraged to play an active role in keeping with his functions to promote efforts for the peaceful settlement of disputes and conflicts between States.

During this session's debates, both in plenary meetings and in this Committee, many States have stressed their concerns about existing conflicts, among which the Middle East conflict stands out owing to its special importance for the peace and security of all the States of that region and for international peace and security. Romania continues, as it has done in the past, to favour the achievement
of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East through the convening of an international conference under United Nations auspices, with the participation of all parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, as well as the Soviet Union, the United States of America and other States which could make a constructive contribution to the establishment of peace in that region.

Additionally, we should like to express our anxiety about the continued war between Iran and Iraq. We believe that everything possible should be done to put an immediate end to that war and to resolve all the problems between those two countries through negotiations.

In that context, Romania reaffirms its solidarity with and active support for the position and the initiatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, its political and diplomatic efforts and activities aimed at the peaceful, democratic and independent unification of that country.

Obviously, political security cannot be divorced from economic security. In that connection, the persistence of under-development, the widening of the gap between States and the division of the world into rich and poor countries cannot lay the necessary foundation for international political or economic stability or for the maintenance of world peace and security.
We are profoundly concerned that the world economy continues to be characterized by a series of negative phenomena spawned by the economic crisis, which are felt by all countries to a greater or lesser extent. The overwhelming majority of developing countries are prevented from developing their economies and from making economic and social progress because of their foreign debt, the extremely high interest rates they face and the growing protectionism practised in various forms by the developed countries.

It is both regrettable and paradoxical that today, when one of the greatest scientific and technical revolutions of mankind is in full bloom, the developing countries, and not only the developing countries, have almost all means of access to modern technology closed off to them.

While weapons have not led to increased security, expenditures on their production undermine the efforts of all States in the field of economic and social development, aggravate the poverty of the third world and cause global economic disorder.

We cannot harbour any illusion that in the present explosive economic situation the world can live in tranquillity and that sources of conflict and tension can be alleviated and peace and international security maintained and strengthened.

Lasting peace and genuine security for all States also require radical changes aimed at the elimination of under-development and the establishment of a new international economic order. The present and long-term vital interests of all the peoples of the developed and the developing countries clearly require renunciation of egoistic positions, the solving of serious economic problems while it is still possible to resolve and overcome them through negotiations, and the urgent resumption of dialogue undertaken in a constructive and productive spirit. At the same time it is necessary for all States to refrain from adopting restrictions and
economic sanctions for political or other reasons incompatible with the norms and principles of international law and the demands arising from the economic interdependence of nations. There is need also to find means to continue and intensify the transfer of technology to the developing countries and to increase the access of those countries to the gains of science and technology.

A real solution to the economic and financial problems of our time also requires that an end be put to the wasting of human and material resources as a result of the production of ever more destructive weapons.

Today's weapons are far too murderous, and numerous proposals aimed at their radical reduction have been made. It is at least logical to wonder why this frightening race in military expenditures is being continued.

In the view of our delegation, in the present circumstances a reduction in military expenditures would be fully in keeping with both economic needs and the need to increase trust and strengthen peace and international security.

It is clear that the major problems of mankind today cannot be resolved by a limited group of States, no matter how great or powerful they may be. The maintenance and strengthening of international security also requires the democratization of relations among States in keeping with the sweeping changes that have taken place on the global level. In that context we should like to stress the importance of participation on an equal footing in the settlement of all the problems of small and medium-sized countries, developing and non-aligned countries, which today comprise the great majority of countries of the world and are directly interested in a policy of peace, independence and international co-operation.

Romania is determined to contribute even more to the growth of the role of the United Nations in international life as a unique forum with the universal mission of transforming this Organization into an effective instrument accessible to all States for the maintenance of peace and international security. We must enhance
the role of the General Assembly as the supreme body of the Organization, a body likely to ensure the settlement of major questions of concern to peoples. Respect for resolutions adopted by the General Assembly would be a most important first step in that direction.

Romania supports proposals likely to improve United Nations machinery for the maintenance of peace and international security. Given the serious deterioration in the political climate of the world, we believe it timely to consider the activities of the Security Council as a whole in order to single out the practical measures needed to allow that body to fulfil the tasks incumbent on it under the provisions of the Charter.

However, we believe that that makes it essential for the permanent members of the Security Council to drop their attitude of confrontation and engage in constructive negotiations in a spirit of good faith to resolve the problems now facing the Council out of respect for the independence and security interests of all Member States of the United Nations.

At the outset I said that the objectives of implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security were far from being achieved. That in no way diminishes the validity and importance of that document. Quite the opposite: the provisions of that Declaration are more relevant than ever before, and their implementation would be an outstanding contribution to the building of new relations among States in a spirit of full equality and co-operation.

My delegation believes that the General Assembly should once again draw the attention of all Member States to the fundamental provisions of the Declaration, and we hope that our debates will stimulate respect for them as real steps towards the strengthening of international security. In that way our discussions could contribute to a reduction of international tension, improvement of the world's political climate, resumption of the policy of détente and respect for the independence of peoples.
Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): Fifteen years ago the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security was adopted. That document, initiated by the Soviet Union, ranks among the outstanding results achieved during the 40 years of United Nations work. Designed to help implement the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter as well as to enhance the role of the Organization in the preservation of peace and the strengthening of international security, that Declaration, together with other significant documents, was elaborated at the beginning of the process of détente in the 1970s. The development of relations among States and peoples in that period, which was characterized by a policy of realism and common sense, has had an extremely positive impact on the conduct of international relations as a whole.
Today, 40 years after the founding of the United Nations, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is very topical, and its implementation particularly imperative. Since the international situation continues to be tense owing to the policy of confrontation and the arms build-up pursued in the most aggressive imperialist quarters. Those forces are intent upon destroying military and strategic parity and achieving superiority. They are accelerating the arms race and seeking to extend it to outer space; they fan up international conflicts and place burdens on international economic relations.

The most important task facing the world today is averting the dangers that loom and solving problems which will determine the answer to mankind's question of "To be or not to be?". Every State must share in these efforts. It is more urgent than ever that we adopt measures to terminate the arms race on Earth, to prevent an arms race in outer space, and to bring about a drastic change for the better in relations among States.

Those are the basic points with regard to the strengthening of international security. Their implementation, in order to preserve life on Earth and promote peace and harmony among States, was advocated by the overwhelming majority of States during the First Committee's discussion of the problems of arms limitation and disarmament, as a result of which concrete draft resolutions were adopted. What we must do now is inject life into them and to translate them into action through negotiations.

In short, our deeds must match our words. There is no reasonable alternative to that, since today mankind has the choice of surviving together or perishing together. Therefore, we have to learn to live in peace and harmony with each other despite the existence of different social systems and different alliance affiliations. That conclusion reflects the fact that today, in the nuclear age,
national and international security are inseparably linked. We fully share the view of many serious and realistic politicians that security is indivisible and that it can be achieved today only through co-operation, not through confrontation.

In that context, the German Democratic Republic regards the Geneva summit meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States as encouraging, and thus as positive. As the Head of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, put it a few days ago, at the 11th meeting of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, there is no doubt that the conditions for the resolution of the main issue have become more favourable, even though what was achieved did not meet all hopes and expectations. In other words, the foundations have been laid for further negotiations on the crucial issues of war and peace while at the same time a number of agreements have been made serving the welcome development of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Now as before - as Erich Honecker also underscored - the main question with regard to averting a nuclear inferno and safeguarding peace is the cessation of the arms race on Earth and the prevention of its spread to outer space. The resolution of that question presupposes continued resolute, circumspect, patient and systematic work. One must persistently plead for such a solution, since no one who is serious about his responsibility towards his own people and towards mankind can permit the continued arms race accelerating in all spheres and giving rise to a situation where matters would get out of control and developments become unforeseeable, leading ultimately to catastrophe.

Thus, the challenge remaining after the Geneva summit meeting is to leave no stone unturned to make headway on the road to agreements and to make peace more secure. The comprehensive programme of measures in the field of disarmament submitted by the Soviet Union and the concrete proposals and initiatives contained
in the Sofia Declaration adopted by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty offer mankind a chance to promote security and peace in the world. They meet with the full approval and unqualified support of the people of the German Democratic Republic. We expect the other side too to adopt a similar approach to the vital questions facing mankind.

The German Democratic Republic is endeavouring to make an active contribution to the improvement of the international climate and to the promotion of the emergence of a coalition of common sense and realism, and is seeking constructive dialogue with all those with power and influence and all those vested with political responsibility. That is true of the German Democratic Republic's contribution within the United Nations framework and of its bilateral relations, which are aimed at promoting peaceful co-operation.

Particularly at a time of insecurity and instability in international relations, the socialist German State attaches the utmost importance to a constructive and predictable policy of peace.

Constructiveness, continuity, realism and a firm resolve to live in peace and harmony with other peoples constitute a significant contribution to the policy of peaceful coexistence. On that basis national, regional and global security can and must be achieved.

The German Democratic Republic, situated, as it is, on the dividing line between the two major military coalitions, has a special stake in halting present dangerous developments, especially in scaling down military confrontation in Europe. In our view, security, both in Europe and in the world at large, cannot be guaranteed by military means or through military strength. Durable peace on the European continent can be achieved only through détente, disarmament, confidence-building and international co-operation. It is extremely important to
halt further deployment of nuclear weapons on the European continent and to bring about the reduction of those weapons. Therefore, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, as was reaffirmed at the recent Sofia meeting, are in favour of "ridding the whole of Europe of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons" (A/C.1/40/7, p. 5). They also voiced their support for the initiatives on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the European continent, more specifically in Northern Europe and in the Balkans, as well as of a corridor free of nuclear battlefield weapons along the line in Central Europe dividing the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and those of the Warsaw Treaty. Moreover, as is known, the German Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic have submitted to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany a proposal for the establishment of a chemical-weapon-free zone in Central Europe and to enter into relevant negotiations in that connection. The implementation of that proposal would be conducive to the relaxation of tension in the region and would at the same time help bring about a world-wide ban on chemical weapons, which is supported by the majority of States.
Furthermore, the German Democratic Republic reaffirms its readiness to contribute in a constructive spirit to a successful outcome of the Stockholm Conference, to explore new avenues for co-operation with the Western European countries and to continue its constructive participation in the work of all-European forums. There is no doubt that the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region would contribute to improving the over-all climate in Europe, which would also have a positive bearing on neighbouring regions.

The safeguarding of peace in the world makes it more imperative than ever before to eliminate, through peaceful means, hotbeds of tension and conflict. One of the most essential conditions for the resolution of such problems is the recognition of and respect for realities in the world, *inter alia*, the existence of a multitude of sovereign and independent States and peoples, their sovereign right to choose their order of society and to organize their lives according to their own concepts, the inadmissibility of any interference in their internal affairs and declarations arbitrarily claiming entire regions as spheres of so-called vital interest. In view of the continuing imperialist policy of threat, coercion and embargoes being pursued with regard to free Nicaragua, the German Democratic Republic supports the endeavours of the States of the Contadora Group and other Latin American countries on behalf of a peaceful and just solution of the conflict situation in Central America.

In the face of the aggravated situation that has emerged in southern Africa as a consequence of imperialist policies, the German Democratic Republic affirms the call for an end to the policy of *apartheid* and for the termination of support for Pretoria's racist régime - for example, the support labelled so-called constructive engagement. The people and the Government of the German Democratic Republic demand that the aggressive acts and the interference and military intervention in Angola and other States in southern Africa be stopped. They reaffirm their unswerving
solidarity with the patriotic forces of South Africa, under the leadership of the African National Congress. The German Democratic Republic holds firmly to its position that Namibia must immediately be granted independence on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), without any pre-conditions. Once again, my country expresses its solidarity with and sympathy for the South West Africa People's Organization.

The continuing dangerous situation in the Middle East prompts my delegation to reaffirm the resolute support of the German Democratic Republic for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), as the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Only such a conference can pave the way for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. The peaceful and lasting solution of conflicts in various regions of the world in the interest of the peoples concerned and on the basis of the United Nations Charter would be an essential step towards maintaining world peace and making international security more stable.

The course of the deliberations at the fortieth session of the United Nations General Assembly in general, and the discussions here in the First Committee in particular, have clearly illustrated that the overwhelming majority of States is pleading for a turn for the better, for a turn towards a safe and peaceful world. That is reflected not only in the positions of statesmen from socialist countries but also of leading representatives of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement and Western States. Those views were also expressed at the commemorative session held to mark the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. They are also the views of politicians of the most diverse parties, scientists and scholars, cultural workers, physicians, clergymen - in short, to an extent unparalleled in history, world public opinion has addressed the issue of mankind's
future and spoken out against the nuclear threat, against weapons in outer space
and in favour of peoples' living peacefully together. And, not least, the United
Nations is expected to make an effective contribution towards that end.

The German Democratic Republic, for its part, will continue to participate
actively in all fields in efforts to achieve that objective.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): What is of eminent concern in our time is the
unsolved problem facing mankind, bringing a halt to the arms race. For all the
untoward world developments that have brought us to an epoch of increasing
insecurity, terrorism and near anarchy have their origin in the arms race.

If there is no international security, to maintain national security there
must be recourse to weapons, and when there is a recourse to weapons there is, of
course, competition, and we have the arms race. That is why I believe the question
of international security to be of pre-eminent importance and that it should be
discussed in extenso and not, in light of the weeks on end devoted to disarmament,
for only one week. For disarmament can be achieved only as the result of
international security. Without international security, there can be no
disarmament, no matter how many meetings are held on the subject - and thousands
have been held over the past 40 years, albeit without any result because they have
been held in an attempt to achieve disarmament without any regard to international
security.
I do not know why, but for some reason international security does not seem to be attractive to the major Powers, and other Powers follow their lead. That is one of the reasons why the subject of international security is given such little time. It is not the fault of the United Nations, but, rather, a reaction to the general approach to the world situation.

One aspect of the unsolved problem is bringing the arms race to a halt. It must be realized that the whole approach to the problems of the arms race and disarmament has been, and continues to be, basically erroneous, leading nowhere but to a deadlock - as was demonstrated by the two special sessions on disarmament, which produced no results. Yet there has been no special session on international security, which further proves my point that international security is ignored and bypassed while we concentrate on disarmament, which cannot be achieved without international security.

This is not a question of principle, but one of simple logic. There is no possibility of halting the arms race at a time when, even in the United Nations era, States Members have no source of security upon which they can rely other than their own armaments. Logically, therefore, they are going to see to it that their armaments are sufficient to protect them, and thus we have an arms race. The competition involved in striking a so-called balance of forces - but, in reality, with an eye to achieving the edge in weapon superiority - escalates and perpetuates the arms race. What is required is a system of international security and a régime of international law that would enable us to do away with nuclear weapons and all the dangers threatening mankind today.

Now, according to all eminent scientists - in the United States, in the Soviet Union and in other nations as well - nuclear weapons are weapons that cannot be used with impunity. Because of the effect of prevailing winds, if such weapons were to be used their fallout would inevitably return, perhaps within as little as
ten days or so, and destroy the country of origin. No attack with nuclear weapons can be carried out without the country using such weapons being in turn forced to suffer their consequences. So far, such weapons have not been used, but they are still retained as a deterrent. Why is there such concern to achieve through weaponry what should exist as a result of international security, the subject we are now discussing?

The competition through the arms race to achieve a supposed balance of forces is one factor that has created the present untenable situation. There is agreement that there can be no progress towards a cessation of the arms race and disarmament without parallel progress towards a system of international security and legal order, as provided for in the Charter. In this connection, I should like to quote from the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which clearly states:

"Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system" - I repeat: the security system - "provided for in the Charter." (S/10/2, para.13)

Our concern is not with international security in the abstract, but with the concrete system of international security provided for in the Charter of the United Nations, which should be applied and respected by all nations. However, it seems to have been forgotten and bypassed in the situation with which we are faced today and with which we have been faced for so long.

The international security system provided for in the Charter relies upon the effective implementation of the decisions of the Security Council. The Charter concept of security is based upon the effectiveness of the Security Council. If, therefore, Security Council decisions are not implemented because of the Council's lack of a United Nations force to see to that implementation and for the
enforcement of its resolutions, then the Council ceases to be a "Security" Council and becomes a Council for a pretence at security. What is the good of having the Security Council as the only organ of the United Nations with access to a means for enforcing its resolutions if, contrary to Article 43 of the Charter, it has been deprived of those means by depriving the United Nations of a United Nations force?

We therefore see that the question of international security is closely linked with Article 43 of the Charter, which provides for a United Nations force and which has been completely forgotten and laid aside. True, in 1983 and 1984 Presidents of the Security Council convened closed meetings at which it was decided that there must be international security through the Council and that the Council must therefore implement the means available to it for enforcing its resolutions. The Council recognized that, it asserted that at its meetings, but it stated that the matter was still under consideration. That was in 1983 and 1984. Time flies, but we have seen nothing done. It is for this reason that, as part of the question of international security, I am stating that we must give the Security Council the means of enforcing its resolutions. That is the central axis around which international security turns."

The McCloy-Zorin general statement of agreed principles of 1961 referred to the need for a United Nations force, and so did the General Assembly in paragraph 13 of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, to which I have already referred. Yet for over four decades all the efforts of the Conference on Disarmament in all its various forms have been taken up with the hopeless task of achieving disarmament agreements without giving due consideration and attention to the need for a parallel and concomitant system of international security, as provided for in the United Nations Charter. And this is the subject the Committee is discussing today.
The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament emphatically notes the indispensability of international security to any progress on general and complete disarmament. Bilateral disarmament, on the other hand, requires agreements based on inspection, control and verification that have proved unattainable in the prevailing climate of extreme mistrust and hostility. The arms race cannot be halted if the United Nations is rendered inoperative and unable to provide a system of international security as required by the Charter. Yet all the appeals made to sanity have not produced results, for they have all shared a common drawback: they are subject to the political will of the States Members concerned.
They consider the exercise of such political will to be their own right - and rightly so. But on the other hand, States have a firm commitment and obligation to comply with the Charter and to undertake measures for the system of international security provided for in the Charter. That undertaking and solemn commitment by all States Members of the United Nations arises from their signature of the Charter.

Therefore, I affirm that international security is an existing obligation, and must go forward. It is an accepted maxim that law without enforcement action is no law; in a parallel way, security without enforcement means, through the Security Council, is no security. Effective security and order through an appropriate organization is always a compelling necessity for us all. We have the United Nations, which was created for that purpose.

The most propitious fact is that the Charter of the United Nations provides for an adequate system of international security and order; that system and the means for attaining it are set out in the Charter. But there has been no interest in proceeding with it.

As a result, developments in the international field have brought into sharp focus the incapacity of the Security Council to give effect to its decisions. In recent years, a series of unanimously adopted Security Council decisions have been ignored and bypassed with impunity by those concerned. That is what has to be remedied. Effect must be given to the decisions of the Security Council, for that is the way to international security.

The Charter does not obligate its signatories to shed their armaments, as did the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Covenant was based on disarmament and the shedding of armaments was an obligation for signatories. Indeed, it reached the point where the organization itself conveyed to States that they had to reduce their armaments by a certain amount. Of course, the Covenant of the League of
Nations failed completely, as did the League itself. The Charter of the United Nations does not call for disarmament; it does not interfere in the affairs of States, or tell them that they must disarm, or do anything like that. However, it establishes a system of international security and expressly demands compliance with that system.

That is where we are today: in a world where there is no obligation to shed our armaments or to disarm, but where there is a strong obligation to achieve international security in accordance with the Charter. The Charter is based on a security system, and principles of disarmament emerge from and are dependent upon that security system. We see that clearly in Article 11 of the Charter, which states that

"The General Assembly may consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments..."

Disarmament and the regulation of armaments are a sequel to the maintenance of international security and peace. I say "international security and peace" because that is the correct order: it is international security that will bring peace, not the other way around. Peace, of course, brings very good things, but in order to get peace we need international security. The consequence of not building an international security structure through Security Council resolutions is that that whole structure remains inoperative.

In this Committee, we must declare emphatically on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations that every nuclear weapon will have to be outlawed and eliminated. Nuclear weapons are inherently self-destructive and they ought not to exist at all; they are unusable. The historic Charter prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations must become
reality; it cannot remain an idle phrase. The Charter system of collective security has to be given effect.

I must reiterate with emphasis that the practice so far of proceeding directly to disarmament negotiations without any reference to parallel and concomitant measures for collective international security through the United Nations is a sterile exercise, as has been abundantly shown. That is why we have had no disarmament at all. We have had two special sessions without result. Perhaps many are under the impression that international security will be the outcome of disarmament, but that is illogical.

The summit meeting between President Reagan of the United States and General Secretary Gorbachev of the Soviet Union was a success and opened the way to common understanding on many issues. Both leaders have shown good will and a spirit of co-operation, and I believe that in that spirit they should proceed towards agreements on international security. Whatever they may do they will be unable to agree on disarmament, because, as I have said, disarmament is a negative concept: one can never agree to disarm. How can one agree to disarm? And how can one see that the other side has disarmed without inspection, control and verification, which are impossible things? But they can agree on international security, which is a positive concept.

I believe that that concept of international security should be promoted and that this Committee should devote more than one week to discussing it.
Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): The aspiration to authentic and lasting international peace and security and the related hope to see the United Nations play a greater role in that sphere may be viewed in the same necessary, even urgent, terms as the promotion of world-wide economic development and the achievement of general and complete disarmament. The fact is that those three goals towards which the United Nations is striving are closely linked. They are all fostered through interaction by all positive developments, while they are damaged by any deterioration in international relations.

While the natural interrelationship among those three needs does not preclude a compartmentalized, thematic approach to the questions they pose, it does require an overall approach to international relations in keeping with a comprehensive perspective of the problems facing the contemporary world. Only awareness of that reality can promote correct understanding of the international situation and foster the implementation of a strategy adequate to bring about international peace and security to everyone's advantage and benefit.
That interrelationship among those three objectives which stir the energy, imagination and effort of the United Nations does not, however, exclude the primary attention that must be devoted to the question of international peace and security, which is the foundation of any viable structure. For a just and lasting world order requires an international society under the dominion of law and relations between States under the fiefdom of international legality.

The absence of stable world peace and lasting international security give rise to uncertainty, distrust and suspicion, thus upsetting the national priorities of States, which are compelled to subordinate their economic and social development to the overriding need to build a national defence and to safeguard their national independence. That is particularly true for non-aligned countries, which, in an irreversible political choice have opted to remain outside military alliances and to avoid the thinking of the ideological confrontation between East and West.

For that very reason attempts are often made to make their position even more vulnerable, because the independent expression of their national will generally runs up against policies of subjugation, and because their quest for mutually beneficial co-operation is countered by a strategy of seeking unilateral advantage. Despite - or because of - that important reality, the contemporary trend of strengthening the independence of the third world remains largely dependent on a notion of world security which is unfortunately characterized by relations of force and balances of power.

That is no surviving, sporadic phenomenon, but is a redeployment of strategies intended primarily to ensure the domination of exclusive interests and, above all, to inscribe a systematic geo-strategic pattern on the third world. Hence the use of economic, financial and - we must stress - food weapons as instruments of a policy of buttressing and expanding zones of subjugation, influence or obedience.
Hence too the attempts to undermine centres of regional decision-making, initiative and action and the determination to weaken the frameworks of co-operation and joint action of non-aligned and developing countries. This serves also as a pretext for attempting to discredit certain international organizations and to eliminate them as precious and irreplaceable frameworks for action.

In the attainment and strengthening of international peace and security, the only viable approach is a comprehensive one which rejects discriminatory and exclusive notions and avoids partial and fragmented measures. The right to peace and security cannot be seen as an exclusive privilege of military strength or a natural attribute of economic prosperity. The indivisible need for security is universal; that universality makes all States the beneficiaries, and they must contribute collectively to its implementation. Without such an approach any action will probably lose viability sooner or later.

That is the basic lesson Algeria has drawn from a Euro-centric concept of security, which has already reached its limits and will be further stretched in the future. It is imposing on the Mediterranean the North-South division which we see at the core of so many imbalances and inequalities between a politically stable and economically prosperous centre and a periphery exposed to grave political insecurity and ongoing economic uncertainty.

Yet if there is one region which ought to have been the object of a comprehensive approach to the increased need for security, it is indeed the Mediterranean, where the persistence of numerous hotbeds of crisis in and around the basin continues sometimes brutally to aggravate world tension. That is particularly true for the Middle East crisis, which is a point of inflammation in an ever deteriorating situation. Given its nature, it is a conflict whose persistence will spare no nearby country from its severe effects, as we see from the present crushing situation.
(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

It is a conflict which involves a protagonist whose principal raison d'être is the prolongation and exacerbation of tension. Indeed, the circle of Israeli aggression has been extended to the very doorstep of the portion of Europe which is so sure of its stability and balance. Israel's aggression against Tunisia heralds new developments threatening that balance at its very pivot. These are no mere disturbances which can be withstood by a structure designed by its supporters to last and to absorb nearby shocks.

It is in fact an entire region, from the Atlantic to the Arabian Gulf, which Israeli strategy defines as its natural sphere of domination and conquest. For some time now Europe has been witness to an attempt to translate that wild ambition into reality. It is beginning to be its victim and will be so increasingly in the future.

Thus, guarantees of improved European security is far less likely to emerge from a limited concern about heightened signs of resistance to the original aggression than from a comprehensive solution to the Middle East conflict. That is the basis for the entire Mediterranean reaching a genuine, lasting level of security.

The resumption of dialogue between the two super-Powers and the expected resultant détente should not rule out a sincere contribution to the solution of regional conflicts with respect for all the rights of the peoples and States which are parties to them. That means that conflicts must be understood in all their dimensions and in their original terms. It excludes attempts to distort a local conflict into an aspect of East-West confrontation, or to set aside the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, or to engage in intervention, intimidation, the threat or use of force with the intention of preventing a people from freely choosing the economic, social and political system it wishes.
The restoration of credible confidence and the will to improve international relations requires also the mobilization or encouragement of regional efforts at conflict resolution. To that end, a continental organization such as the Organization of African Unity or a regional framework such as the Contadora Group should be able to count on the sincere support of all States, especially the major Powers, in their search for solutions to the crises they are dealing with. Only in that way can a regional approach to international peace and security truly be implemented.
Given the continuation of numerous dangerous conflicts that threaten international peace and security, the United Nations, at this particular moment when the advantages of dialogue and concerted action seem more convincing than at any time in the past, must reassert its full responsibility and determination in the firm advancement of world peace. We are convinced that this universal Organization is the only appropriate framework for dealing with the universal need for security. It is within the Organization that we can provide for the transition from an existing system of selective security to the desired goal of collective security. Thus, the Organization must go beyond the meagre framework of crisis management and raise its efforts to bear upon the original goal of promoting and maintaining authentic and lasting international peace and security.

On the other hand the universal Organization has been given a clearly defined framework for achieving each of its objectives: for disarmament, there is the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly; for the establishment of just and equitable economic relations there is the programme of action for a new international economic order; and, in its own Charter, there are formulas for the implementation of collective security. Thus, all the Organization need do to act in a matter commensurate with its aspirations is to draw upon that essential and decisive factor, the collective will of States to work together to bring about the realization of those goals. We must therefore emphasize the specific responsibility incumbent upon those who, because of their military and economic strength, are able to slow down or to accelerate the implementation of such an undertaking. A return to dialogue and joint action can have no real or lasting effect on international reality unless it is based upon the systematic and broad-based participation of the greatest number. It is our conviction, as well as our hope, that such a collective will finally emerge in the interests of all.
Miss DONOSO (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): Forty years have gone by since the United Nations was created as an Organization to preserve international peace and security. Our Organization was born out of the crystallization of earlier international efforts towards that end and in order to create a better world for succeeding generations. These four decades, with their wealth of experience in every sphere in the search for solutions to world armed, economic and social crises during a period of relative world peace, should encourage us in confronting the present-day threats to our planet.

In his address to the eighteenth session of the General Assembly in 1963, the then-President of Bolivia, Dr. Victor Paz Estensoro, stated:

"Peace should not only be a hope which we pursue, but a norm of law to which we bow. ... there are some obvious ways to guarantee the right of all men to peace: general and complete disarmament, obedience to law and the strengthening of international organizations." (A/PV.1252, p. 8-10)

Ever since, and even before, that time, Bolivia has continuously and systematically expressed its complete support and solidarity with the principles of disarmament. Even at that early date it foresaw the devastating effects any new war would have on the nations in conflict and on all other peoples as well.

At a time when a vast military potential is being created by scientific discoveries of new means of destruction, we should be more loyal than ever to this international Organization, the only one in our century that has survived to implement the principle of promoting world peace and co-operation. All States Members should contribute not only to reiterating existing principles but to strengthening and modernizing mechanisms to maintain international peace and security in order that they may operate effectively, particularly in the light of the new threats to the security of nations that were not fully contemplated at the time the United Nations Charter was drawn up. Suffice it to mention in this
connection the total destructive power of nuclear energy and the use of outer space for military purposes.

From the universal, microcosmic standpoint, the threat of the misuse of nuclear energy and outer space is a lethal one. In this forum, we have for 40 years been discussing the effects of the arms race, and recently the misuse of outer space, which can alter the natural balance not only of Earth but of the entire universe, the consequences of which would change the evolutionary process of man and of all existing life forms on Earth. In this connection, it is encouraging for a small and vulnerable nation like Bolivia to observe that the two major Powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, are engaged in bilateral negotiations with a view to preserving international peace and security through the control of the manufacture, stockpiling and other aspects of nuclear weapons. We sincerely hope that those negotiations will continue on a permanent basis and in a spirit of conciliation. In that connection we believe that the recent summit meeting between the President of the United States and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was very useful.

Small nations that do not possess even the means seriously to conduct activities in the nuclear sphere and even less the means to be a competitive factor must not focus their efforts only on striving to see that nations with the economic power required for the manufacture of nuclear weapons limit the situation. Small developing nations, mere powerless spectators of the arms race, are nevertheless exposed, willy-nilly, to all the devastating effects of a confrontation between the major Powers, and they must demand that those Powers offer minimum guarantees in the event of a breach of the principles of international law, either by accident or deliberately.

The responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security is an enormous one, and the United Nations Security Council, which was created for
that purpose, must do everything it can to promote peace and dialogue among all States, especially between the world's major Powers, since it plays a fundamental role not only in containing but also in preventing international conflicts.

As an internationally recognized institution in which the hopes of all peoples, large and small, are placed, the United Nations must try at all costs to prevent the proliferation of crises between conflicting Powers and to avoid the catastrophe of confrontation. However, it must not confine its efforts solely to confrontation between the great Powers, even though the effect of such a confrontation could bring about the extinction of all life on Earth, including that of the aggressor. According to the principles of the United Nations Charter, it should also consider crises affecting other nations that possess only conventional weapons. They too are Member States with needs and problems that cannot be ignored. Such problems, which affect the sovereignty of those peoples, could serve as pretexts for greater conflicts.

Problems with universal implications are of course important and frightening, but we should not forget that as simple dwellers on Earth we face every day conflicts that are less determinant but equally serious. We have very different problems to face - in a general way, we might cite as examples some that have been discussed at length in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, such as conflicts arising out of border disputes, rights over territorial waters, the production and use of chemical weapons and so on. However, there is a new problem of increasing international importance that has not yet been discussed in the Security Council, in spite of its representing a serious threat that could affect small countries, and one that is being created by the international criminal syndicates that deal in the illicit drug traffic.
The threat posed by illegal trafficking in drugs and weapons depresses development and the economies of small, vulnerable countries. That traffic tends to create unreal and illusory economic improvements and to play a role of social, economic and political destabilization. Many developed countries, with their full social and economic backing and modern police and judicial systems, cannot eliminate the demand for narcotics, the production of which gives rise to international networks of drug trafficking which are involved sometimes in weapons trafficking as well. Since it is very difficult to stop the proliferation of threatening factors, there is an unwitting strengthening of criminal organizations which do not hesitate to unorthodox methods to attain their ultimate goals.

The great economic resources and the power held by the groups of drug traffickers are now so great that they have become a threat to the security of the democratic institutions of small States where they operate or seek to set up operations. Thus, States must begin to pool their efforts to ensure that international action to reduce the demand for and production of narcotics be simultaneous and co-ordinated with efforts to safeguard the internal security of States.

Therefore, multilateral efforts to gain firm control of the traffic in drugs must be joined to existing efforts to reduce this evil and should also take into account the implications of the use of armed violence, mercenaries and other related methods, which have become dangerous to the security of many Governments and to the sovereignty of the States concerned.

In its Article 34, the United Nations Charter states that

"The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."
(Miss Donoso, Bolivia)

My delegation considers that in the near future the Security Council and the relevant organs of the General Assembly should study the international threat and danger the traffic in illicit drugs poses to the security of States and should then propose the necessary measures. In other words, members of the Security Council, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, should face this new international threat, which was not foreseen at San Francisco, when no danger to the security of States was envisaged beyond the dangers posed by other States. Forty years on, the modern scene, with its amazing technology and the massive, apparently inexhaustible financial resources in the hands of powerful transnational entities, demands that international forums tackle and diagnose these new threats to the security of national and Government institutions which come not from other States but from the criminal groups which are attempting to defy, and even to replace, the States of the world.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.