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

Mr. CHEANG (Singapore): Since the birth of the United Nations 40 years ago the threat or use of force in international relations, in direct contravention of one of the Organization's sacred principles, has regrettably become quite commonplace in the international arena, especially in the third world.

Force appears to play a greater role in international politics than in domestic politics simply because States refuse to accept the legitimacy of international law for the settlement of conflicts when it is not in their national interest to do so. Were every State to act in such a manner, the present international system - the United Nations - would inevitably break up. Naturally, such a catastrophic development would harm the interests of small third world nations more deeply than it would the major Powers, especially the super-Powers. Small third world nations would be at the mercy of their larger and powerful neighbours, which might be aggressive and expansionist.

Furthermore, it is no longer valid to assume that only the major Powers or super-Powers would take advantage of chaos and anarchy in various regions of the world to pursue selfish interests. Unfortunately, even third world countries may adopt the features once characteristic of the European colonial Powers. These micro-imperialists should be compelled to desist from their aggressive actions, which are contrary to the United Nations Charter. Viet Nam's invasion and continued occupation of Kampuchea is a classic example of a third world country which has resorted to the use of force in resolving a conflict. Let us all be clear about one thing: it is legitimate to resort to the use of force to defend
oneself against aggression when all other peaceful avenues have been exhausted. However, using force or threatening its use to resolve conflicts is a different matter and should not be condoned or accepted.

Countries may have a variety of reasons for resorting to the use or threat of force: seemingly irreconcilable differences over religion, ethnic and racial composition, economic competition, ideological fervour, and so on. Most of the time, however, the use of force is only a means to a selfish end, as in the case of Soviet and Vietnamese aggression in Afghanistan and Kampuchea, respectively. By the same token, South African aggression against its neighbours, cloaked in the mantle of self-defence, cannot be justified and should rightly be condemned. The recent overwhelming endorsement by the General Assembly of the draft resolution on Kampuchea submitted by the countries members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) on 5 November 1985, document A/40/L.4, testifies to the fact that the majority of members of the international community would not condone the use of force to resolve disputes by any member, let alone accept a fait accompli.
As a small country, Singapore believes that the use or threat of use of force in international relations to resolve conflicts or disputes is both wrong and counter-productive, especially for the third world countries. The present international system and order, which is not as strong and stable as it should be, could, in time, break up should nations choose continually to flout the sacred principles of the United Nations Charter for whatever reason or reasons.

Why has the effectiveness of the collective security system been weakened? First, it is not so much the inability as the reluctance of Member States to fulfil their obligations that has led to the present state of affairs. Many Member States have - not to their credit - chosen to violate the principles of the United Nations Charter. Secondly, the Security Council has failed to function like a court of law in a national legal system where judges, while not entirely free from personal bias, attempt to ascertain the facts of a case objectively and to apply to the facts of the case the relevant legal principles. Unfortunately, the Security Council seldom behaves like judges do. Extraneous factors like the relationship between a Council member and the parties to a dispute, as well as the national interests of a Council member or its allies and friends, inevitably affect the determination of the facts of a dispute. The identification and application of United Nations Charter principles and general rules of international law are similarly affected by these considerations. This process leads the Security Council to apply the rules selectively or in a biased manner. It also hampers its ability to agree on determining who is right or wrong and on measures to remedy the situation. Consequently Member States have little confidence in the fairness and objectivity of the Security Council. Finally, the inability or reluctance of the five permanent members, especially the super-Powers, to work together should not be forgotten. The Security Council can work only on the assumption of great Power unanimity. It is obvious that this has not been the case since the cold war
began. Hence the onus is on the super-Powers to rise above their narrow interests to work towards the common global interest of international peace and security. They should realize that bilateral measures to keep the peace do not suffice, and that the strengthening of the collective security system would supplement rather than be a substitute for these measures. Therefore the super-Powers should not bring their rivalry into the Security Council. Above all, they should not selfishly unite to frustrate any move by the majority of the international community to strengthen the collective security system.

It is not an exaggeration to say that there will never be total - or at least guaranteed - security for all nations, large and small, until there is some impartial and effective international authority expressing man's best instincts and common interests and designed and empowered to keep the peace, restrain aggressive States, control armaments to some extent at least, negotiate and enforce peaceful settlement, facilitate peaceful change and assist poor countries to develop and modernize. While the United Nations was created with many of these noble objectives in mind, it has been unable to fulfil or realize its tasks to the full for reasons which have already been enumerated several times in the past.

The States of the international community should therefore not only reaffirm their commitment to the system of collective security but, more important, they should abide by their commitment. In this connection it is unfortunate that the ad hoc committee that was supposed to have been set up under the provisions of resolution 38/191 of 20 December 1983 has yet to be established. It is also unfortunate that four of the five permanent members of the Security Council were unable to lend their support to the previous two resolutions on this item, whose only objective is the strengthening of the effectiveness of the collective security system for the benefit of all States, including the five permanent members of the Security Council.
While it is not really surprising to see the member States of the eastern and western blocs opposing the resolution on this item, one wonders why a handful of third world countries chose to join this minority of States in opposing the expressed desire of the majority of the international community. What do these third world countries have to lose by the strengthening of the collective security system? One would imagine that they would have more to gain than to lose from such an exercise. Their action only leads one to question their motives and foreign policy orientation.

Therefore it is imperative that all Member States work harder for a stronger, more credible, more effective United Nations, since it is the only international institution at present dedicated to working towards a stable international order. We therefore call upon the East and the West, especially the permanent members of the Security Council, not to withhold their co-operation and active assistance in the achievement of this desirable goal. Should we fail in this task the alternative facing us would be a more unstable world in which only weak countries, especially those in the third world, would fall prey to the aggressive and expansionist designs of others.

Mr. MANDA-LOUNDHET (Congo) (interpretation from French): The report of the Secretary-General of our Organization relating to a comprehensive study of concepts of security, in document A/40/553, states that security concepts have evolved in response to the need for national security and as a result of political, military, economic and other changes, and that, based on military capabilities, economic strength, social development, scientific and technological progress as well as political co-operation, they can, as the case may be, emphasize any one of these elements or a combination of them and "may stress national unilateral national action ... or multilateral co-operative formulas". (A/40/553, p. 4, para. 3)
We note, however, that unilateral national action has prevailed over multilateral co-operation and that force is more than ever a means for maintaining a "semblance of peace". Invoking reasons of security "aimed at reducing national vulnerability", certain States Members of the United Nations, in particular the major military Powers, regularly "torpedo" international peace and security.

Basing themselves on reasons stemming from the systematic overlapping of totally fabricated hybrid elements, they intervene militarily everywhere in the world and maintain "hotspots" in order to satisfy their need for power and their self-interests. So long as the "destructive fires" continue to have their devastating effects far from their own territory, this does not worry them; on the contrary, their continued interest induces them to fan the flames even more. "Community morality" no longer has any meaning in a world where the strong seek to dictate their law.
All those inadmissible actions serve to hinder the social and economic progress of the developing countries which, instead of investing a goodly part of their revenues and mining and other resources in undertakings towards their own development, are compelled by the force of circumstances to devote them to the purchase of weapons and the payment of foreign instructors — in other words, national defence.

The world is not static, as claimed last week by the representative of one delegation in the general debate on the Antarctic. With time, the phenomena relating thereto necessarily undergo significant changes. To seek to reject this fundamental condition of nature would be to deny the obvious and use deception to attempt to achieve their objectives of domination and, in the last analysis, to perfect the system of exploitation they have so skilfully instituted.

It is that kind of conduct which in the years between 1950 and 1960, shortly before the independence of African countries, was at the root of the social and political crises which then shook the world. Most of the 150 armed conflicts that have broken out since 1945 in the developing countries were the result of that fact. Today we cannot fail to recognize that the consequences of those crises were severe for both the colonialists and the colonized and at times went so far as to destabilize the very political régimes that had provoked them.

Instead of continuously violating the spirit of the United Nations Charter and hanging on to their strategic and economic interests based on profits, it would have been wiser to seek worthy human solutions. The world would thus have avoided some of the insecurity and growing instability existing in international relations.

The numerous United Nations efforts for the promotion of human rights and the strengthening of international peace and security and the legitimacy of the
struggle of peoples under colonial domination, foreign occupation or racist régimes, as well as their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence, are highly laudable. Among other things, resolution 39/155, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session, constitutes for the international community a very important appeal for the adoption of

"... all necessary measures to prevent the further deterioration of the international situation and, to this end:

"To seek, through more effective utilization of the means provided for in the Charter, the peaceful settlement of disputes ...;

"To proceed without delay to a global consideration of ways and means for bringing about ... the restructuring of international economic relations ... with a view to establishing the new international economic order;

"To accelerate the economic development of developing countries ...".

Despite the Organization's overall positive performance, we regretfully note the persistence of certain weaknesses. Indeed the Security Council does not always facilitate the realization of the wishes of the Members of the United Nations and very often appears to be hindering progress owing to the existence of the outdated veto system. The results of some of the work done in these past weeks have clearly shown that. It is therefore necessary to remodel the Council's mechanisms and working methods so as to strengthen its authority and ability to act.

The seas and oceans, covering about three-quarters of the globe's surface, the international means of maritime traffic necessary for trade, navigation and the economic exploitation of marine resources, which have played a fundamental role in mankind's survival, in our time run the risk of no longer filling that role because of the international insecurity resulting from the new dimensions in the continued development of naval forces and systems.
While the navies of the two super-Powers can now deploy very powerful forces comprising modern vessels and airships capable of carrying very powerful weapons systems that have been highly perfected and developed, a number of other States - although not as powerful - are equally endowed with similar forces.

To get a clearer picture of what the naval arms race has become, let us look at the information according to which the construction programme of one of the great marine Powers provides for the establishment of a navy of 600 vessels with 15 groups of aircraft-carriers and their escorts, four surface-combat groups with their cruisers, 100 nuclear-powered, multi-mission attack submarines, 10 groups of supply ships at sea and more significant amphibious transport capabilities.

The Mediterranean has become the theatre par excellence for the great Powers' show of naval force, and that seriously compromises the sovereignty and independence of countries in the region and hinders the peaceful settlement of disputes.

My delegation fully supports the Final Declaration of the First Meeting of Foreign Ministers of Mediterranean States members of the Non-Aligned Movement, held at Valletta, Malta, on 10 and 11 September 1984. Similarly, we consider that the Luanda Final Declaration on the Mediterranean is a positive element for the strengthening of peace and security in that part of the world.

The threat to international security can be seen not only on the seas and oceans; it exists also on land and in outer space. Ultra-sophisticated deadly weapons have for decades dotted the land and are already in outer space. To that must be added the constant increase in tension throughout the world.

In South-East Asia, Central America, the Middle East, southern Africa and elsewhere the situation is no better. To take just the case of southern Africa, we
note with dismay that, despite the relevant United Nations decisions and resolutions, Namibia remains under the yoke of the obstinate, racist South African régime, subtly assisted by its traditional friends.

Angola, a neighbour of my own country, sees its territory regularly violated by that same régime. The descriptions and poignant photographs contained in the report of the Commission of Investigation established pursuant to Security Council resolution 571 (1985) bear irrefutable witness to that fact. With that evidence, can anyone still advocate other misleading theories? The challenge is before us.
The delegation of Congo believes that the maintenance of international peace and security necessarily requires respect for the sovereignty of other States and the establishment of good-neighbourliness and mutual confidence based on open, sincere co-operation among States.

Mr. BENNOUNA (Morocco) (interpretation from French): As a primary purpose of our Organization, the strengthening of international security remains at the centre of the concerns of the Kingdom of Morocco. The Foreign Minister of Morocco stated before the Assembly earlier in the session that our planet had been spared a world-wide conflagration – which, in this age of weapons of mass destruction, would have amounted to true collective suicide – and he stressed the disquieting growth of local conflicts, especially in the less favoured regions of the world, which run counter to and endanger the hard economic development efforts made by the peoples involved.

The political, economic and technological interdependence of the world is constantly increasing, and in such a world the pressing need for a system of collective security is becoming ever more obvious. No longer can anyone disregard or feel immune from any conflict or incident, regardless of its location or the parties involved. Feelings of insecurity are widely shared, and the quest for security must be an ongoing, collective endeavour.

That is why the international community has affirmed the imperative nature of the basic norm set out in Article 2 (4) of the Charter, according to which

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations".
(Mr. Bennouna, Morocco)

There is a concrete interest served by respecting and promoting respect for that norm, which is the cornerstone of any organized international society. Such is the crucial importance of our Committee's debate, which must rise above selfish short-term interests and outmoded notions of hegemonism of any kind. The Kingdom of Morocco, whose national existence has its roots in age-old traditions and which has no reason to assert itself through opposition, has always advocated the establishment of good-neighbourly relations based on mutual respect for differences and on positive co-operation in order to promote the realization of the potentialities of all.

It is in that spirit that we strive in all international forums to strengthen the prohibition of the threat or use of force, which, in our view, bears three essential corollaries: first, the adaption and progressive development of international law to take into account various contemporary manifestations of the threat or use of force; secondly, the creation and implementation of preventive measures to prevent situations or disputes which could pose a threat to international peace and security; and, thirdly, the existence and improvement of institutional machinery adequate for the redress or punishment of possible violations.

With respect to the first corollary, it should be noted that, in addition to the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, international law has made substantial progress, as reflected in the United Nations by the adoption of resolution 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970, which contains the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. That text interprets aspects of the Charter; one of its main contributions is its clarification of the situation with respect to a number of cloaked violations of international security which tend to lead to dangerous developments.
"Every State has the duty to refrain from organizing or encouraging the organization of irregular forces or armed bands, including mercenaries, for incursion into the territory of another State.

"Every State has the duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another State or acquiescing in organized activities within its territory directed towards the commission of such acts, when the acts referred to in the present paragraph involve a threat or use of force". (resolution 2625 (XXV), annex)

Other texts too have corroborated and spelled out that interpretation of the broad area covered by Article 2 (4) of the Charter, including resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974, containing the Definition of Aggression.

Thus, responsibilities are clearly established, and nothing can justify such acts, which, like direct aggression, are crimes against the peace and security of mankind as a whole.

As regards the second corollary, the Kingdom of Morocco, in its reply annexed to the note of the Secretary-General contained in document A/40/454 of 23 August 1985, noted that in the context of collective security it has now become imperative to emphasize the preventive role. First of all, it is up to the Organization to encourage Member States to have recourse to all the procedures provided for in Article 33 of the Charter for the peaceful settlement of their disputes and for the reduction or elimination of all situations of tension in their regions. The Secretary-General could well act as mediator or use his good offices to clear a situation, thus avoiding any deadlock which could cause a serious deterioration of relations between Member States. In his report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, the Secretary-General wrote that
"The Secretary-General has traditionally, if informally, tried to keep watch for problems likely to result in conflict and to do what he can to pre-empt them by quiet diplomacy." (A/37/1, p. 3)

All peace-loving States should encourage all action taken by the Secretary-General in that spirit.

We note too that there are numerous disputes or situations of tension rooted in and fuelled by controversies relating to given events and specific facts. In those circumstances, it is up to the Security Council and the Secretary-General to make available to the parties impartial commissions of inquiry or investigation responsible for establishing and relating the truth about the facts which are the source of the controversy and which could give rise to tension and conflict.
As for the third aspect, the credibility of our whole Organization depends on the ability of the Security Council to employ all the possibilities given it by the Charter, and particularly Chapter VII, taking the decisions and imposing the sanctions as required.

The strengthening of international security depends to a great extent on strengthening the Council's effectiveness so that it fully assumes the responsibilities given it by the Charter. We sincerely hope that the spirit that prevailed during the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, as well as the resumption of dialogue between the two super-Powers, will promote the creation of a new climate in the Council, one of firmness and respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter. We know from experience that if States can act with impunity that opens the way to the rule of brutal force and great excesses.

Finally, the global approach to security does not exclude consideration of the details of regional matters, which require greater co-operation between the countries directly concerned, in order to establish the bases for pragmatic solutions, contain and eliminate external intervention and develop a dynamic for peace, with respect for the right of all the parties freely to choose their own political, economic and social system.

The Kingdom of Morocco, situated at one side of the most important sea passage, the Straits of Gibraltar, linking the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, and at the meeting point of Europe and Africa, has always worked for the creation of conditions favouring peace and security in the Mediterranean. We are very concerned about, and affected by, the increase in subversive intrigues and acts of terrorism, examples of which have recently been witnessed in the Maghreb. In these circumstances, it is imperative to co-ordinate all efforts to end these attacks on the most sacred principles of Mediterranean civilization.
We have followed with continuing interest the conferences on security and co-operation in Europe, which are closely linked to the situation prevailing throughout the Mediterranean, especially along its southern coasts. We should establish interregional co-operation, to harmonize initiatives and bring about co-ordination, to the benefit of all the peoples concerned.

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Of all the questions related to the strengthening of international security, that of strengthening security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region is of great importance. We have decided to speak for the second time today in order to put forward our views on this extremely important matter.

The continuation of the policy of militarizing the region and the escalation of military and political confrontation give rise to growing concern among many countries of the world, especially the Mediterranean countries. A factor greatly increasing the threat to the Mediterranean region is the deployment of nuclear missiles in many European countries. The missiles are a threat not only to adjacent areas but to the whole of the eastern Mediterranean, the Balkans and the States of North Africa. There is no need to stress that their deployment creates a new area of tension there, with great explosive potential.

Foreign military bases and military materiel are an equally grave threat to peace. The militarist policy of imperialism in the Mediterranean area leads to the region's becoming a concentration of hotbeds of tension.

The fire of war is still burning in the Middle East. Israel continues to insist on infringing the sovereignty and independence of Arab States and carries out a policy of State terrorism and violence against them. Responsibility for Israel's activities lies fully on those that provide military and political cover to their strategic partner.
Pressure continues openly to be put on Libya in order to compel that sovereign State to abandon its independent foreign policy. The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya this morning eloquently presented many facts in that connection, and we express our solidarity with that country, which has become the victim of imperialist blackmail.

The situation in Cyprus and the area around it remains tense. Military and political pressure is also felt by other independent States of the Mediterranean.

Being a Black Sea and therefore a Mediterranean Power, the Soviet Union approaches Mediterranean problems with the same goals as all other peace-loving forces in the area. Our country proclaims its support for a policy aimed at transforming the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and fruitful co-operation. It draws attention to the unbreakable link between security in that area and security in Europe.

As noted by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, M. S. Gorbachev:

"Guided by the general principles of its foreign policy, the Soviet Union sincerely strives to see to it that hotbeds of tension in the Mediterranean region are liquidated by peaceful, political means. We are in favour of positions being brought closer together in order actively to co-operate in the search for the settlement of regional problems at the negotiating table to protect the sovereign rights of States and peoples subjected to pressure and brutal interference in their internal affairs."

Clearly, international security cannot be ensured by force. That indisputable conclusion fully applies to the Mediterranean, which is directly adjacent to Europe. Because of its population density and its over-armament, Europe is more vulnerable than any other continent to a military conflict, especially a nuclear
conflict. Security there, as in the world in general, can be ensured only by the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems, détente, disarmament, strengthening of confidence and the development of international co-operation. The Soviet Union has constantly proposed that effective measures be taken so that the European continent will ultimately be free of medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons.
Implementation of the proposal to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and co-operation would, in our view, contribute to more concrete measures, including those proposed by the Soviet Union. I should like to draw attention to some of them. They include, inter alia, an agreement not to deploy nuclear weapons on the territories of Mediterranean States; the obligation on the part of the nuclear Powers not to use nuclear weapons against any Mediterranean country or deploy such weapons on its soil; the withdrawal of the Mediterranean region of all ships with nuclear weapons aboard and the extension to that region of measures of mutual trust in the military sphere that have already proved their value, such as prior notification of important military manoeuvres, invitations to observers to such manoeuvres and exchanges of military delegations.

Another important contribution to the reduction of tensions in the Mediterranean could be an agreed reduction of armed forces, especially naval forces, in that area along with other concrete measures relating to the limitation of naval activities and armaments. Military tension could be reduced by the creation of a chemical-weapon-free zone in the Mediterranean region and then on the whole of the African continent.

The implementation of those proposals would lead to the establishment of a climate of confidence among the States of the Mediterranean and would add to their security, creating a solid foundation for the strengthening of economic, scientific, technical, cultural and other forms of inter-State co-operation and paving the way for a return to détente in this area. The situation in the Mediterranean is of direct concern to the security interests of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, since the area is contiguous with their borders. It follows, therefore, that Mediterranean security is directly linked to the security of adjacent areas. We strongly support the measures taken by all peace-loving States to normalize the situation in that region, and it is from that
viewpoint that we assess the results of the meeting of Mediterranean countries members of the Non-Aligned Movement in September of last year at Valletta, which favoured extending the efforts of the Mediterranean non-aligned countries aimed at transforming that area into a zone of peace, security and co-operation. We share the concern expressed by the participants in that meeting at the deployment of nuclear missiles in the area, as well as their conclusions with regard to security, both in the Mediterranean and internationally.

We express our readiness to co-operate further with the States of the Mediterranean in efforts to implement the transformation of that region into a zone of peace, security and co-operation, and we agree to take an active part in discussions to that end, both within the framework of the United Nations and in other multilateral, regional or other forums.

Mr. KEBEDE (Ethiopia): The question of the maintenance of peace and security is of utmost importance to my Government, as, indeed, it is dear to all Governments dedicated to the cause of peace, justice and democracy. I should therefore like to make a brief statement on the agenda item now under consideration.

Throughout history, mankind as witnessed dangerous tendencies and aspirations on the part of some to attain a level of domination over a people or country they intend or are likely to subjugate. Through the years, those who espouse colonial and/or neo-colonial interests have waged many declared and undeclared wars over small countries that neither entertain designs against others nor have the capacity to threaten the security of powerful States.

The situation prevailing in the world today does not seem to be any better. If anything, it has been further complicated by the nuclearization of the war machines of some powerful States. The hegemonistic policies pursued by some imperialist Powers continue to threaten international peace and security. Those States continue to assert their exploitative positions over the resources of many
developing countries and to expand their spheres of influence on a global scale. To this end they have made frantic efforts aimed at the acquisition of new military bases and the expansion of existing ones and have interfered in the internal affairs of other States, resorting to measures aimed at undermining the political and socio-economic independence of many developing nations. They have continued to support the dark forces of colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, expansionism, irredentism and reaction. They have resorted to crude schemes of intimidation, ranging from what has become known as economic coercion to naked forms of gunboat diplomacy. In my own region, Africa, they continue to train, arm and infiltrate mercenary groups against sovereign States preoccupied with the challenges of underdevelopment.

Ironically, those very Powers are the ones that have taken the liberty of advancing proposals for the solution of so-called regional conflicts. In a typical hypocritical manner they have gone so far as to prescribe solutions to problems that are strictly national in magnitude and scope. If they truly wish to contribute to the solution of regional conflicts, we wonder if they could not do so by refraining from resorting to various forms of interference and intervention in the internal affairs of other States. If they have the slightest intention of enhancing the stability of countries in any region of the world, they should demonstrate their commitment to the maintenance of international peace and security by respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of those States and also by refraining from destabilizing their legitimate Governments.

Unfortunately, recent pronouncements made by the leader of one major Power leave much to be desired. It is a matter of regret to my country that the leader of a major Power chose to use the occasion of the observance of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations to announce his Administration's long-cherished design to render all-embracing support to renegade elements bent on
dismembering my country and subverting its popular revolution. Fraught as they are with all the dangers inherent in any attempt to achieve the realization of imperialist ambitions, such pronouncements clearly constitute a threat both to the security of my own country and to the peace and stability of the Horn of Africa as well. While we recognize the special responsibility incumbent upon the permanent members of the Security Council in matters pertaining to the maintenance of peace and security, we deplore any and all manoeuvres aimed at linking issues intimately intertwined with our sovereignty to the global policies and strategic interests of some imperialist Power that has unfortunately failed to draw any lessons from past adventurist wars.
(Mr. Kebede, Ethiopia)

That those quarters have dismally failed to comprehend the scope and magnitude of the objective reality prevailing in the Horn of Africa was made abundantly clear by a statement recently made by a highly placed official of a major Power to a so-called foreign relations council. I should like to draw attention to some of the points contained in that statement. Not only did the official in question attempt to define the problems in the region in terms of the strategic interests of his country, but he endeavoured to denigrate the path of development chosen by the Ethiopian people to redress the chronic social, economic and political injustices which have been perpetrated against the ordinary citizens of my county for many centuries. In the same vein, Ethiopia's bilateral relations with other countries were challenged. In that statement too, forces representing the real interests of the masses were branded as terrorists, while subversive, secessionist elements with no mass base were described as so-called democratic resistance forces.

If there is anything that such assertions and claims clearly indicate it is the inability of one super-Power to grasp the realities in our region and its failure to appreciate the proud anti-fascist and anti-colonial legacy of the Ethiopian people. Such insinuations also reveal the primacy of strategic considerations over the interests of the peoples of the developing world in the eyes of those with vested economic and military interests in our region. If any profound local development which could impede the satisfaction of the insatiable appetite of some Western multinationals is to be considered to be an act of hostility towards a given super-Power, then all those who have liberated themselves from the shackles of colonialism and neo-colonialism will be acting treasonably. If international peace is to be independent upon securing new strongholds for the multinationals, then such peace is bound to remain illusive and precarious.
If Africa has witnessed problems of regional and sub-regional dimensions it is because some States have failed to respect the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations. If peace has not prevailed in parts of Africa it is because the imperialist States have fomented conflicts - local and between States - with the avowed intention of undermining the sovereignty of the independent countries of the region.

As a country which has fearlessly fought in defence of its independence, and as a nation which has resisted numerous acts of aggression and encroachments by the forces of colonialism and expansionism, Ethiopia will continue to make any sacrifice to defend its territorial integrity, national unity and independence. That proud country will be the last to yield to the dictates of an imperialist Power. With similar zeal Ethiopia will endeavour to contribute its share to the maintenance of regional peace and security and to the fostering of the spirit of good-neighbourliness in the north-eastern part of Africa.

Finally, let me reiterate Ethiopia's total commitment to the cause of international peace and security and its unswerving commitment to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. AL-ALFI (Democratic Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): The recent commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations served to underscore the importance of the maintenance of international peace and security and to confirm the re-commitment of Member States to upholding the principles of the United Nations Charter and realizing the legitimate aspirations of their peoples to peace and security after long suffering as a result of destructive, bloody wars. Member States have called for genuine efforts to strengthen the role and effectiveness of the United Nations in the peaceful settlement of international disputes and for effective measures to resolve the dangerous international
situation and to strengthen international security in response to the aspiration of our peoples to peace and security.

Those appeals were not made without reason. They reflect the grave concern of the world's peoples at the dangerous situation, at the increase in hotbeds of tension and in confrontation between States, at the unprecedented spiral of the arms race—especially the nuclear arms race—and at the entrenchment of aggressive policies based on nuclear deterrence and theories of limited nuclear war and on attempts to achieve military supremacy, endangering international peace and security and threatening man and civilization with extinction.

Civilization is threatened also by the trend seen in the policies and practices of certain imperialist Powers which are against the aspiration of peoples to freedom. Those Powers use or threaten the use of force, violate the territorial integrity and independence of States and frustrate the ambitions of peoples to achieve self-determination.

The failure of certain States—especially those bearing a special responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security—to evince the necessary political will has prevented the United Nations from meeting the hopes and expectations pinned on it as regards the enhancement of international peace, and it is wrong to ascribe the situation to any inability of the Organization to play its assigned role. Those States also obstruct full implementation of the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and have worked ceaselessly to hamper the work of the United Nations—particularly the Security Council through abuse of the right of veto contrary to the interests of peoples struggling for freedom and independence. Thus they prevent the adoption of measures and imposition of sanctions under the Charter to end the racist, aggressive and expansionist policies pursued against independent countries and struggling peoples.
Adding to our concern is the fact that those States have begun pursuing a policy of State terrorism aimed at undermining the socio-political systems of other States that have chosen the path of political, economic and social development that is opposed to imperialism, colonialism, racism and Zionism. To that end, those States use their political, military, economic and propaganda power to undermine the sovereignty and independence of others by various means, including military action, the planning of direct or indirect acts of aggression, the imposition of economic embargoes, the planning and financing of acts of economic sabotage and ferocious propaganda campaigns. Nicaragua is an example of a small country that is the target of such aggressive policies.

Those policies and practices pursued by imperialist States on flimsy pretexts add to our concern, especially as they are based on claims of undefined security needs which lead them not only to dispatch their fleets thousands of miles from their own shores to threaten the stability and security of independent States, but also to establish or expand military bases in various parts of the world, carry out military manoeuvres close to our borders and shores, and create special forces for military intervention in other States. In fact, those policies and practices aim at taking our peoples back to the colonial era, imposing hegemony over our industrial capabilities and plundering our natural resources.

In view of all that, it is not surprising that the racist régimes in South Africa and Israel have the support of the imperialist Powers in carrying out their acts of oppression and annihilation against the Palestinian, Namibian and South African peoples. Nor is it surprising that Israel's repeated acts of aggression against the Arab States, the latest of which was its raid on Tunisia, and the acts of aggression perpetrated by the South African régime against the African States win the support, blessing and encouragement of the imperialist Powers.
We repeat our conviction that international peace and security can be strengthened only through the achievement of justice, disarmament and the universal application of the principles of peaceful coexistence, completion of the process of eliminating colonialism, and the democratization of international relations and co-operation on an equal footing. That requires a pooling of efforts to put an end to all acts that are contrary to the Charter and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (resolution 2625 (XXV)) and to promote the policy of peaceful coexistence and co-operation between States, irrespective of their social and political systems, their size or their geographic position.

The implementation of those principles calls for complete and general disarmament, under effective international controls, and for the redeployment, to meet development needs, of the enormous resources at present being wasted on increasing nuclear arsenals and accelerating the arms race and extending it to outer space. It also implies that States must make a strict commitment to the Charter, refrain from intervening in the internal affairs of other States, completely renounce the policy of State terrorism aimed at destabilizing independent States and undermining their socio-political systems and support the struggle of people for freedom and the achievement of their right to self-determination.

The democratization of international relations will undoubtedly help to consolidate the independence of States and assist them in their efforts to increase the prosperity of their peoples and develop their economies. In view of the widening economic gap between the industrial capitalist countries and the developing countries, and the fact that the latter are deprived of equitable, effective participation in international economic relations, the realization of
peace and security for all the peoples of the world requires that the industrial capitalist countries give up their arrogant positions and work towards eliminating that gap. They should start meaningful, serious negotiations with a view to achieving adequate, equitable solutions to international economic crises and restructuring international economic relations which were imposed at a time of inequitable international situations. That should be done in a way that guarantees the genuine development of the developing countries and the establishment of a new international economic order.

International security is a common responsibility, and efforts must be pooled in order to achieve it. The picture today may seem dim, but we still hope that it will be possible to strengthen international security through the only adequate machinery available to us - the United Nations. Those who view matters solely in the light of their own selfish, narrow security interests must come to recognize that giving up that narrow perspective and their destructive policies is a sine qua non if our peoples desire for peace and security is to be realized.

Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic): Fifteen years ago, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. At the time of its adoption, legitimate hopes and expectations were raised among peace-loving and justice-loving peoples throughout the world. Unfortunately, when we look back at the course of events since then we have to admit, with much regret and concern, that the record of the implementation of that historically important document is in no way positive.
There is no need to say that what is of concern to the international community and the United Nations at the present time – as was borne out by almost all the Heads of participating delegations in their statements made during the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly and at the meeting commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of this universal Organization – is the deterioration of the international situation, responsibility for which resides in the policy of confrontation of the most aggressive circles of imperialism which have embarked on and continue to conduct an unbridled arms race, in particular a nuclear-arms race. Our country maintains that these imperialist circles must abandon their irrational and immoral dream of obtaining military superiority over the socialistic countries, which are more than ever determined to preserve at all cost the current approximate military and strategic parity between the two military blocs. That is the root cause of the present deterioration of the world situation into tension that generates a serious threat to the peace and security of peoples in the various regions of our world.

In southern Africa, for example, with the multifaceted political, economic and military support given South Africa by one imperialist super-Power through its policy of so-called constructive engagement, as well as by some of its allies, the illegal racist Pretoria régime is continuing to use its diabolical machinery of repression against the oppressed people of South Africa and to commit acts of military and economic aggression against neighbouring independent countries, namely, Angola and Mozambique, and to delay the process of granting speedy and unconditional independence to Namibia in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In the Middle East, the Israeli Zionist régime, with the increased political, military and economic support of one imperialist super-Power, its strategic ally,
and other Western military circles, is with impunity continuing its acts of aggression against the Palestinian and Arab peoples in the territories it has occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, and its other acts of aggression and occupation against certain Middle East countries, such as Syria and Lebanon.

Laos, like the international community, is strongly of the view that, the question of Palestine being a fundamental element in any settlement of the Middle East conflict, it is necessary to convene as soon as possible an international peace conference on the Middle East in accordance with the spirit and letter of the relevant resolution of the General Assembly. Equally reprehensible has been the recent Zionist air attack on Tunis.

If we turn to the region of Central America and the Caribbean, we see that the threat posed by the policy of provocation, intervention and aggression pursued by the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) against the peace, security, independence, sovereign and territorial integrity of revolutionary Nicaragua, as well as against socialist Cuba, is being intensified and even worsened. It goes without saying that such a policy of the present United States Administration runs counter to the purposes and principles of our Charter as well as the relevant Declarations of the General Assembly, in particular those relating to the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States. The Lao Government has spared no effort in actively supporting the peace endeavours being made with regard to Central America by the Contadora Group as well as by other Latin American countries.

Equally reprehensible are the activities of destabilization and subversion being carried out daily by imperialist, expansionist and regional reactionary forces against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, an independent and sovereign country and member of the Non-Aligned Movement.
In the region of the Indian Ocean, as is known, the strengthening of the United States air and naval base of Diego Garcia poses a serious threat to the peace, independence and security of the countries and peoples bordering that region as well as to the hinterland States. Laos, together with the international community, strongly urges the speedy convening of an international conference on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

As members here know, South-East Asia has for many decades now not enjoyed peace and security. Since the founding of the Lao People's Democratic Republic in December 1975, the tenth anniversary of which was widely celebrated at home last Monday, the Lao people, like the fraternal Kampuchean and Vietnamese peoples, have just one heartfelt aspiration, that is, to live in peace, understanding and co-operation with all peoples of the world, and in particular with their neighbours, without distinction as to political or social systems, in order to reconstruct their country so brutally devastated by the war of imperialist aggression and to build a new happy and prosperous life. But unfortunately those legitimate wishes of the three peoples of Indo-China clash with the desires of those very forces of expansionism and hegemonism acting hand in glove with the imperialist and international and regional forces that dream of dominating South-East Asia.

Those forces are still bent on driving a wedge between the three Indo-Chinese countries, on the one hand, and the six countries members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), on the other. We are pleased, as I said last month in a plenary meeting, to note that positive steps have been taken to bring us closer together. We are convinced that the spirit and the letter of the communiqué of the Eleventh Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, held on 16 August this year in Phnom Penh, the capital of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, constitute a
good basis for solving the problem relating to peace, stability and co-operation in that region of the globe.

As for relations between my country and Thailand, our neighbour, some important questions are still pending. My Government has already reiterated to the Thai Government that it is prepared to negotiate with it at any time, in Bangkok or in Vientiane, in order to ensure strict implementation of the joint Lao-Thai communiqués of 1979 establishing the basis for harmonious relations between our two countries. We hope that the Thai Government will respond positively to our constructive proposal. It goes without saying that settlement of those bilateral relations will particularly contribute towards the strengthening of peace, security and co-operation in the region.

Nobody can deny the fact that only through détente disarmament, confidence-building and international co-operation can a durable peace in the world be achieved. This is true, of course, of the European continent. In this respect, my country reiterates its support for the consistent position reaffirmed at the recent meeting at Sofia by the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty "in favour of ridding the whole of Europe of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons". (A/C.1/40/7, p. 5)

The Lao Government, like the international community at large, attaches paramount importance to the summit meeting just concluded between General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and President Reagan. It is true that the world community has not been completely satisfied with the outcome of that summit.
In this connection, I should like to echo the assessment made by Kaysone Phomvihane, General Secretary of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, Le Duan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Viet Nam, and Heng Samrin, General Secretary of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea, during their meeting held three days ago at Vientiane on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the founding of the Lao People's Democratic Republic. In strongly reaffirming their fullest support for Soviet peace initiatives aimed at halting the nuclear-arms race on Earth and preventing its spreading to outer space, the three leaders said:

"The Geneva summit opened up a new era of dialogue and created good conditions for peoples struggling for peace, national independence and social progress. The United States should no longer seek to obtain military superiority over the Soviet Union, but rather contribute to bringing about the possibility of consolidating peace."

Mr. MAHOUB (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Iraq has always been greatly interested in, and wishes now to state its views on, the three agenda items before us today: "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region", "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security" and "Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security". The objectives reflected in those items are of particular urgency in the light of the current dangerous world situation, which threatens the very survival of mankind. It is imperative that the international community take concerted action to face up to that threat.
We are particularly concerned at the continuing arms race in the fields of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, conventional weapons and weapons with indiscriminate effects. The entire international community has become concerned that the arms race may no longer be limited to Earth but threatens to spread to outer space through the militarization of space. This gives rise to suspicion and rivalry among States and the wasting of the resources and the economic and financial potential of countries, which would be better used to eliminate famine, repay debts and ensure economic and social progress throughout the world. Peace, security and disarmament cannot be viewed separately from economic and social development.

My delegation hopes that this Committee's debates on the important items before it will make an effective contribution to strengthening the role of the United Nations to enable it to fulfil its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and to a restoration of confidence in this Organization's ability to re-establish a high level of peace and justice.

There are many hotbeds of tension and war in the world. Acts of aggression of all kinds continue against the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of States, along with persistent foreign intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States.

The situation in the Mediterranean continues to deteriorate because of outstanding crises, and is a cause of grave concern. Therefore, Iraq fully supports the declaration of the Mediterranean as a zone of peace, security and co-operation, free of armed conflict, naval forces and nuclear weapons. But how can that be done so long as Israel, which possesses nuclear weapons, continues its aggressive expansionist policies in the region, making it one of the most explosive and sensitive areas of the world? There is, of course, a direct geographic and
strategic link between the security of the Mediterranean region and that of the Middle East. Those two regions will never know peace and security until Israel withdraws totally and unconditionally from all occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and until the Palestinian people, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), its sole, legitimate representative, is enabled to exercise its inalienable right to self-determination and to establish an independent sovereign State in the land of Palestine, with Jerusalem as its capital.

The Zionist entity not only tramples under foot the human rights of the population of the Palestinian and other Arab territories, but persists in international terrorism in the neighbourhood of the occupied Palestinian territories. We cite as examples the brutal, treacherous attack against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon and — even further from Tel Aviv — the aggression by Israeli armed forces against the territorial integrity of Tunisia two months ago and the act of aggression against Iraq's peaceful nuclear reactor in 1981.

There is no difference between these Israeli practices and the practices of the racist régime of South Africa and its attitude to the peoples of Namibia and the rest of southern Africa. The Pretoria régime practises terrorism against the Namibian people, including executions, acts of violence against African citizens and attempts to murder members of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). The racist régime engages in inhuman practices not only against the people of Namibia, but against other neighbouring African countries, as demonstrated most recently by the perfidious attack against Angola last September, at the time of Israel's attack against the brother country of Tunisia. Iraq reaffirms its support for the statement on the questions of Namibia and South Africa made by the Foreign Ministers at a meeting of the non-aligned countries in Luanda in September 1985.
To restore peace and security to Africa it will be necessary to make serious, effective efforts to eliminate the growing military arsenal of the South African régime and its nuclear potential, to free the oppressed people of South Africa and to put an end to the suffering of the Namibian people, so that it may be accede to freedom and independence under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole, legitimate representative.
(Mr. Mahboub, Iraq)

Security and peace in Africa and Asia require as a fundamental measure that pressure be exerted on the Pretoria and Tel Aviv régimes to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty and open their nuclear activities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Iraq wishes to reaffirm its deep conviction that it is necessary to take practical and concrete measures to implement the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and to ensure respect for the littoral States, guarantee their territorial integrity, non-interference in their internal affairs, denuclearization of the Indian Ocean and elimination of all weapons of mass destruction in the region, thus protecting it from rivalry among the super-Powers. The increased military presence in the region adds an element of urgency to the need swiftly to carry out the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. This is why my delegation hopes that a conference on the Indian Ocean will be held as soon as possible next year, pursuant to the resolution adopted at the last session of the General Assembly.

Consideration of the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter are of fundamental importance during this session not only because of our celebration of the Organization's fortieth anniversary but also because this session coincides with the fifteenth anniversary of the adoption in 1970 by the General Assembly of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security in resolution 2734 (XXV). There is no doubt that continuing armed conflicts and the aggressive expansionist policies are due to the fact that the principles of the Declaration - the need to settle international disputes through peaceful means, through negotiation, conciliation, mediation, arbitration and the good offices and efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations - have not been respect or carried out. The Declaration also stresses the prohibition of States engaging in terrorism and the inciting or participation in such acts; and I should like to
remind members of General Assembly resolution 36/103, which speaks of the inadmissibility of foreign intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States.

It goes without saying that the United Nations has during its first 40 years done much for the world by speeding up the decolonization process and guaranteeing human rights through various economic and social measures, through technical, health and other information. We know that the United Nations cannot do more than its Member States wish, but it is also true that the First Committee must consider implementation of the objectives of the United Nations in the field of maintenance of international peace and security. Achievement of these goals by this Organization is not yet at the level of or consonant with the potential contained in the Charter regarding the maintenance of international peace and security. It is regrettable to note that there are many focal points of tension in the world and that the number of areas of conflict remains the same despite the fact that we have reaffirmed that our weakness is that international disputes are not being settled by peaceful means. States have made eloquent speeches on this matter but have not made any serious effort to avoid armed conflict so as to protect their own selfish self-interests. No effort has been made by States to respect the provisions of Security Council resolutions which must be implemented under Article 26 of our Charter. It is regrettable that there is one State which continues to reject implementation of Security Council resolutions, even those that are unanimously adopted, not that that State opposes this or that paragraph or that it prefers to use other means peacefully to settle conflicts, but simply because it rejects resolutions of the Security Council whenever the latter tries to restore peace. This blatant challenge to the will of the international community obviously requires concerted efforts on its part, increased solidarity and respect for the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter in order for it to deal with these violations of the Charter.
To conclude we must stress that the world does not expect fresh resolutions or international documents from us for the settlement of international disputes and the restoration of peace. We have enough documents on that score. What the world expects from us is bold and practical initiatives that would make possible implementation of collective security provisions of the Charter, strengthen the credibility of the United Nations so that the Security Council, which has up until now been paralysed, can start taking measures provided for in the Charter, for implementation of its resolutions, to restore international peace and security and prosperity for the international community and to prevent new wars for mankind as a whole.

Mr. SHAKER (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): In considering the items currently before the First Committee, we found it necessary to concentrate on the increased threat to international security. The deterioration of the international situation in the wake of the huge arms race following the Second World War, and in particular its nuclear aspect, as well as the concomitant stockpiling of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, have all made the spectre of an unlimited world catastrophe loom large over mankind.
(Mr. Shaker, Egypt)

The policies of massive arms build-ups and the inability of the United Nations to fulfil its mandate properly, as well as the increased resort to force in international relations in terms of policies of invasion and occupation, have all given the impression - not, unfortunately, erroneous - that such is the order of the day in our contemporary world and that we must accept it. However, we say, "Enough is enough." Today, 40 years after the founding of the United Nations, as we look back over the four decades of the world Organization's life and analyse both the positive and negative aspects of its performance, we must admit that it has not been fully successful in carrying out the noble role to which the peoples of our world committed themselves in undertaking to achieve the aspirations of the peoples of the United Nations for the establishment of a secure and stable world.

The present world crisis is not only one of confidence; it is also a crisis of apprehension at what might result from the current international flashpoints and disputes and the resulting increased tension in international relations. On that basis, it is essential to ensure that such disputes are dealt with, in terms of conciliation and negotiation, not confrontation. Egypt believes it is important to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security and in the solving of international disputes. Two years ago, in his address to the General Assembly, President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt put forward the idea of a review and appraisal of the international situation in all its aspects within the framework of the United Nations with a view to establishing a new international order in which justice, peace and prosperity would reign. At the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, Egypt proposed a thorough evaluation of the international political system, of the role of the United Nations and of its effectiveness in the maintenance of international peace and security. While exercising its historical choice, Egypt has been and will continue to be in favour of enhancing the capabilities of the United Nations and its development as a
guardian of peace and a framework for coexistence between peoples and nations. In Egypt's view, the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter will continue to be the guarantee for the independence of developing and newly independent peoples and the reaffirmation of their sovereignty under international law.

The delegation of Egypt believes that the creation of a climate of greater trust and understanding among States can only be achieved through the consolidation of the collective security system enshrined in the Charter and through the full implementation of its provisions. The Charter gives the Security Council a central role in that system and in the maintenance of international peace and security. We support the strengthening of the role of the Council in that regard and, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt stated at the Council's meeting on 26 September 1985:

"Among the practical and vital methods to enhance the effectiveness of the Council - in addition to the presence of political will and collective conduct - is that vast spectrum of mechanisms available to the Council in tackling situations and conflicts that may threaten international peace and security." (S/PV.2608, p. 84-85)

The Egyptian Minister for Foreign Affairs continued:

"Those varied forms of mechanisms available to the Council will be enriched and made more effective by updating and rationalizing the Council's rules of procedure, which, despite their adoption 40 years ago, remain provisional and not comprehensive or final. The time has come to update them and make them flexible enough to meet the requirements of international relations, taking into account the experience acquired over the years." (p. 86) Egypt intends to submit to the Security Council, in an informal working paper, a specific proposal with the aim of achieving, through informed consultations in
the Council, a rationalization and modernization of the Council's rules of procedure and methods of work in order to make it more effective and to enable it to shoulder its responsibilities opportunistly, taking into account the proposals made by the Secretary-General in his reports on the work of the Organization from 1982 to 1985. We believe those proposals to be objective, profound and frank in dealing with the shortcomings of the Council and of the Organization as a whole because of the lack of an effective system of collective security. The Council has, indeed, examined some of these ideas over the past three years in informal consultations, but it has not yet achieved full agreement on the method of implementing the proposed reforms. Last year, in a note by the President, the Security Council reaffirmed its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and its responsibility for the prevention of international disputes. The Council also reaffirmed the powers and duties entrusted to it under the United Nations Charter.

The Final Political Declaration of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries held at Luanda on 7 September 1985 reaffirms that the only way to resolve international disputes is through dialogue, through multilateral negotiations within the framework of the United Nations. Consequently, as we said earlier, the effectiveness of the Organization must be strengthened. At the same time, while speaking of multilateral forums, we would like to refer to the ray of hope, piercing an overcast sky, provided by the bilateral negotiations at Geneva at the summit meeting between the leaders of the United States of America and the Soviet Union. We welcome that meeting and its results, however limited they may be, because they constitute a glimmer of hope, particularly if we look on the positive side of the joint communiqué issued after the meeting concerning the subjects dealt with, such as the agreement to increase efforts, through bilateral disarmament negotiations, to bring about a 50 per cent reduction in strategic
nuclear weapons, in spite of the fact that a definition has not yet been agreed upon, as well as the agreement reached to discuss an interim agreement on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe and to intensify bilateral negotiations on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of their stockpiles.
I had the honour to be Chairman of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which successfully concluded its work with the adoption of a consensus Final Declaration. Egypt welcomes the constructive way in which the positive results of the Review Conference and the non-proliferation régime were studied at the Summit Meeting. It also welcomes the agreement between the two Powers to try to persuade more States to accede to the Treaty. We also welcome the affirmation of the commitment to conduct negotiations in good faith concerning matters pertaining to the limitation of nuclear weapons and disarmament, in accordance with article VI of the Treaty. Egypt believes that that is a positive result of the meeting between the two leaders. We believe that the meeting was a step in the right direction, to be complemented by the bilateral negotiations to be resumed in January next year on the limitation of strategic and medium-range weapons, as well as by the negotiations between the two super-Powers on the arms race in outer space.

We earnestly hope that the negotiations will be conducted in good faith and will result in effective agreements as soon as possible, in accordance with the wishes of the international community expressed, inter alia, in numerous General Assembly resolutions adopted in previous years as well as in the resolutions to be adopted this year and the declarations of the Non-Aligned Movement and its leaders.

Egypt, which is situated in the heart of the Arab world, in North Africa and on the southern coast of the Mediterranean, welcomes the inclusion of the item on the strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region in our Committee's agenda for the third year. Egypt reaffirms that the region's security embraces that of the adjacent regions. My delegation stands by paragraph 3 of the Valletta Final Declaration of 1984 (A/39/526), reaffirming the sovereign rights of the peoples of the region, and paragraph 15, reaffirming the principles of
sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, security, non-intervention and non-interference. Our aim in singling out certain paragraphs is to point out that Egypt, as a non-aligned country of the region, has always renounced policies of the use of force or the threat of force, has always opposed attempts at blockade, embargo and interference in the internal affairs of other States and has always warned against those attempts and opposed those who carried them out. Egypt has always retained its decision-making independence and freedom of action. It has paid dearly, even in the form of its livelihood and resources, to maintain its sovereignty and the choice of its own destiny. We say frankly and unequivocally that that is our approach.

The Egyptian delegation deeply regrets the contents of the letter of 29 November this year (A/40/959) to the Secretary-General from the representative of a Mediterranean coastal Arab State, under the agenda item entitled "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region". Egypt does not intend to enter into sterile political polemics. The letter is devoid of any meaningful content and does not deserve an answer by us now. It repeats allegations that have been proved to be groundless. My delegation will confine itself to that comment, especially after the declarations of the highest Egyptian officials reaffirming that Egypt, as an African-Arab State, would find it impossible to infringe the territory of an African or Arab brother.

On the other hand, the security of one of the non-aligned countries in the Mediterranean region has been seriously violated. Egypt has already condemned Israel's brutal act of aggression against our brother country of Tunisia. It was a flagrant violation of all the norms of international law and the principles of the Charter, and open defiance of the international community, by which it has been widely condemned.
(Mr. Shaker, Egypt)

We must point out that the security of the Middle East is linked to the security of the Mediterranean. On that basis, we believe that the question of the Middle East continues to be a great threat to peace and security at the regional and international levels, in view of the continued policy of aggression, expansion and occupation pursued by Israel. We repeat that the question of Palestine is the core of the Middle East question. Israel's immediate, unconditional and complete withdrawal from the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories of the West Bank, Gaza, Jerusalem, the Syrian Golan Heights and southern Lebanon is needed for the achievement of a just and comprehensive peaceful settlement, guaranteeing the rights of all those concerned and meeting the needs of legitimacy and justice, and based on a commitment to international instruments and conventions.

Without a solution to the question of Palestine there can be no lasting, just peace in the region. Therefore, the Palestinian people must exercise its inalienable rights, under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), its sole legitimate representative, including its right to self-determination, without external interference, and the right to establish its own State on its own soil. In that connection, we also demand Israel's complete withdrawal from Lebanon, in accordance with United Nations resolutions. We demand that the warmongers allow Lebanon to decide its own future by itself and give it a chance to solve its problems without external interference.

The continuation of the status quo in the Middle East and the extension of aggression to Tunisia affect security and co-operation in the two regions. As a contribution to the reduction of tension in the Middle East and the world, Egypt has taken the initiative in calling for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Last year the First Committee for the first time adopted
by consensus a resolution on the establishment of such a zone. It also gave a role to the Secretary-General and the United Nations. Replies have started to reach the Secretary-General from some of the parties concerned, whose opinions on the establishment of the zone had been requested. We hope that, in accordance with what is to be in this year's resolution, the Secretary-General will complete his task, and that all the States concerned will put forward practical ideas to guarantee the establishment of the zone through the use of United Nations machinery. Indeed, Egypt firmly believes that the United Nations must play an important central role in all stages of the establishment of the zone, since it bears the primary responsibility in disarmament matters, in accordance with Articles 11 and 26 of the Charter, and for the maintenance of international peace and security.
(Mr. Shaker, Egypt)

The international community is undoubtedly suffering from the imposition of policies of force and zones of influence. There is a long list of crises in the world that are posing a threat to international peace and security. The Luanda Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries called for the restoration of the sovereignty, independence and freedom of all countries and peoples under foreign occupation, whether in South-West Asia, Afghanistan or South-East Asia, including Kampuchea.

Egypt also takes a keen interest in peace and security in Cyprus, with guarantees of the unity, integrity and non-aligned status of Cyprus.

The escalating acts of oppression and denial of human rights in South Africa are proof of the bankruptcy of the inhuman apartheid system there. It is also an indication of the beginning of the end of that régime. Its occupation of Namibia must end, through the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), so that the Namibian people can regain their sovereignty over their resources, which the Pretoria régime is using to consolidate itself. It is inconceivable that the United Nations should be prevented from shouldering its responsibilities towards a Territory directly under its jurisdiction, as is the case in Namibia.

Solving the problems of the hotbeds of tension in the Middle East, Africa, Asia and Central America would give a great impetus to the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and its principles, particularly since 15 years have passed since its adoption. Those principles govern international relations and provide for the resolution of disputes by peaceful means, as well as reaffirming the inadmissibility of interference in the internal affairs of other States.
(Mr. Shaker, Egypt)

In paragraph 250 of the Luanda Final Political Declaration of 7 November 1985 the non-aligned countries reaffirm the importance of the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security and the settlement of international crises and disputes by peaceful means. As a founding member of the Non-Aligned Movement and as a member of the Security Council, Egypt believes that the political will of the permanent members of the Council is the key element in the Organization's success or failure in shouldering its responsibilities. Egypt calls upon those members not to subject the role of the United Nations to their crisis of confidence. The solution would be the renunciation by the permanent members of the policies of confrontation and the holding of constructive negotiations in good faith to solve the problems before the Council.

Egypt believes that the Non-Aligned Movement has a part to play in consolidating the role of the United Nations. Our Movement has supported the Organization since its inception. Since then it has expanded, and its expansion reflects the credibility of the principles and basic truths that we believe in, and preshadows a future free from polarization and alignments, in a world resolved to co-operate for development, and not for the stockpiling of weapons, for life and not for mass destruction.

Egypt bases its policies on the belief that the confrontation between East and West is pushing humanity to the brink of catastrophe, and Egypt is convinced that peace among States cannot be achieved through the consolidation of military blocs. Our only possible choice is to continue the work of our Non-Aligned Movement, whatever the obstacles and pitfalls, so as to achieve a better future through the work of the United Nations, which has been contributing effectively to the socio-economic progress of all countries and peoples. We hope that the Organization will continue, despite the obstacles, to maintain international peace and security and achieve a degree of international détente in coming years that
will lead to the promotion of the system of collective security and consequently to the consolidation of the role and mechanisms of the Organization.

We must depend on dialogue and consensus, as embodied in the philosophy of the Non-Aligned Movement. Let us renounce the use of force to solve international problems. Egypt will continue along the path of strict, unshakeable commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter as the sole framework for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): Consideration of the question of the review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security coincides this year with the observance of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the fifteenth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration. This provides us with an opportunity to review the achievements, as well as the failures and shortcomings, of the work of the Organization, primarily in carrying out its basic function—the maintenance of peace and the promotion of security in the world.

In the past 40 years the world has undergone enormous changes. The United Nations has been an integral part of these changes, influencing them and changing itself in the process. The struggle of peoples for liberation from colonial rule—has been led and almost completed under the auspices, and with the assistance, of the United Nations.

In the past few decades the world Organization has made a great contribution to the maintenance of peace and security in the world. A new awareness of the interdependent character of the world and the need to solve questions of interest to all multilaterally has been increasing in the Organization. The basis of an international strategy for general and complete disarmament has been initiated and established here, as has the concept of the new international economic order.
Ideals of peace and progress have also been defined here. Above all, the United Nations has given full affirmation to the independence, sovereignty and self-determination of peoples.

Those accomplishments, as well as the emergence on the world scene of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the policy of non-alignment, have narrowed the scope for the use of force and the policy of domination. However, the period in question has had its disappointments and unfulfilled expectations. International peace and security, the self-determination of peoples, the sovereign equality of countries and unhampered development have constantly been in serious jeopardy. The achievements of mankind are not yet accessible to all. Many peoples the world over are deprived of the basic opportunities for development and even the means of existence. All are living in the ever-darker shadow of nuclear catastrophe. Never in the past have there been so many obvious problems, nor has the discrepancy between old relations and new requirements been so large.

Instances of the threat or use of force, intervention and interference in the internal affairs of others are manifold, together with the most diverse forms of the violation of the freedom and independence of States and the denial of the right of peoples to self-determination. The most frequent and direct victims of this situation are small and medium-sized non-aligned and other developing countries, which are often forced to exhaust their resources in order to ensure their sovereignty and territorial integrity, rather than to invest them in development and prosperity.

That is precisely why the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries recently emphasized that the limitation and reduction of the military activities of great Powers and the blocs beyond their boundaries would constitute an important element in the strengthening of the security of non-aligned countries. The Foreign
Ministers therefore expressed their conviction that the gradual military disengagement of the great Powers and their military alliances from various parts of the world should be promoted.

The widening of the gap between the developed and developing countries has been followed by attempts to impose new forms of subjugation and domination. The problem of debts and their servicing is becoming increasingly difficult, and threatens the economic independence and political stability of developing countries.
The arms race is continuing unabated and is being extended to new parts of the world and even to space.

No real progress has been made in resolving crises. Not only are they not being resolved, but the flame of conflagration, fuelled by new sources of confrontation, is engulfing new areas. The crisis in the Middle East has plagued international relations for almost four decades, constantly threatening to degenerate into a conflict of broader dimensions. This is particularly dangerous in that sensitive region of the world. Two decades after the United Nations assumed special responsibility for Namibia, the Namibian people has not yet achieved freedom and independence, despite the fact that the plan for its accession to independence is clear, concrete and generally accepted.

The international community and the United Nations have provided platforms for political solutions of other crises in the world, from southern Africa to Lebanon, Cyprus, Iran and Iraq, Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Korea and Central America. These platforms are known, have been repeatedly pointed out and are generally accepted, but efforts to put them into effect continue to be impeded.

The negative factors characterizing the present international situation are inevitably reflected in the activity of the United Nations. There are persistent attempts to erode multilateralism and to sidetrack the world Organization and solve major outstanding issues in the narrow circle of the most powerful. In the present international conditions it is necessary to take resolute and concrete measures with a view to achieving the objectives of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

In the present nuclear age and our interdependent world it is more true than ever before that international peace is one and indivisible. There is no international security - nor can there be - without equal security for all countries and peoples. The security of some cannot be ensured at the expense of the security of others. The destiny of the world cannot be decided in a narrow
circle of States; questions of common interest should be discussed and solved by countries big and small, primarily through the United Nations and under its auspices.

The best guarantee of the security of any State and the world at large is full respect for independence, sovereignty, self-determination, territorial integrity and the free choice of development, together with strict adherence to the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. The violation of those principles is unjustifiable and unacceptable under any circumstances.

Hence, the ever more urgent task is to strengthen the United Nations and make it a genuine centre for harmonizing the efforts of all nations with a view to realizing the purposes and principles of the United Nations, as set forth in Article 1 of the basic document of the Organization. One of those basic goals is the creation of conditions for the safeguarding and strengthening of international peace and security.

Freedom and independence, equality, development, disarmament and a world free of blocs are at the core of the policy of non-alignment. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries is, therefore, by its very nature, against all forms of dependence, intervention, interference, aggression and occupation and against the division of the world into spheres of influence.

At their recent Ministerial Conference in Luanda, Angola, the non-aligned countries, which have always attached exceptional importance to questions of international security, accorded top priority to those matters. The Ministers reaffirmed that there was no viable alternative to co-operation among States and their peaceful coexistence, regardless of their political, economic and social system, size or geographical location. Détente, in order to be durable, must be universal and comprehensive and open to universal participation, in the interest of
all States. Only such détente can lead to equitable and meaningful solutions to key problems and provide the basis for lasting peace. The Ministers emphasized that the non-aligned countries should play an active role and participate in this process on an equal footing and continue to make a constructive contribution, in the interest of the entire international community.

Many proposals have been made and many actions begun in the last 40 years with a view to promoting the work of the United Nations and improving its effectiveness and efficiency. We are convinced that the role of the United Nations in international relations can be strengthened only through joint efforts to bring negotiations on vital world questions, including security, back before the competent forums of the United Nations and to ensure international co-operation on the broadest bases.

The role of the United Nations organs dealing with international security, and primarily the vote of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Secretary-General, should be strengthened in connection with monitoring crises, taking preventive action and settling disputes by peaceful means, as well as in the management of those crises that require urgent attention and in taking effective measures for the restoration of peace and security, including those envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter.

As a European country, Yugoslavia attaches particular importance to the process of security and co-operation on that continent. On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, European countries displayed a great desire for and interest in the continuation of this process. We are confident that, with the necessary degree of political will, the ongoing negotiations within the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe can provide the impetus for the halting of the arms race and the relaxation of tension in that part of the world.
Initiatives for the establishment of zones of peace and co-operation, particularly in those areas where the confrontation of the blocs is direct and their military presence more concentrated, enjoy our full support. We support the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. Yugoslavia, together with the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, is in the forefront in the efforts to transform the Mediterranean into a region of genuine peace and co-operation.

Progress in disarmament is indispensable, as is the termination of the system of fear and domination, based on the build-up of arms and the stockpiling of nuclear weapons. It is also indispensable to ensure rapid economic development, particularly in developing countries, and to establish equitable and just economic relations. Dialogue and co-operation offer the only road to greater economic stability, and this is also in the interest of the developed world.

It is necessary to relieve the already complex international relations of the burden of crises such as those in the Middle East, southern Africa, Central America, South-West Asia and South-East Asia. It is obvious that solutions cannot be achieved or dangers to peace eliminated if there is not respect for the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence, the non-use of force, non-intervention and the right of each and every nation to self-determination and the free choice of its own development path, free from the presence of foreign troops, pressure and interference.

Present-day problems should be solved only by political means, through negotiations and on the basis of the principles of the Charter. We welcomed the resumption of the dialogue between the two major Powers. However, it must not be made a reason for slowing down or halting talks in the organs of multilateral negotiations. Negotiations outside the multilateral mechanism should be a useful complement to the negotiations within it.
The gravity of the situation confronting us calls for joint efforts by all the members of the international community to maintain world peace and security.

Antagonism and other contradictions must be surmounted in favour of joint action for peace, development and the well-being of mankind. We must rededicate ourselves to the hopes and convictions which we embraced at the birth of our Organization - that it is possible to maintain and strengthen peace on the basis of dialogue and peaceful coexistence between countries, irrespective of their size and military, economic or political might.

Concern over the state of affairs in the world has prevailed at this session, graced by the participation and presence of a record number of Heads of State or Government. However, adherence to the Charter and faith in the United Nations have not wavered. Despite all the difficulties and the attempts to erode the foundations of countless positive attainments, it has been proved once again that the United Nations is indispensable in matters of peace, security, disarmament and development.

Today the world is faced with great challenges. The historic responsibility assumed by the United Nations and all its Member States at the threshold of the fifth decade of the existence of the Organization is therefore even greater.

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

Mr. ISSACHAROFF (Israel): I wish to reply to the representative of Libya, who inundated the Committee this morning with accusations against my country, using the usual vernacular of his régime. Above all, the representative of Mr. Qaddafi's régime talks of:

"disregard of all international law and standards of international behaviour".

(A/C.1/40/PV.59, p. 21)
As in recent years the Libyan régime has continuously demonstrated the state of the art in disregarding international law, I should like to dwell briefly on his words.

Mr. Qaddafi has unreservedly supported and backed international terror world-wide, leading to the murder of innocent civilians, including citizens of my country, and even Libya's own dissident exiles in various parts of the world. Libya has repeatedly aided and abetted terrorist acts against civilian aviation, such as the latest hijacking of an Air Egypt aeroplane to Valletta, which led, once again, to the tragic death of innocent civilians. This presumably is not in disregard of international law, at least as far as Libya is concerned.

In addition, Libya has invaded and occupied significant parts of Chad; it interferes incessantly in the internal affairs of that country, and has supported insurgency against Tunisia and Niger, and has trained anti-Government rebels in southern Sudan. This, too, presumably is not in disregard of international law, under a Libyan interpretation.

If all that were not enough, the Libyan régime has abused and exploited diplomatic immunity under international law by supplying weapons through diplomatic channels to various terrorist groups supported and financed by Qaddafi. One of the most shocking instances of this blatant abuse resulted in the fatal shooting - from the Libyan Embassy - of a British policewoman in London last year. I am sure the Libyan representative will assure us that this also is not in disregard of international law.

On reflection, I suppose that as far as Mr. Qaddafi's régime is concerned these acts are not in disregard of international law, as they constitute the basic principles of that régime's raison d'être, the very tools of its statecraft. Indeed, how could one expect that a régime born in iniquity could act in any other way? It knows no better. One would, however, expect that Libya would at least not have the audacity to lecture others on respect for international law.
In addition, I should like to emphasize that the Government of Israel and it alone, is responsible for the security and legitimate self-defence of its borders and its citizens. Any contentions to the contrary by the Libyan representative are as baseless as the legitimacy of the régime he represents.

As to Israel's action against the PLO headquarters in Tunisia, to which some representatives have referred, I should like to emphasize that it was not directed against the territorial integrity or political independence of Tunisia. It constituted a legitimate act of self-defence against the terrorist PLO headquarters in Tunisia, which had initiated, planned, organized and launched hundreds of terrorist attacks against Israel, against Israeli targets outside Israel and against Jews everywhere. In the past year more than 600 such attacks have killed or severely wounded more than 75 Israeli civilians - men, women and children. Israel, like any other sovereign State, will not tolerate a state of affairs in which its citizens are attacked and murdered by terrorist groups with impunity. Similarly, no other State should tolerate, facilitate or sanction the planning and perpetration of such acts in or from its territory against other sovereign States.

I wish to make one final point. Israel has been accused of pursuing various policies that are not consonant with regional or peace and stability. I find it inappropriate and rather pointless that some States should see fit to attempt to inform the Committee about, or elaborate on, non-existent policies to which my country does not subscribe. As Israel's representative on the Committee, I should like to set the record straight. Israel is committed to peace. This has been clearly demonstrated by the peace treaty concluded between Israel and Egypt. Both countries entered the process in good faith and have striven to lay the foundations for a wider peace process in the area. Would Israel have withdrawn from Sinai, handed back important oilfields and dismantled strategic air bases if it had been pursuing the policies attributed to it by some speakers? Israel has proved that it
(Mr. Issacharoff, Israel)

will work for, and take tangible steps for, the realization of peace. I assure the Committee that Israel earnestly desires, and will continue to work for, the extension of the peace process.

Mr. MILAD (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): When is it a suitable time for the representative of the Zionist, racist, terrorist entity, led by the leaders of terrorist gangs that are inimical to humanity, justice and right, to speak of stability, peace and security, and international law? Does not the entity usurp the land of an innocent people, the Palestinian people, which has been afflicted by that hideous entity, which displaced a whole people, taking its properties, endangering the peace and security of its Arab neighbours and occupying part of their territory?

The answer to those questions is simple and self-evident. The Zionist, racist entity has allies that are also racists, so we do not expect of it anything but injustice, murder and more violence.

We have spoken on several occasions of the inhuman practices perpetrated by the entity and how it has threatened, and is still threatening, regional and international peace and security. The acts of genocide perpetrated by the entity against the Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples in Palestine, Lebanon and elsewhere all indicate the nature of the Zionist entity.
That entity's rejection of and non-compliance with United Nations resolutions - and especially those of the Security Council - is another manifestation of its defiance of the international will and its disregard for the United Nations Charter and for international law.

As to the previous speaker's remarks about my country and its alleged support of international terrorism, it is common knowledge that the so-called State of Israel has caused numerous problems and has placed many obstacles in the way of efforts to strengthen peace and security in the region. That speaker claimed that Libya had instigated the recent hijacking of an Egyptian aircraft. We have stated that Libya never has and never will commit such deeds. I would cite the fact that Israel has attacked Libyan civilian aircraft over the territory of Sinai with the loss of several lives.

As to his comments with regard to Chad, Tunisia, Sudan and other States, we wish to point out to him and to the other members of this Committee that the representative of the Zionist entity is not serving in this Committee as the defence lawyer for Tunisia, Sudan, Chad or any other country. On many occasions we have reaffirmed that Libya has not intervened in Chad, in Tunisia or anywhere else.

Mr. ADAM (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to clarify a number of points. When the representative of Israel spoke in exercise of his right of reply, in connection with this morning's statement by Libya, he mentioned my country. The representative of Israel stated that Libya has supported the rebels in southern Sudan. I wish to assure members of the Committee that relations between the Sudan and Libya are now based on good-neighbourliness and peaceful coexistence, and on Arab brotherhood. Libya supports no Sudanese elements whose views differ from those of the central authority of the country. What is happening in Sudan is a question to be decided by the Sudanese people alone.
Mr. SAID (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): My delegation is not familiar with the game of rights of reply and counter-rights of reply. It is not our policy or our habit to engage in such procedures.

However, I have just heard a statement that the aggression of which my country was the victim on 1 October 1985 was not an attack on our territorial integrity and independence. When military aircraft violate the air-space of a country, bomb sites close to its capital and close to civilians, drop their bombs, cause over 100 casualties, including the deaths of civilians – innocent men, women, and children – and cause considerable material damage, how can anyone say that was not an attack against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of that country? I wonder then how such actions should be defined. I shall not dwell on the subject, but shall content myself with noting that at that time the international community gave its own verdict; that the Security Council took a stand on the matter, and clearly and unanimously condemned that aggression.

I refer those who consider this kind of action as normal to the verdict handed down by the international community.

Mr. TOROU (Chad) (interpretation from French): The representative of Libya has just stated with his habitual mendacity that there are no Libyan troops in Chad and that Chad is not occupied. Unfortunately, the opposite has just been confirmed by a dispatch issued this morning by the most authoritative source: the Libyan Head of State. That dispatch stated that

"Mr. Muammar Qaddafi, the leader of the Libyan revolution, stated on Thursday at Dakar that he was prepared to convert those troops in Chad into a buffer force."

I should like to know by what right Libya can send troops into Chad. Or are they tourists, as we are given to understand? As we view the presence of those troops in a sovereign State, it definitely constitutes an occupation. We shall not dwell on the point; the facts are well known to all.
Mr. MILAD (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to make it clear that I have no intention of engaging in polemics to reply to the representative of Chad. We have repeatedly affirmed that we have not interfered in the affairs of Chad and that we have no forces in Chad.

Mr. TOROU (Chad) (interpretation from French): I too am loath to engage in polemics, for we know that the foreign policy of Libya is in general based upon conspiracy and lies. We shall therefore press the point no further.

The CHAIRMAN: At tomorrow morning's meeting, the Committee will begin to take action upon draft resolutions on international security agenda items: draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.86, L.87 and L.88.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean having completed its work, we shall also be able to take action upon the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

I call now on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/40/L.87, Mali; and A/C.1/40/L.88, Zambia.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.