



President: Mr. Imre HOLLAI (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear an address by the President of the United Mexican States. On behalf of the General Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations Mr. José López Portillo, President of the United Mexican States, and to invite him to address the Assembly.

2. Mr. LÓPEZ PORTILLO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, it gives us great satisfaction that the President of this thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly is a representative of Hungary, a nation which has succeeded in preserving its identity in all circumstances.

3. Mr. Secretary-General, the international community has conferred upon you the highest and most sensitive of its responsibilities in these perilous days. We must therefore all share with you the commitment of our time: peaceful, just and productive coexistence. In facing the challenge of today's unsettled world, I offer you the solidarity of my country.

4. Mexico sees in the United Nations the best and highest international forum, where it is possible to hope for rationality in the overwhelming presence of the absurd. Since the unparalleled ignominy of the Second World War this has been the only setting in which arguments can be adduced in the light of reason and law to prevent a new conflict that very probably would be our last. It represents the only way to give new impetus to the endeavours of civilization.

5. If these words seem exaggerated to us today, if the dramatic tone strikes us as anachronistic, let us ponder the fact that less than 40 years have passed since the end of that war. Let us recall that it was preceded, and in fact brought on by, an economic depression and that the despair caused by that serious setback proved to be an evil counsellor of peoples and Governments. Let us remember that before absurdity and death took over there was a slow and gradual debasement of reason and of life itself.

6. The symptoms are ominous. In recent years we have drifted far from the principles that gave birth to this Organization, in large measure because of the attitude of those who think they can achieve their objectives through the use of force and disregard of the law. They fail to realize that in abandoning the processes of the rational solution of controversies or disputes they bring us all closer to the abyss of violence and anarchy.

7. Today there is no region that can regard itself as immune from crisis. The tragic conflicts of the South Atlantic and the Middle East bear witness to this. Some areas of the world are in great turmoil. I refer to those where the arrogance of their leaders is imposed on the historical demands of their peoples. We share the indignation and shame of those who, in the face of genocide practised by former victims of genocide, are now protesting against a vile crime that is an affront to mankind. Repetition of the worst excesses of the war has also revived the atmosphere of ignominy and the heavy burden of fatal foreboding.

8. We note with concern that pressure is being brought to bear on the Members of the United Nations in order to sway their votes. The results that are sometimes achieved indicate the vulnerability of many countries. The negotiating mechanisms prevailing in some agencies of the system raise doubts as to whether they are at the service of those who created them or whether they are inspired by true respect for the sovereignty of States.

9. Mexico has always been active in and committed to the United Nations, not with the idea that it may be the last resort for the prevention of total destruction but because it is the best means available to us to halt the process that could lead to such an outcome.

10. This makes it essential to bring together the two fundamental areas of negotiation for which the world is waiting: that which will lead to détente between the two super-Powers and that which will reorganize relationships among countries with different levels of development. The two conflicts, between East and West and North and South, have, we would repeat, crucified all mankind. Only through a convergence of both areas of negotiations can there be established a new international order, one that includes the process of political decolonization and the fundamental challenge facing international society—economic decolonization. Both types of decolonization are changes attesting to the most profound potential of a human being—the attainment of his own dignity.

11. Mexico's traditional adherence to and promotion of the principles of the United Nations and its contribution to those two major areas of negotiation are well known; evidence of this is the Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States, the world energy plan, the International Meeting on Co-operation and Development, which was held at Cancún in October 1981 and the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).

12. We have been unflagging in our efforts to give impetus to the development of international instru-

ments to promote disarmament worldwide, particularly in Latin America.

13. We believe that the arms race and development are in competition with each other, not only as regards the utilization of available resources but also because they represent incompatible approaches: arrogance and inequality, which will lead to annihilation; or tolerance and co-operation, which would make progress possible for all. We know that the funds allocated for technical assistance to developing countries for the next five years amounts to less than will be spent on weapons in the next five days.

14. Everything would indicate that the world economy is being sacrificed to the arms race. The great Powers are arming themselves even at the expense of their own standards of living, while their adversaries are doing the same. And they are dragging all mankind, which wants not weapons but progress, into this vortex.

15. Thus is created a Dantesque vicious circle. The greater the tension, the greater the concern for security; the greater the insecurity, the greater the arms expenditure; the greater the concentration of resources in armaments, the greater the impoverishment and social inequality and the greater the political radicalization and tension—until the wheel of destruction starts its atavistic cycle all over again.

16. The strongest Powers may insist on imposing their will upon others and on taking advantage of the power imbalance, which favours them, to strengthen their aspirations to hegemony. But they will not thus subdue moral sensibility; nor will they quell revolution. They will succeed only in fanning the flames of the conflagration that uncontrolled can set fire to everything.

17. The practical ineffectiveness of the means of collective security is at the very core of armed conflict. Thus, for example, when a weak country is openly threatened by political pressure that is superior to its own strength and it realizes that it cannot rely on the United Nations for protection, it is reduced to the fateful choice between arming itself or being annihilated.

18. At the same time, when the international community is incapable of generating the minimum conditions needed for general progress, peoples have to choose between the wretchedness of abject subsistence and the harsh road of revolution. Such is the tragedy of Latin America today. Such are the prospects of most of the nations here represented.

19. At the present moment, rather than an appeal what is needed is a warning: the world is absolutely interdependent, and not one of its parts can be saved if the others are doomed.

20. Mexico has tirelessly collaborated in the other major area of negotiation, which is aimed at the establishment of a new international economic order. It proposed to the community of nations that it draft a document having legal status that would encompass the doctrine and basic rules of a new model of international relations—the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, which was adopted by the General Assembly almost 10 years ago.

21. Mexico has recently demonstrated its willingness to commit itself to the struggle for justice and rational coexistence as regards not only global problems or remote conflicts but also issues that affect it very closely and for which it has taken risks and made sacrifices. This is evidenced by the proposal for a world energy plan made by an oil-exporting country during the oil boom and above all by effective co-operation in good times and bad with those countries neighbouring ours that lack such resources.

22. I consider that the ideas and proposals we put forward in the energy plan are still valid and that it is possible to foster an orderly, progressive, comprehensive and just transition between two epochs of mankind—the present one, in which the consumption of hydrocarbons predominates, and the future one, in which the development of new energy resources will have priority. The world energy plan is still a good method for the achievement of the new international economic order.

23. Even during the present crisis Venezuela and Mexico have moved forward and set an example by reaffirming and renewing the San José Agreement to help the countries of Central America and the Caribbean by guaranteeing their supplies of oil and by creating soft loan funds for their development. The \$700 million that Mexico alone has earmarked to date for that purpose is granted unconditionally and without distinction and equals the amount that the United States plans to allocate for the same region.

24. Our willingness to commit ourselves is shown also in our efforts to enhance the possibilities for a negotiated settlement of the social and political conflicts of that same region, notwithstanding the many who would like us to feel threatened and thus be driven by fear to support repression. They forget that Mexico has already had its revolution, which it is continually consolidating, and so has no reason to be afraid of its people's desire for justice. We support and will continue to support détente and negotiated political settlements, with due respect for the parties concerned.

25. But Mexico's most constant concern and task in the international sphere is the transition to a new economic order.

26. We have stressed that the entire gamut of economic relations between the developing countries and the industrialized world must be transformed. Those relations have figured on the agendas of many international conferences, but the progress made has not been particularly encouraging. It was therefore our thought to convene a summit meeting of the main industrialized countries and a representative number of developing nations. The idea was for heads of State and Government, rather than negotiating topic by topic, to show their firm political will to take a qualitatively significant step in the stalled negotiations by acknowledging the need to seek this essential new order.

27. Mexico and Austria worked for more than a year and a half to make possible the Cancún summit meeting. As the process which was to lead to the global round of negotiations became increasingly bogged down, the meeting of the heads of State took on greater importance. We noted alarming indications of a world economic slowdown. Many countries placed their hopes in Cancún, not because it might

result in solutions, but because it was the only forum that could provide the political impetus necessary to revive a suspended process.

28. The meeting took place almost a year ago and was attended by 22 heads of State and Government, or their representatives.

29. In an attempt to replace prejudice with sound judgement, and to transform monologue into dialogue and subordination into solidarity, differing points of view regarding our present-day situation were expressed openly and with tolerance for the ideas of others.

30. At that meeting many of us stated that the lack of harmonious relations was making the world in which we live increasingly perilous for rich countries and implacable and cruel for poor countries. We maintained that progress for all should be a condition for the progress of each individually.

31. The tragedy of hunger was stressed, and strategies to increase food production and improve food distribution were discussed. The possibility of organizing a fair and balanced trade in raw materials and industrialized goods was set forth. It was not only petroleum markets and prices that were dealt with, but also ways of organizing the exploitation and use of energy sources and of alleviating the financial burden that oil purchases represent for developing countries.

32. Tragic paradoxes that we have been unable to resolve were examined in Cancún: recession in the countries of the North, due to, among other things, the lack of a market for goods which are needed by the South but which it cannot purchase because of inadequate financing; liquid funds from the countries of the South that are placed in the North and then loaned to other countries of the South; and the persistence, and even the worsening, of monetary and financial practices which have proven time and again to be inadequate and ineffective, both in the South and in the North.

33. Faced with such paradoxes, we maintained that financing the joint development of rich and poor countries was not only rational, but the only possible way to achieve a healthy world economy.

34. We acknowledged, and we say again today, that many of the problems of the South are of the South's own making; but there are other serious constraints that stem from its relations with the North. We see today that the likelihood of such constraints becoming fatal to the world economy has been rapidly increasing since we met at Cancún.

35. Many things have changed since then. In recent years we have witnessed unprecedented hostility, rhetorical belligerence and lack of understanding between the super-Powers. In 1982 the world saw the outbreak and escalation of actual armed conflict in many areas. Such conflicts are irrational in every case and should be of serious concern to us, both because of their very existence and because of the relative ease with which they are coming about.

36. What most concerns and affects the majority of countries, however, is the extremely serious deterioration of the international economy, particularly in the poor countries, where three quarters of the

world's population lives and where the consequences of the crisis are felt in tragic measure.

37. Steadily decreasing income due to the plunge in the prices of raw materials on the one hand, and higher interest rates and shorter terms of repayment on the other, are the two blades of the shears that threaten to slash the momentum achieved in some countries and to cut off the chances for progress in the others.

38. In fact it is generally recognized that the world is now in the throes of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. Growth rates, both in industrialized countries and in the developing world are at the lowest levels recorded in recent decades. Rampant unemployment, endemic in poor countries, has now become widespread in the most powerful nations as well. All over the world, men and women who had jobs are losing them. The reduction of inflation achieved in certain countries through huge sacrifices in employment does not mean that the problem has been overcome. The brutal rise in interest rates over the last three years has not only created an intolerable burden for debtor nations, but has also given rise to speculation and a flight of capital which are uncontrollable and of unforeseen magnitude.

39. The events of the past few years have more than confirmed the need to tackle energy problems in a comprehensive manner and in close co-ordination with the other areas of the world economy. Petroleum sales abruptly shifted from a seller's to a buyer's market, which resulted in surpluses that have again caused prices to fall and have discouraged efforts to bring about a transition in the field of energy.

40. The disarray has been detrimental to the oil-producing countries and has been a victory for no one, since it is but another factor in the crisis. The decline in available financial resources caused by lower petroleum prices has led us from an unresolved energy crisis to a financial crisis that is deepening the recession and threatening the stability of the international monetary system.

41. Spectres arise in this panorama, spectres which could seriously threaten the world if the present trend continues. The most dangerous of these threats is that the social pressures created by economic dislocations could reach the point of exploding. We should recall that developing countries have no so-called social-security and crisis-control systems such as those which exist in the developed world. We cannot afford, and therefore do not have, unemployment insurance or extensive public welfare programmes.

42. A second spectre that appears to be dangerously near at hand is a North-South and North-North crisis in trade in both basic and industrial commodities. We all want to export more in order to solve our problems, and we all want to import less to avoid a drain on our foreign exchange reserves and our domestic markets. When the entire world is in the midst of a severe recession, the only exportable item is the crisis itself. If recession in industrialized countries continues to push down the prices of raw materials and to restrict the entry of manufactured goods from the South, both our problems and theirs will become more critical.

43. The favourable trade balance of the industrialized countries as a whole has become the major feature of the international economic order, with the exception of a period of less than 10 years of positive balances for some oil-exporting countries. It is therefore inevitable that the vast majority of developing countries have a negative trade balance.
44. To maintain the flow of trade in these circumstances necessarily implies the establishment of credit flows that would make it possible to pay the industrialized countries for goods and services. To sustain growth in the countries of the South and maintain employment in the countries of the North, the amount of such credit must continually increase; this is even more the case if the cost of the accumulated debt increases as a result of higher interest rates.
45. Reduced availability of credit for the developing countries has serious implications not only for those countries but also for production and employment in the industrial countries. Let us not continue in this vicious circle, since it could well be the start of a new Dark Ages, with no possibility of a Renaissance.
46. Here we have a third threat. I refer to the serious problem of the lack of co-ordination in the international financial system. As everyone knows, several heavily indebted countries, among them Mexico, have recently been obliged to begin renegotiating their foreign debt.
47. This is a paradox that makes us reflect on the fact that the growth of many of the countries of the South is now being criticized by the very countries that made loans to them for that purpose and that are now haggling over extending the credit needed for continued growth, although only such growth will make it possible for the former countries to repay the latter and to buy from them.
48. Today, Mexico and many other third world countries will be unable to comply with the payment schedule agreed upon in conditions quite different from those that now prevail.
49. Suspension of payments is to nobody's advantage and nobody wants it. But whether or not this will happen is beyond the will and, thus, the responsibility of the debtors. Everyone must negotiate seriously, carefully and realistically. The international financial system consists of several parts: lenders, borrowers and guarantors; it is tied to those that produce and those that consume, those that buy and those that sell. It is everybody's responsibility and it must be shouldered by everybody. Common situations produce similar positions, with no need for conspiracies or intrigues. We developing countries do not wish to become vassals. We cannot paralyse our economies or plunge our peoples into greater misery in order to pay a debt the servicing of which has tripled without our participation or responsibility and the conditions of which were imposed upon us. We countries of the South are about to run out of chips; if we cannot stay in the game, it will end in defeat for everyone.
50. I wish to be emphatic: we countries of the South have not sinned against the world economy. Our efforts to grow in order to conquer hunger, disease, ignorance and dependency have not caused the international crisis. A more immediate cause is the decision to arm, to fight force with force, dragging all the economies, directly or indirectly, towards this senseless objective.
51. But we can overcome the crisis.
52. It will be done more quickly if we can count on the rational support of the international financial community rather than reluctance or punishment for sins we have not committed.
53. Such support will be of benefit to both creditors and debtors, for we all belong to one world, in which, if we are all part of the problem, we are also part of the solution. We need foreign exchange to make payments and purchases. Our opposite numbers also need to buy in order to make collections and sales. This is a healthy relationship which is to everyone's advantage. It is that simple.
54. Mexico is a good illustration of various North-South problems because of its dual situation as a country on the threshold of development and in its geographical location and because of the domestic and international prospects as regards its petroleum resources.
55. In recent years we have made every effort to meet the needs of our population by developing its great productive potential, in conjunction with the needs of the world economy and supported by substantial external financing. For four years we grew at a rate of over 8 per cent annually, we doubled our installed industrial capacity, we rose from eighteenth to fourth place among oil-producing countries, we tripled hydrocarbon production during that period and we undertook the urgent task of intensive social development, thereby generating more than 4 million jobs not only to absorb the existing unemployed but to provide work for new generations.
56. The greatest growth in our history was dramatically interrupted in 1981. Our plans, which had been programmed and budgeted for on the basis of four successive fiscal years, suddenly could no longer be financed because of a drop in the price of raw materials, including petroleum, and because of higher interest rates on the already contracted external debt, the cost of servicing which tripled. A pernicious sequence of inflation, devaluations and mounting prices and wages put a brake on our prosperity. In just three years the flight of capital became double the total of foreign investment in our country. Thus, because of the financial system and free exchange, facilitated by our proximity to the wealthiest country in the world, our reserves were exhausted. It is easy to say that, but for 70 million Mexicans who had begun to look forward to better times it is a brutal reality.
57. Our way of being, of acting and managing our affairs, has been distorted in the news media, which have made us appear to the eyes of the world a country incapable of shaping its destiny and incompetent in administering its resources, so that the alternative would have to be our subordination to the ruthless ambition of outside Powers. Developing countries like Mexico have suffered countless such experiences. Many of our problems are made worse by tendentious reports which bring on the results they announce.
58. After major attempts to correct this economic situation, my Government decided to attack the root

of the evil and extirpate it once and for all. There was obviously an inconsistency between internal development policies and an erratic and restrictive international financial structure.

59. A reasonable growth policy could not be reconciled with freedom to speculate in foreign exchange. We therefore established exchange control.

60. Given our 3,000-kilometre border with the United States, exchange control can only function through a banking system that operates on the basis of the policies of its country and Government and not its own speculative interests and the fluctuations of international financial chaos. For that reason we have nationalized the banks.

61. We have been a living example of what happens when that enormous, volatile and speculative mass of capital ranges over the world in search of high interest rates, tax havens and supposed political and exchange stability. It decapitalizes entire countries and leaves destruction in its wake. The world should be able to control this; it is inconceivable that we cannot find a formula that, without limiting necessary movements and flows, would permit regulation of a phenomenon that damages everyone. It is imperative that the new international economic order establish a link between refinancing the development of countries that suffer from the flight of capital and the capital that has left those countries. At least they should have the crumbs from their own loaves.

62. In the face of these dramatic realities, we are lectured about economic liberalism at all costs, which is not applied even in the countries that most passionately defend it. On the contrary, the danger of losing their national integrity has led many Governments—among them, our own—to intensify their economic reforms and to strengthen the role of the State in directing their national economies; these are cases of legitimate self-defence.

63. Mexico is open to negotiation in every sphere and every forum. We have the resources, tradition and historical background to reinforce the principles laid down by our social and popular revolution. We are sure that, as a country bordering both the North and the South, our fate is of concern not only to Mexicans but to all developing countries. To all of them I say that we must hold our heads high and stand together, today and always, in dignity and with our shared endeavours and our shared hopes.

64. Never has the principle of sovereignty over natural resources and economic processes been more valid than now. The terms of the debased relations that we suffer could lead to the dissolution of sovereignty itself. The interference of transnational corporations, the growing concentration of financial facilities, the subordination of the banking systems to the great metropolitan cities, the massive outflow of capital and the imitation of models alien to our development endanger the very existence of States.

65. Although its formal links have been broken, dependency persists, and the pattern of domination on which the colonial régime was founded has even been reinforced. The concentration of wealth and power increases, while vast regions of the world become ever more impoverished. In the present

situation the machinery of international co-operation that we have devised has been useful in soothing some troubled consciences, but it has proved altogether incapable of solving the serious everyday structural problems.

66. The charges levelled by the countries of the South in this respect were accurate and far-sighted. In proposing a new order, we sought a profound institutional reform capable of rechannelling international economic relations. We should have liked to avoid the tremendous deterioration of recent years and to have eased the crisis. But it is never too late.

67. Throughout history, major transformations usually occurred when there was no other course to take, which accounts for the distance that separates prophets from revolutionaries. Major ills call for major remedies.

68. International economic relations should be reviewed judiciously and with a sense of commitment. Let us not look for culprits but, rather, find people who will take responsibility for the future. The tracing of the ultimate cause of our ills is a task for historians and research workers, not for political leaders.

69. The assumption of that immense task of political and economic integration requires a change in attitude. Until now ideological manichaeism, which nurtures the hegemony of the great Powers, has prevailed.

70. There has been a tendency to impose the same system of the past, and in a tense dialectical relationship as yet unresolved, the doctrines and strategies of change have been in confrontation with vested interests, love of compromise for its own sake, and the conservative instincts of empires that never end. Therefore, the global economic negotiations must provide the opportunity to reconcile these opposing views in approaches compatible with the needs of the present. The necessity to convene these negotiations is urgent; they cannot be postponed.

71. Nor can the alleged dispute between the specialized agencies of the system and the sovereignty of the Assembly be put forward as an excuse for delaying the dialogue. All the United Nations bodies have been created by our sovereign decision; all of them function within a given legal framework, and are to be respected.

72. The justification for these international bodies is not to be found in the perpetuation of undesirable inequalities, but in the search for rational solutions to the crucial issues of our time—disarmament, collective security and development.

73. The United Nations was created in a different era and the Organization and its Members now find themselves at the crossroads. We have the forum we deserve and there is no other. If we do not know how to use it to overcome the crisis and establish a more equitable order, and above all one compatible with our times, there will be no further opportunity. Global negotiations should begin immediately, and they should be conducted thoroughly, with a serious intention of reaching agreement. World peace and security are threatened to an even greater extent today. We must safeguard them at all costs. Any solution or concession is preferable to the alternative. We cannot afford to fail. Something tremendous is at stake here, not only

the heritage of civilization, but the very survival of our children, of future generations, of mankind itself.

74. Let us make what is reasonable possible. Let us recall the tragic conditions in which the Organization was created and the hopes that we placed in it. The place is here and the time is now.

75. Let us hope that the logical confrontations of pluralism, the understandable outbursts of dissidence, compounded by the frustration of impotence, and the unavoidable delays in negotiations do not nullify the highest good represented by the United Nations.

76. Let us not resign ourselves to the United Nations becoming bogged down in formal procedures, while outside pressures are brought to bear to satisfy selfish interests unable to withstand the test of inclusion in an international legal order.

77. We are all part of this union. It is as strong as we wish to make it, particularly those who have the real power and therefore the ultimate responsibility. We have never created anything better or more efficient. Again and again I shall repeat what I have said here. This is the time to decide whether mankind belongs to the powerful, or the powerful to mankind. That has never been truer than now. We shall know the answer here, and in the centuries to come people will bear witness to it.

78. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I should like to thank the President of the United Mexican States for his important address.

79. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. Hollai, allow me to congratulate you on the occasion of your election to the presidency of the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly and wish you full success in your most responsible task. We had the opportunity quite recently of complimenting the Secretary-General, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, when he visited the Soviet Union and held important talks there. He received a deservedly warm welcome.

80. A session of the General Assembly is a unique opportunity to review the international reality in all its diversity and to sense more profoundly what is of greatest concern to people on different continents. And, one becomes convinced once again that of the multitude of problems in today's world the main problem, the one that stands out, is that of averting the threat of nuclear war.

81. Virtually everyone agrees that world developments have been evolving in an alarming way. People are asking themselves whether the insane arms race can be halted and the slipping towards the abyss prevented. What should be done to counter the policies of those who are playing out various scenarios of nuclear war as if it were some kind of a game of chance rather than a matter that affects the destinies of mankind?

82. Those are legitimate questions. The Soviet Union is firmly convinced that peace, which is of the greatest universal value, can and must be preserved; and it must be a just peace, worthy of those heights which civilization on earth has attained. We draw this conviction from history itself, which contains many a tragic page but also examples of brilliantly devised solutions to the most acute international problems.

83. Let us recall how the Charter, which is a universally recognized code of rules that must govern relations between States, came into being. The establishment of this Organization and the Charter crystallized, as it were, the experience of the struggle against and the great victory over fascism. At that time the hope was held out to the world that it would be possible to avert another global tragedy. For almost 40 years now, that hope has been a reality.

84. Now let us look at the changes in international relations brought about in the 1970s, when the peoples of the world were given an opportunity to breathe the air of détente. Surely the differences in social systems and ideologies or in the world outlook were no less then than they are today. But even taking these differences fully into account, States and the leaders who guided their policies did find ways leading to constructive relations between nations. This constant in the experience of peaceful coexistence has taken root in the minds of peoples and in the fabric of inter-State relations, and it is not easy to discard. The urge to give orders to other countries, to dominate the world, must not be allowed to overshadow the experience of the past or muffle the voice of reason.

85. The Soviet people reject the gloomy view that mankind has no other path to follow than building up piles of armaments and preparing for war. It would be a mistake to underestimate the rising menace of war. But it is an even greater mistake to fail to see that possibilities do exist for putting up an insurmountable barrier against war. The Soviet Union and the Soviet people are placing all their political and moral potential and all the prestige of their policy on to the scales of peace.

86. This is surely demonstrated by the obligation unilaterally assumed by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, an obligation solemnly stated in the message of Leonid Brezhnev at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament the twelfth special session [*12th meeting*]. That was an act of historic importance and it was seen as such throughout the world. Is it not time for our Western partners, the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*], to assess in earnest the opportunities opened up by the Soviet Union's initiative? We expect them to weigh it carefully once again. In seeking to minimize the importance of the Soviet Union's peace initiatives, many Western leaders speak of the need for trust in relations between States. But how would that purpose best be served? It would be best served by renouncing preparations for war, the policy of the arms race and of whipping up world tensions. Why do they not assume the obligation, as the Soviet Union has done, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons?

87. It is sometimes said that it is not merely a question of nuclear weapons alone, for there are conventional weapons as well. Yes, there are. But there is a convincing reply to that, too: we insist that all States assume an obligation to renounce any use or threat of force in their relations.

88. As far back as 1976 the Soviet Union proposed that a world treaty be concluded on the non-use of force in international relations and it submitted a draft treaty to the General Assembly for its consideration.¹

The draft treaty expressly provides that States would refrain from the use of force involving any types of weapons—and I emphasize, any types of weapons. It would be a good idea to inscribe this on the doors of every agency in Washington that is concerned with United States foreign policy.

89. We note with satisfaction that the initiative concerning the non-use of force was endorsed by the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations. Indeed, the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations was even established to draft such a treaty. Why, then has no such treaty been worked out? Because States members of NATO are thwarting it. Can the situation be remedied now? Yes, it can. The Soviet Union is prepared even today to come to the negotiating table in order to formalize strict obligations not to use force in settling disputes and differences which exist between States. No one would venture to deny that quite a few such disputes and differences have accumulated. But there are no problems among them that would not lend themselves to peaceful solutions. There are none in any part of the world or in any area of world politics—if, of course, one is motivated by the objectives of peace.

90. It has to be noted, however, that the United States of America has chosen a different policy for itself. The essence of this policy is the desire to impose its will upon other States and peoples. That desire underlies all plans for the production of weapons and underlies United States foreign policy. The Soviet Union has repeatedly drawn attention to the fact that such a policy poses a serious threat to peace.

91. The objective of gaining an edge in armaments has been openly proclaimed in the United States. The idea that it has to be number one militarily has become something of an obsession. Huge sums are being allocated for building up the United States war machine and the pyramid of weapons is getting higher and higher. In the mean time there is continuously at work an assembly line fabricating all kinds of falsehoods about the Soviet Union's armed forces and its foreign policy. People are being deliberately misled.

92. Why is all this being done? Simply because in an atmosphere of lies, hysteria and chauvinistic intoxication it is easier to get astronomical military budgets approved; it is easier to divert the country's resources to war preparations and away from peaceful purposes such as eliminating unemployment and fighting inflation, away from using them for the benefit of people, which is what the Soviet Union is calling for.

93. There is no dearth of versions of nuclear war being planned by the apostles of the arms race: a blitzkrieg, a protracted war, a limited war, an all-out war. Every conceivable and inconceivable definition is being put into circulation. With the cold-blooded composure of grave diggers, they are speculating on the number of casualties each side would sustain in a nuclear catastrophe. They deliberately hush up the fact that if a nuclear war were to break out under present conditions, there would be no winners, and few people today would disagree with that.

94. The Soviet Union has, on a number of occasions, including the sessions of the General Assembly, pointed to the dangerous nature of Washington's course aimed at upsetting the military equilibrium which has evolved between the USSR and the United States of America, and on the whole, between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO. Everywhere, on land and on sea, the United States is seeking to impose or strengthen its military presence and to set up new bases. Look at the bloody orgy that is taking place in the Middle East where a frantic search is under way for new clients to be harnessed to the Pentagon's militaristic strategy.

95. It should, of course, be clear that the Soviet Union does not recognize anyone's right to military superiority. And it will see to it that that does not happen.

96. One of the principles recognized by the United Nations is non-interference by States in the internal affairs of other States. It has been reiterated many times in United Nations decisions.

97. However, the world is witnessing today a flagrant flouting of this principle.

98. Who, we might well ask, has given Washington the right to tell sovereign States what they should and what they should not do in their own house? Who has given it the right to try to punish those who cherish their sovereignty and would not yield to pressure, to apply all kinds of sanctions, to impose economic blockades, and even to brandish arms?

99. From what some say, it would appear that United States interests are being endangered almost everywhere in the world. This is an absurd thesis. Yet it is being used to justify crude interference in the affairs of others, used on a sweeping geographic scale, as regards both nearby countries and those situated many thousands of kilometres away from the United States.

100. The Soviet Union has never permitted, nor will it ever allow, anybody to interfere in its internal affairs. This is the stand of the States of the socialist community, as well as of other countries which respect their independence and their legitimate rights.

101. I should like to express the hope that no calls for outside interference in the affairs of other sovereign States will be made from this rostrum either. Otherwise, this high rostrum will cease to be what it is intended to be. And may the United Nations emblem, which is before the eyes of all those present in this Hall, serve as a warning to those who fail to distinguish between what is theirs and what belongs to others.

102. No review of the international scene can overlook the situation taking shape in some regions of the world. In the first place, attention is riveted on the Middle East, for this session of the General Assembly is taking place at a time when ashes have not yet settled in the streets of the ruthlessly destroyed ancient city of Beirut and when the blood of tens of thousands of victims of aggression has not yet been completely absorbed by the soil.

103. All honest people all over the world feel outrage and disgust over the orgy of bloodshed staged by the aggressors in the Palestinian camps in west Beirut

where defenceless Palestinians, mostly women, children and old people, were massacred.

104. Could Israel commit aggression and perpetrate genocide against the Palestinians but for its so-called "strategic consensus" with the United States?

105. As far as one can judge, in Israel they are now rubbing their hands gleefully. But this is what is called a Pyrrhic victory. The aggression was bound to turn, and has in fact turned, into a serious political and moral defeat for Israel. The rift between Israel and its neighbours has widened. New seeds of hatred and animosity have been sown, and they can bear the grapes of wrath.

106. Those who determine Israel's policies seem to give little thought to the future of their country. And that is too bad, indeed. They are clearly hampered by chauvinistic intoxication.

107. The root cause of the Lebanese tragedy lies in Camp David. It should be clear now to every unbiased person that separate anti-Arab deals only put off the establishment of a just peace in the Middle East.

108. The aggressor and its accomplices say that Camp David means peace. Such an assertion makes a mockery of the profound, humane and noble idea of peace. What kind of peace it makes is evident from the fact that more blood has been shed since Camp David than during the Israeli aggression in 1967.

109. Washington's recent statements, which it is serving up as a Middle East settlement plan, confirm that they are still thinking there in terms of diktat and enmity with regard to the Arabs, rather than in terms of peace.

110. The overwhelming majority of States hold it as a political axiom that there can be no durable peace in the Middle East unless the question of an independent Palestinian State is resolved. The Washington plan, however, states explicitly that the United States is against the creation of such a State.

111. It is widely accepted and recorded in United Nations decisions that the problem of fulfilling the national aspirations of the Palestinians cannot be solved without the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], whereas the American plan makes no mention at all of the PLO as a party to the settlement. In fact, Washington also fully evades such a fundamental matter as Israel's withdrawal from all the Arab territories seized by it.

112. All decisions taken by the United Nations proceed from the premise that genuine security in the Middle East can only be such as would be common to all States and peoples in that region. The so-called Washington initiative focuses everything on the security of Israel alone, and its interests are made paramount, with the United States itself, naturally, maintaining its arrogant and unjustified claims to a leading role in Middle East affairs.

113. We regard positively the views on a Middle East settlement expressed at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference at Fez. On the whole these views are on the same lines as those of the Soviet Union regarding a Middle East settlement.

114. As Leonid Brezhnev has recently stressed once again, a just and durable peace in the Middle East can and must be based on the following principles.

115. First, the principle of the inadmissibility of seizure of foreign lands through aggression must be strictly observed. That means that all the territories occupied by Israel since 1967—the Golan Heights, the West Bank of the Jordan river and the Gaza Strip, the Lebanese lands—must be returned to the Arabs. The borders between Israel and its Arab neighbours should be declared inviolable.

116. Secondly, the inalienable right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination and to the establishment of its own independent State on the Palestinian lands which will be freed from the Israeli occupation—on the West Bank of the Jordan river and in the Gaza Strip—must be ensured in practice. Palestinian refugees must be given the possibility envisaged in United Nations decisions to return to their homes or be given appropriate compensation for the property they left behind.

117. I ask the following in this connection: has anybody annulled the decision adopted by the United Nations in 1947, which envisages the establishment in the former mandated territory of Palestine of two sovereign States—an Arab State and a Jewish State? Nobody has annulled it. Then what are the grounds for talking about the legitimate existence of the Jewish State alone, while impeding in every way the establishment of the other, Arab, State for over three and a half decades? There have been no such grounds, nor are there any now.

118. Thirdly, the eastern part of Jerusalem, which was occupied by Israel in 1967, where one of the main Moslem shrines is located, must be returned to the Arabs and become an inseparable part of the Palestinian State. Freedom of access by believers to the holy places of the three religions must be ensured throughout Jerusalem.

119. Fourthly, the right of all States in the region to a safe and independent existence and development must be ensured, naturally on the condition of full reciprocity, for the security of some cannot be ensured by flouting the security of others.

120. Fifthly, the state of war between the Arab States and Israel must be terminated and peace between them must be established. That means that all parties to the conflict, including Israel and the Palestinian State, must assume an obligation reciprocally to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of each other and to settle the disputes that may arise by peaceful means through negotiations.

121. Sixthly, international guarantees of the settlement must be worked out and adopted. The role of the guarantor could be assumed by, say, the permanent members of the Security Council or by the Security Council as a whole.

122. The path to a durable peace in the Middle East lies through collective efforts by all the parties concerned, including the PLO, and the best way towards this end is to convene an appropriate international conference.

123. For almost two years now bloody hostilities have been going on between Iran and Iraq. This is a

senseless war from the point of view of the vital interests of the peoples of the two countries. This conflict is also fraught with grave consequences. The fire should be put out before it spreads further.

124. The most reasonable thing to do would probably be for Iran and Iraq to put aside arms, to slip covers over the muzzles of their guns and to settle their differences at the negotiating table.

125. The Soviet Union has invariably come out in favour of putting an end to the war between the two States, with which our country has maintained traditional ties, and it is doing all in its power to bring that about. We expect that other major Powers will abandon attempts to take advantage of the conflict.

126. Dangerous scheming is still going on around the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The foes of the Afghan people, including those who flaunt their commitment to democracy, are trying to hinder the building of a new and truly democratic life in that country. While in words a political solution to the problems which have arisen around Afghanistan is being advocated, in deeds the achievement of such a solution is being impeded in every possible way.

127. Opportunities for such a solution do exist. They are embodied in the constructive proposals of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which the Soviet Union fully supports. Only one thing is required, and that is to stop the armed intervention from outside against Afghanistan and not interfere in the internal affairs of that sovereign non-aligned State.

128. In the Soviet Union we view as a step in the right direction the start of negotiations in Geneva between representatives of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and Pakistan through a personal representative of the Secretary-General.

129. We fully understand the legitimate concern of the coastal States of the Indian Ocean over the expansion there of the United States military presence. One can literally watch it grow, posing a threat also to the security of the USSR from the south. We cannot but draw our own conclusions from this.

130. The Soviet Union endorses the idea put forward by the non-aligned countries to turn the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. If it were not for the attempts by certain Powers, above all the United States of America, to frustrate implementation of General Assembly resolution 34/80 B on this matter, an international conference which could be of tangible benefit to the whole of that vast region would have been convened long ago. Even now, without waiting for the conference to be convened, we call upon all the States whose ships use the waters of the Indian Ocean to refrain from any steps that could complicate the situation in that region. This means not sending there large naval formations, not conducting military exercises and not expanding or modernizing military bases of those non-coastal States which possess such bases in the Indian Ocean.

131. One example of the way in which States with different social systems can fruitfully co-operate to mutual advantage and in the interests of universal peace can be seen in Soviet-Indian relations. This co-operation is a concrete and impressive contribution

to the cause of security on the South Asian subcontinent and in the international arena as a whole. A new and powerful impulse has been given to it by the results of the recent talks in Moscow between Leonid Brezhnev and the Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi.

132. In another part of the Asian continent, South-East Asia, the Soviet Union supports the efforts aimed at turning that region into a zone of peace. A series of initiatives put forward jointly by Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Kampuchea opens up prospects for both deepening the dialogue between them and the members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN] and in general normalizing the situation in the area. These initiatives have been reaffirmed by such a display of goodwill as the partial withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea.

133. The peoples of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Kampuchea have chosen their own road of social development. In their march along that road they are repelling those forces which are seeking to prevent them from building a new life. The USSR resolutely sides with those States. It is rendering and will continue to render them necessary assistance and support.

134. The Soviet Union is prepared to seek, together with all the Far Eastern States, ways of enhancing the security of that region. Not so long ago we proposed that the time-tested experience gained in carrying out certain measures to build mutual confidence in Europe be considered from the point of view of its application to the Far East. The Soviet Union is ready to discuss this matter in a practical vein with the participation of the People's Republic of China and Japan.

135. For decades now the situation on the Korean peninsula has not been normalized, which increases tensions in the Far East. The Korean problem can and must be settled by peaceful means without any outside interference, as is proposed by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

136. Socialist countries are taking the initiative in strengthening security on a scale embracing the entire Asian continent. This is the intent of the proposal made by the Mongolian People's Republic for the conclusion of a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between the Asian and Pacific States.² The Soviet Union supports this useful initiative.

137. When a centre of tension appears in some part of the globe there can be no doubt that it is caused by the actions of those who have no regard for the legitimate interests of others. Not infrequently they are inspired by attempts to retain by force positions inherited from the colonial past.

138. One case in point is the South Atlantic. It is to be hoped that the peoples have drawn appropriate conclusions from the recent events in that region. The Soviet Union has on a number of occasions publicly stated its position that a just settlement of the problem that has arisen there can be achieved through negotiations within the United Nations framework

and on the basis of United Nations decisions. That continues to be our position today.

139. Another case in point is southern Africa, where the South African racist régime, with the connivance of Western Powers, is actually waging an undeclared war against Angola and some other States of the region. Pretoria has been blatantly defying United Nations decisions on the granting of independence to Namibia. There is no doubt, however, that the Namibian people will attain freedom and independence.

140. Still another case in point is the region of Central America and the Caribbean, where a campaign of pressure and threats is going on unabated against Cuba and Nicaragua, whose only fault is that they want to live according to their own standards. Attempts are being made to portray them as the trouble-makers in that region. Those are attempts made in bad faith. Together with other peoples and States of the Caribbean, Cuba and Nicaragua are in favour of turning it into a zone of peace, independence and development, and the Soviet Union has full sympathy for this goal.

141. Is there anyone who does not know whose advisers and instructors, both uniformed and otherwise, are now in El Salvador, and who rules the roost there, trying to prop up the corrupt and unpopular régime? The USSR has opposed and will continue to oppose such actions.

142. The sympathy and support of the Soviet people are entirely on the side of all the peoples fighting for their freedom and for national and social progress.

143. If there was any lack of evidence that the peoples and States consider the continuing arms race to be one of the most critical issues of our time, the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has provided such evidence in abundance.

144. Ardent appeals to avert nuclear war and halt the arms race were voiced from its rostrum. The Assembly failed to reach agreement at that session on concrete steps in this field, and it is well known who is responsible for that. Still, the determination of the overwhelming majority of States to ensure peace and achieve disarmament was expressed in no uncertain terms.

145. At that session the Soviet Union submitted a detailed programme of measures to curb the arms race, ranging from nuclear and chemical weapons to limiting conventional weapons and naval activities of States.³

146. As has been repeatedly emphasized by Leonid Brezhnev, there is no type of weapon which our country would not be prepared to limit or ban on the basis of reciprocity. And if the accumulation of arms is not only continuing but accelerating, if this tragic competition is proceeding at a pace that leaves behind accords on arms limitation, and if the agreements already reached in this field are called into question, all this is the direct result of the United States policy aimed at building up its military muscle. It makes no secret of this policy line; indeed, it is bragging about it.

147. To take a problem such as the limitation and reduction of strategic arms, that is, the most destructive weapons, the problem which is of utmost importance under present-day conditions, there had

been many delays on the part of our partners before the Soviet-American talks started. Undoubtedly, the fact that they are being held is in itself of positive significance. But that alone is not enough. What is required is the desire on both sides to seek agreement.

148. Without going into the details of the talks, it should, however, be emphasized that so far the other side has failed to show the desire to come to agreement. Surely one cannot take for such a desire the attempt to single out from the totality of weapons possessed by the USSR and the United States only those types of weapons—in this particular case land-based missiles—which constitute the backbone of the Soviet Union's strategic potential, and to make them alone the subject of reduction, leaving out all the rest, that is, submarine-launched missiles, strategic bombers and cruise missiles, where the United States preponderance is obvious.

149. Certainly this lopsided approach promises no hope for the success of the negotiations. The principle of the equality and equal security of the sides must remain their unshakable foundation. Accuracy, science, balance of parameters, together with a careful evaluation of all elements of the problem—all these must be taken into account. There must be no room for deception, guile or juggling with facts, either in large or in small doses.

150. It should be recalled that the Soviet Union has put forward an important proposal, namely, to agree to freeze the strategic armaments of the USSR and the United States quantitatively as soon as the talks begin, and at the same time to restrict their modernization to the utmost. We have proposed that for the duration of the talks the sides should take no actions that might upset the stability of the strategic situation.

151. That is our concrete response to the mounting feeling in many countries of the world in favour of a freeze on the existing levels of nuclear arms, to be followed by their drastic reduction, which is advocated by the Soviet Union.

152. Unfortunately, those who are conducting negotiations with us on this problem shudder at the mere words "a freeze on arms". What has actually been frozen on their side, and quite deeply at that, is the realization that the talks must be frank, in good faith and free from any lopsidedness.

153. What is the state of affairs at the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe?

154. Sometimes encouraging statements are heard from the United States side in this respect. But this is an assumed optimism. The so-called zero option—or, to be more precise, pseudo-zero option—proposed by the United States does not offer a solution to the problem. It provides for the elimination only of Soviet land-based missiles, including those which the Soviet Union has possessed for over 20 years now. As to the medium-range nuclear forces of NATO, they are not to be subject to reduction by a single unit and can even be built up.

155. We have no doubt that Washington realizes that the Soviet side would not agree to a one-sided solution that would run counter to the security interests of the

USSR and its allies. Therefore, what is doubtful is whether Washington is really seeking an agreement.

156. The Soviet Union's desire to come to agreement with the United States is buttressed by practical steps. As is well known, it has unilaterally discontinued further deployment of medium-range missiles in the European part of the USSR. And, what is more, it is carrying out the reduction of a part of that force. Finally, we are not stationing any additional medium-range missiles beyond the Urals, from where Western Europe would be within their reach.

157. The Soviet Union has faithfully kept its word in this matter too.

158. Throughout the post-war period, since the emergence of the first atom bombs, the Soviet Union has been persistently seeking approaches to putting an end to the nuclear arms race. At that time it was much easier to ban the atomic weapon than it is nowadays, when there exists a huge arsenal of nuclear armaments.

159. But even today this problem can be resolved. Mankind has no other reasonable option but to reduce the nuclear threat gradually though consistently, step by step, and ultimately eliminate it.

160. In this context, it is extremely important to erect a barrier against the development of ever new types and systems of nuclear weapons—a process which tends to destabilize the strategic situation for it entails the emergence of weapons which, because of their characteristics, would hardly lend themselves to verification. If this is so, the working out of relevant international agreements on their limitation and reduction is becoming more difficult.

161. That is the reason why it is becoming increasingly urgent to stop nuclear-weapons tests and to erect a tangible physical barrier to the development of ever new kinds of nuclear weapons and thus slow down the arms race.

162. The States of the world, with very few exceptions, demand a ban on all nuclear-weapon test explosions in all environments and for all times. Their will was reflected in a series of decisions adopted at the United Nations. Moreover, when signing the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, all the parties to it, including the United States, undertook to do away with nuclear-weapon tests for good.

163. In our view, it is the direct responsibility of the United Nations to demand that all countries, and the nuclear Powers in the first place, do their utmost to achieve that goal.

164. As a nuclear Power, the Soviet Union declares that for its part, it is ready to do that. We propose the inclusion in the agenda of this session of an important and urgent item entitled "Immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests".

165. What is proposed specifically? It is proposed to speed up the working out and signing of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and to put the talks on that subject in the Committee on Disarmament on a practical footing.

166. The Soviet Union is submitting to the Assembly for its consideration "Basic provisions of a treaty on

the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests" [see A/37/243], a document which takes into account the measure of agreement reached during the discussion of that problem in recent years. It also takes into account the views and suggestions advanced by many States, *inter alia* on questions of verification.

167. In order to create more favourable conditions for the elaboration of the treaty, we propose that all nuclear-weapon States declare a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, including peaceful ones, as of a date to be agreed upon among them. Such a moratorium would be effective pending the conclusion of the treaty.

168. In the context of the problem of the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, I wish to single out two more aspects of importance.

169. First, the Soviet Union is prepared at any time to ratify—on a reciprocal basis—the treaties concluded with the United States on the limitation of underground nuclear-weapon tests and on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. Secondly, we are in favour of the resumption of the trilateral talks between the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom.

170. Those talks were under way. Then they were broken off, and it is public knowledge who was responsible for that.

171. In the context of the struggle to lessen the nuclear threat, there is still another important problem to which the Soviet Union would like to draw the Assembly's attention.

172. The number of non-military nuclear facilities, above all power installations, is increasing in various countries. This is an inevitable process, which is bound to grow in scope in the future.

173. However, intentional destruction, even with the help of conventional weapons, of atomic power plants, research reactors and other similar installations might cause the release and dissemination of a huge amount of radioactive substances, which would have fatal consequences for the population. In other words, it would be tantamount in its effect to a nuclear explosion.

174. As calculated by experts, the consequences of the destruction of a large atomic power plant are comparable to the radioactive contamination occurring after the explosion of a one-megaton nuclear bomb. Therefore, the need for ensuring a safe development of nuclear energy is closely linked with the task of preventing the unleashing of nuclear war.

175. Being desirous of lessening the nuclear threat in this area, too, the Soviet Union proposes the inclusion in the agenda of this session of an urgent item entitled "Multiplying efforts to eliminate the threat of nuclear war and to ensure a safe development of nuclear energy".

176. The Soviet Union proposes that the General Assembly declare the destruction of peaceful nuclear facilities with conventional weapons equivalent to an attack involving the use of nuclear weapons—that is to say, it should equate such destruction with those actions which the United Nations has already qualified as the gravest crime against humanity.

177. The question of a speedy elimination of chemical weapons presents itself in all its magnitude. This weapon is one of the means of mass annihilation. The unrestrained build-up of chemical weapons in the West, far from enhancing anybody's security, is only aggravating the risk of military conflicts with the use of these lethal weapons.

178. The Soviet Union has consistently been advocating the exclusion of chemical weapons from the arsenals of States. The relevant proposals submitted by it have been referred to the Committee on Disarmament. We hope that its members will proceed, with all due sense of responsibility, to the elaboration of an international convention on the prohibition and elimination of these barbaric weapons.

179. There is an increasing danger that the arms race will acquire a qualitatively new dimension unless the necessary measures are urgently taken. Washington is now planning a military thrust into outer space.

180. We are convinced that the arms race must not be permitted to spread into the boundless expanses of outer space. The United Nations can and must play its part in this respect.

181. For a number of years now the Soviet Union has been seeking the conclusion of an international treaty prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. The expanses of outer space should be an area only for the peaceful co-operation of States.

182. A separate question and a major one is the reduction of conventional armaments and of the numerical strength of armed forces. The Soviet Union wishes to see this problem, too, firmly integrated into the fabric of international negotiations and agreements.

183. In relation to Central Europe, these problems are under discussion at the Vienna Talks on Mutual Reduction of Forces, Armaments and Associated Measures in Central Europe. For nine years now, these talks have been, figuratively speaking, marking time, and the time to find agreements that would ameliorate the situation in an area with the highest concentration of the opposing armies is long overdue. The Soviet Union and its Warsaw Treaty allies are doing their utmost to achieve that.

184. It is a favourite allegation in the West that the Warsaw Treaty countries are superior to NATO in terms of conventional armaments in Europe. Yet at the Vienna talks the socialist countries are proposing to establish for both sides equal levels of armed forces stationed in Central Europe.

185. Unfortunately, the conduct of our Western partners in the negotiations is not conducive to reaching such an agreement. Although some rouge, figuratively speaking, has recently been applied to their position, the essence has remained unchanged.

186. So what is left of the so-called concern of the Western countries regarding the alleged superiority of the Warsaw Treaty over NATO?

187. And what is worse, steps are being taken outside the framework of the talks, which can only be described as provocative. What is there to say, for instance, about the recent agreements between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States

concerning the bringing from overseas of additional contingents of American troops under far-fetched pretexts? In other words, instead of reducing forces in that region, conditions are being prepared for increasing them by several more divisions. That is, of course, a mockery of common sense. The same applies to the planned redeployment of United States military units to the immediate vicinity of the borders of the German Democratic Republic.

188. In Europe, as well as on other continents, the Soviet Union is countering the policy of confrontation with the policy of good-neighbourliness and co-operation. We understand and appreciate the desire of the Europeans to follow the path opened up by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

189. There exists a possibility of further progress towards making Europe a continent of peace and stability. The attainment of this goal would be largely facilitated by the implementation of the idea of convening a conference on confidence-building measures and disarmament in Europe.

190. That is one of the principal issues at the Madrid meeting of the States participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. If all its participants adopt a constructive approach at its resumed session in November, general agreement could be reached both with regard to the convening of the conference and to ensuring the success of the Madrid meeting.

191. Seeking to alleviate tension throughout the world, we have recently proposed that the decision-making bodies of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization make declarations on the non-extension of the sphere of action of the two military and political groupings to Asia, Africa and Latin America. That would constitute a major step towards détente. All the members of the Warsaw Treaty support this proposal. We hope that the NATO countries will study this proposal and respond to it in a positive manner.

192. In recent years serious obstacles have emerged in restructuring international economic relations on a democratic and equal basis. The root cause lies in the policies of certain Western Powers aimed at keeping the developing countries in an unequal position, at facilitating the attempts of the monopoly capital to exercise its sway over those countries.

193. A recent vivid example of that is the attitude of some Western Powers to the enormous work accomplished by States in preparing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. Many years of effort have produced a document whose provisions do not prejudice anybody's interests. And what has become of it? The United States is hampering the adoption of that convention. We would like to express the hope that it will stop being in opposition to a vast majority of States and will adhere to the convention.

194. The USSR is in favour of democratization of both political and economic relations between States. As to our participation in rendering assistance to the newly freed States in overcoming their economic backwardness, in this respect too the Soviet Union is doing at least as much if not more than any of the developed capitalist countries.

195. It is common knowledge that the foreign policy course of any State is an extension of its domestic policy. Our country sets itself economic and social tasks of vast magnitude. We need peace to accomplish them.

196. The Soviet Union is extending its hand to every State which, for its part, is willing to maintain and develop good relations with us. That applies to Europe. We are prepared for a further expansion of co-operation with Western European countries on a peaceful and mutually beneficial basis. That applies to Asia, where the Soviet Union has long-standing and stable ties with many States. That applies to Latin America, where normal, business-like relations are being established between the USSR and a number of countries, including Mexico, Brazil and Argentina. The same applies to the United States of America. We are convinced that from the viewpoint of a long-term policy of principle the deterioration of relations between the USSR and the United States is not in the interests of the United States itself. The American people is hardly different from other peoples as far as the desire to live in peace is concerned. Our country has on several occasions pronounced itself—in particular at the Congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and at the USSR Supreme Soviet—in favour of developing normal relations with the United States.

197. The policy of the Soviet Government aimed at preserving and strengthening peace and preventing another war is endorsed by all Soviet people, since all they aspire to is a peaceful—and only peaceful—future.

198. At the end of this year the Soviet people will mark an important event—the sixtieth anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Land of the Soviets is invariably faithful to the peaceful behests of the founder of our State, V. I. Lenin.

199. As Leonid Brezhnev has recently stressed once again, “concern for peace is paramount in the policy of the Soviet Union”. This concern determines the fundamental direction of all foreign policy activities of the Soviet State, which are based on the Programme of Peace for the 1980s adopted by the twenty-sixth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This Programme is being implemented by the Soviet Union together with other countries of the socialist community, cemented together as they are by a

common political system and world outlook, by the identity of goals and ideals.

200. All the activities of socialist countries convincingly prove that peace is their policy aim. Every step, every foreign policy move made by them, serves the attainment of that noble goal.

201. The Soviet Union has rebuffed and will continue to rebuff policies based on the cult of force. Those who come out for preventing a nuclear disaster and for strengthening peace can always count on its support and co-operation.

202. All our actions in the international arena will continue to be inspired by our deep-held belief in the necessity and the possibility of saving the present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

AGENDA ITEM 33

Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa:

(a) Report of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*;
(b) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports;

(c) Reports of the Secretary-General

203. The PRESIDENT: I should like to call the attention of delegations to a draft resolution [A/37/L.2] which has just been distributed and which concerns an appeal for clemency in favour of South African freedom fighters.

204. In view of the great urgency of this issue, I would propose that the draft resolution be considered at the beginning of this afternoon's meeting when I hope that it can be adopted without objection. If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Annexes*, agenda item 134, document A/31/243.

² See A/36/586.

³ See A/S-12/AC.1/11 and Corr.1 and 12 and Corr.1.