



President: Mr. Jorge E. ILLUECA (Panama).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is my privilege to address to you today, on behalf of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, our warm congratulations and sincere wishes for success. We know your talents as a jurist and a diplomat and your qualities as a statesman which you have so often and so successfully used in the service of your country and of your region, of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and of the United Nations, and they augur well for our present session.

2. To your predecessor, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic, our colleague of long standing, Mr. Imre Hollai, we renew our great respect and special thanks for the calm, rational and effective way in which he conducted our work.

3. We reiterate our confidence in and support for the Secretary-General, whose reports on our activities have provoked clear and salutary thought on the state of international relations and the role befitting our institutions.

4. Lastly, we are pleased to welcome among us Saint Christopher and Nevis.

5. It has been said that the delegations from the third world come to the United Nations to present their demands, describe their difficulties and explain their concerns and then go home with reassurances and promises that are sometimes not kept, because reality determines otherwise. We detect this general feeling of frustration at every session, as it is true that the hopes for the improvement of the world situation are dashed by events and incidents the seriousness of which we recognize.

6. Indeed, wherever we look, we see only disorder and confusion. Economic, monetary and financial disorder! Disorder in political relations and confusion in ideological relations! Disorder and confusion in assigning responsibility for ensuring peace and understanding among nations and for ensuring full development for peoples in the best possible conditions.

7. This year again, we are far from the global security provided for by the Charter, because we cannot reach agreement on the methods to be used, on the procedure to follow or even on the meaning of the concept. Generalized war, we are told, has so far been avoided, but regional conflicts continue to be manipulated and the great fear of nuclear war grips all peoples without exception.

8. Furthermore, since recovery seems to be confirmed in certain countries, statements are being made advocating a dialogue to deal with the crises of growth and development, while nevertheless encouraging the maintenance of several grey areas concerning the objectives, content and format of such a dialogue.

9. One should not therefore be astonished if peoples, particularly the peoples of the third world, seek new ways to ensure peace and development, in the absence of a security system whose establishment has been prevented by obstacles arising from mistrust, the promotion of selfish interests, the determination to perpetuate an outdated state of affairs and the decline of what the Secretary-General, in his latest report on the work of the Organization [A/38/1], calls multilateralism and internationalism.

10. Our peoples are hardly familiar with the cryptic language of politico-military circles concerning ballistic missiles, strategic bombers or intermediate nuclear forces. But can one really wish them to be other than particularly interested in the peace movements and in initiatives advocating the non-use of force, the non-use of nuclear weapons and the demilitarization and denuclearization of zones of peace and outer space?

11. Can we be blamed too for insisting that it is essential to continue disarmament negotiations and not to use them as mere window-dressing or as one more pawn in the East-West confrontation?

12. We have the right and the duty to insist on this, all the more so because we are all concerned by the overarmament of the great Powers and because cold-war animosities are re-emerging. The situation is such that we have the unpleasant impression that we have become the hostages of concepts which primarily serve selective strategies.

13. In this connection, we recall that a five-point plan was recently proposed for the Mediterranean, providing for the limitation of naval activities, the reduction of naval equipment, confidence-building measures, the withdrawal of vessels equipped with nuclear weapons and the non-deployment of nuclear weapons in coastal and hinterland States. Of course, we maintain the specific nature of the Indian Ocean. But if this plan is good enough for the Mediterranean then it is also good enough for the Indian Ocean; it could even be applied to other regions that wish to be zones of peace. In this connection the great Powers and blocs should decree a moratorium, with the idea of subsequently limiting, reducing and eliminating all military activity there.

14. It would be naive of us, however, to believe that nuclear disarmament will help make our peoples more secure. Indeed, what security can there be when we see the transfer and the crystallization of international tensions in regions regarded, rightly or wrongly, as strategic?

15. In the case of Chad, for example, the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, which recognizes the legitimacy conferred by the Lagos agreements concluded with the endorsement of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], is opposed to any attempt to internationalize a conflict that primarily concerns the Chadians themselves. However, it was seen fit at one time to resort to means out of all proportion to the African dimension of the problem. We can understand, nevertheless, the recourse to machinery in an agreement for co-operation between the Chadian Government and a foreign Power. An argument has been put forward by our regional organization

to promote reconciliation and reconstruction through negotiations. It would be more advantageous, we believe, to help the Chadians to explore the feasibility of this approach rather than to insert the problem of Chad within the context of possible great Power confrontation.

16. The same argument applies to Namibia. The right of the Namibians to peace and security must be attained through independence and not through the establishment of an arbitrary link between the return to international legality and the imposition on the People's Republic of Angola of conditions incompatible with its sovereignty. If we want to talk about security—although the South African régime is scarcely concerned about the security of its neighbouring States, near or far—if we really want to talk about security, my Government advocates dispatching a pan-African or international peace-keeping force to Namibia's frontiers, once independence has been obtained in keeping with Security Council resolution 435 (1978) or, in default of that, proclaimed by the United Nations under the aegis of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO].

17. It is ironic that certain circles attach importance to the requirements of the *apartheid* minority régime, which is only concerned with human rights and the rights of peoples in order to flout and repress them. We cannot agree that this régime, which does not recognize any right of the African majority, should become the regional policeman. Hypocrisy has become accommodating. The cause of Africa should not be further betrayed, and we reiterate our support for the African National Congress in its struggle for national liberation.

18. Lastly, in the Western Sahara, which remains the key to peace and security in the sub-region, the efforts of the OAU have had their ups and downs. The interests of the Saharan people, whom we fully support in their quest for freedom and justice, must prevail. The OAU has committed itself to preserving these interests by recommending direct negotiations between Morocco and POLISARIO to establish a cease-fire and a referendum free from military or administrative pressure—in other words, after the withdrawal of the Moroccan troops and administration. We have no ambition to make or rewrite history, but to ignore the consensus which arose around this problem during the last Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity would endanger the already difficult task of the Implementation Committee, and the credibility and future of the OAU.

19. To reduce tension and eliminate regional conflicts through political settlements strictly conceived outside any East-West confrontation and with due consideration for the rights of peoples and nations to peace and security, as well as for the fundamental principles of sovereignty, mutual respect and non-interference—this is still our position on the other problems before us.

20. Thus, we continue to support the just proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the reunification of the Korean homeland which would be independent, peaceful and free from outside interference. We also call for the implementation of the declaration on South-East Asia, issued by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries [see A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2], a declaration that the countries of Indo-China and those of the Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN] have already accepted as a basis for dialogue. We follow with interest developments in the talks on the situation in South-West Asia, in keeping with the guidelines set forth by the special representative of the Secretary-General, which is an approach already advocated by Afghanistan itself. We call

on Iraq and Iran to put an end to a fratricidal and senseless war, and we support the initiatives of the Contadora Group and of other States to ensure that democracy, security and stability shall be enjoyed by the peoples of Central America.

21. The questions of the Middle East and Palestine have distinct characteristics, if only because of the responsibility directly assumed by the United Nations with respect to the State of Palestine and the Palestinians for the last 40 years.

22. Conditions of peace will not be met as long as the Palestinians remain a people without land or rights, as long as Israel persists in its politically and legally unfounded argument that its sovereignty over the occupied territories is an established fact, and as long as domination and fragmentation of the Arab environment on the political, economic and social levels persist.

23. The multiplication of treaties and always partial agreements, the proliferation over decades of often partial plans lead us to think that it is time to call, as advocated by the recent International Conference on the Question of Palestine, an international conference on the Middle East in which Palestine, represented by its liberation organization, would necessarily take part.

24. We shall refer again to Lebanon, not to treat it as a separate issue but to express the hope that the unity, stability and preservation of the territorial integrity of Lebanon will be achieved thanks to the recent cease-fire which was agreed to by the parties involved.

25. In connection with the economic section of my statement, I will not go into a detailed analysis of the causes and effects of the crisis because these were dealt with masterfully by senior authorities at New Delhi, Buenos Aires, Belgrade, Geneva and Washington, as well as in other places. It is commendable that it was possible to adhere to the timetable of meetings and that major questions were debated. Nevertheless, the results of this succession of multilateral meetings failed to come up to expectations, perhaps because we entertained too many illusions or were unduly ambitious. The more likely reason is that it is still hard to reconcile our differences.

26. Be that as it may, since optimism is a human quality, we are condemned to persevere and to succeed. However, there are intolerable situations which cannot await the result of complex negotiations. We have in mind, in particular, Africa, a continent which stands most in need of development but which development seems to have forgotten.

27. A brief look at the facts suffices: the average rate of growth in African countries has fallen over the last three years from 4.4 per cent to 0.6 per cent; the annual income of the inhabitants today is lower than it was 20 years ago; the terms of trade have worsened by a total of about 20 per cent over five years; the overall current deficit is estimated at \$12 billion and the foreign debt has increased nearly seven-fold in over 10 years, while the average debt-servicing ratio has more than doubled.

28. Given that plainly gloomy state of affairs, our concern will undoubtedly be shared by the industrialized countries, whatever their economic and social system. The economic recovery which has been forecast will have no effect or will be feeble at best, because the economic and financial difficulties of the African countries will reduce the demand for the exports of the industrialized countries and will thus increase unemployment in some of them.

29. It is in the interest of all, therefore, to launch the emergency programme for Africa now in order to avoid the economic collapse of the most seriously affected

countries. That programme would supplement the structural adjustment measures agreed to by our countries at the cost of additional sacrifices but which can be achieved only with co-operation on the part of the whole international community, given the fact that the origin of most of our problems lies outside our countries.

30. The programme could include the provision of additional financial resources by increasing official development assistance and by organizing the programmes and procedures for the provision of loans by international financial institutions; continued support for the African Development Bank group, in particular with regard to the fourth general replenishment of the resources of the African Development Fund; withdrawal of protectionist measures, lowering trade barriers and opening markets to our goods; and new measures of debt relief, which would include the rescheduling of all our debts and the extension of repayment periods with no penalties for late payment.

31. That programme would have prospects of succeeding if it were accompanied by a reduction of the interest rates of the main international financial centres and the limitation of fluctuations in interest rates.

32. Those are only short-term measures concerning a particular region which is beset by exceptional circumstances. But our solidarity with the rest of the third world cannot be qualified and we cannot sufficiently emphasize the important and urgent need to restructure international economic relations on a democratic, just and equitable basis. We remain convinced that this profound change can be brought about only within the framework of global negotiations, which have been delayed for four years by the negative political will of certain of our partners. In the mean time, initiatives have been taken, such as the organization of an international conference on monetary and financial means of development or the convening of an international monetary conference at the highest level.

33. We support these two conferences and these initiatives, but we believe they should not be considered pre-conditions for launching global negotiations but rather integral parts of the negotiations after the negotiations are under way.

34. Furthermore, it would be abnormal and contrary to our position on collective self-reliance for us to stake everything on the North-South dialogue. South-South co-operation is important, because countries of the third world are determined to preserve their economic independence, strengthen their negotiating power and harmonize their diverse interests.

35. The attainment of those goals presupposes that we can choose the institutional means and set up the appropriate operational instruments. In this context, the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar took the initiative four years ago of proposing the establishment of three funds to promote effective solidarity in the monetary, development and raw material fields, in order to strengthen the complementary links between our economies and ensure for ourselves a role at the international level.

36. It is not a question of organizing the South against the North or of competing with existing international institutions. Our efforts are complementary but not mutually exclusive, because unless we want the new economic order to remain a mirage of the 1970s and 1980s, we must all heed the appeal made at New Delhi by the heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries for collective action to bring about world-wide prosperity.

37. By their permanence or recurrence and because we have not been able to overcome them, the political and economic crises have exacerbated the climate of insecurity in international relations and kept the peoples in a state of uncertainty concerning their right to well-being and social progress. However, they have had the merit of giving the concepts of peace, security and development new dimensions, in keeping with the requirements of shared responsibility, and of provoking a salutary reaction to attempts to impose on multilateral relations an approach inspired by bilateral relations.

38. Whatever the motives for this latest development, it can only stiffen the confrontation and make the breach inevitable and final by relegating to the margins those of us that cannot agree to become pawns in a game carried on without our knowledge. In a world which is divided and stratified, only firm adherence to multilateralism will enable us to appreciate the facets of divergent interests, to resume a dialogue on which the credibility and effectiveness of our institutions will depend and to ensure the attainment of a world in peace with itself, thanks to the establishment of a just, democratic and equitable new order.

39. Here lies the essence of non-alignment, which cannot be reduced to a mere balancing act but rather presupposes the rejection of all forms of subjection, dependence, interference, intervention or pressure in international relations, in order to be able to judge according to merit on the basis of national independence and commitments based on universally accepted principles. In other words, if we have to be aligned, let us be aligned with just causes, the aspirations of our peoples and the purposes and principle of the Charter.

40. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Please accept, Sir, the congratulations of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic on your election to the presidency of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, together with our best wishes for every success. We thank the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic, Mr. Imre Hollai, for the dignified and responsible manner in which he discharged his functions as President of the previous session.

41. Our delegation welcomes the admission of Saint Christopher and Nevis as a Member of the United Nations.

42. As many preceding speakers have already pointed out, this session of the General Assembly is being held in the context of a difficult international situation. Tensions in the world have reached a very dangerous level, a fact clearly indicated in the statement by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. Yuri Andropov, on 28 September 1983 [see A/38/459]. The aggravation of the world situation is the result of the policy being openly pursued primarily by the United States, and by its closest military and political allies as well, a policy that undermines peace and international security. In their attempts to achieve military superiority for the United States of America over the Soviet Union and, by the same token, for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] over the Warsaw Treaty Organization, they are constantly whipping up the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. They are engaged in gross interference in the internal affairs of other States, poisoning the political atmosphere by staging acts of provocation, and deliberately impairing the potential of the peoples for economic and social progress. Driven by their imperialist ambitions, they are trying to impose their imperialist will

on the world through the use or threat of force, including the threat of nuclear force.

43. The time available for effectively solving the problems of preserving peace and achieving true disarmament is limited and growing ever shorter. In these conditions the United Nations and its Member States cannot simply register these alarming facts; they must act and act decisively and without delay.

44. Are there real possibilities of a radical improvement in the current political situation, of solving the problems created by the imperialists, of a return to the path of détente and co-operation?

45. Yes, there are. Such opportunities are being offered by the Soviet Union and other States of the socialist community, by the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and by the overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations. Such opportunities have also been adumbrated in earlier General Assembly resolutions.

46. Let us try to imagine the world as it would be had the constructive proposals of the forces of socialism and peace been implemented and made a reality. Let us try to analyse what is preventing the implementation of those peace initiatives.

47. Turning first to Europe, approximate parity exists between the military potentials of the two social and political systems, though the concentration of combat units and military hardware is 20 times higher than the world average.

48. The Soviet Union, constantly striving for an improvement in the situation on the European continent and for the elimination of the threat of war, is proposing that both medium-range and tactical nuclear-weapon systems in Europe be destroyed or that the deployment in Europe of any new medium-range missile systems be renounced while all existing systems are reduced, by both sides, by approximately two thirds. The Soviet Union is proposing that agreement be reached on parity in both delivery vehicles—missiles and aircraft—and their warheads. Finally, the Soviet Union is prepared, if a mutually accepted agreement is reached that includes the non-deployment by the United States of new missiles in Europe, to reduce its medium-range missiles in the European part of the Soviet Union to a number equal to the number of British and French missiles and to eliminate all missiles subject to reduction, including SS-20s. Thus, the Soviet Union would be left in Europe with a smaller number of medium-range missiles than it had in 1976, that is to say, before the modernization of Soviet missiles began.

49. The Soviet Union supports the proposals for nuclear-free zones in northern Europe and in the Balkans and for a 500-600-kilometre-wide zone in Central Europe that would be free of battlefield nuclear weapons. In the area of conventional arms it is seeking a reduction in armed forces and conventional weapons in Central Europe and advocating that their numbers be frozen by the States permanent members of the Security Council and States having military agreements with them.

50. Finally, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty have proposed to the NATO countries the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual non-use of force and the maintenance of relations of peace, which would have as its centrepiece an undertaking not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against each other, that is, not to use any military force against each other.

51. These proposals, if agreed to, would provide ample opportunities for mutually beneficial co-operation by the States and peoples of Europe in all areas and in a climate of lasting peace and reliable security.

52. What are those who oppose such initiatives seeking to attain? They want to divide Europe with a palisade of American missiles. They are preparing to deploy neutron weapons on the continent of Europe and demanding that their NATO allies further increase their military spending. At the same time—and this is another facet of the monstrous plan designed to hold the States of Western Europe hostage to the United States—the United States of America is forcing them to break off mutually beneficial economic and other ties with the Eastern European States, notwithstanding the fact that Soviet orders alone have been providing employment for no less than one million people in Western Europe. Moreover, the United States is strangling the economies of Western European countries with its high interest rates and an artificially inflated exchange rate for the United States dollar.

53. With regard to missiles in Europe, the United States seems to harbour the illusory hope that somehow it might be possible to force the Soviet Union to end up with zero missiles in exchange for zero reductions on the part of NATO; or, according to the latest United States proposal, to force the Soviet Union to reduce its medium-range missiles and allow new American missiles to be deployed in Europe over and above the present NATO nuclear potential. Such an approach is totally contrary to the principle of undiminished security of other States, as recognized by the United Nations, and the principle of equality and equal security. It should also be emphasized that the American Pershing II and cruise missiles to be deployed in Western Europe are capable of destroying targets throughout the Middle East and over half the African continent, that is to say, they are targeted at several regions of the world—Europe, the Middle East and Africa.

54. Let us now consider the question of the strategic arms of the United States and the Soviet Union, which are roughly equal although difficult in structure. The Soviet Union has proposed the reduction of such arms by one fourth and, concurrently, the reduction to equal, agreed levels of the aggregate number of nuclear warheads deployed on the remaining delivery vehicles.

55. The proposals put forward by the United States provide for selective reductions whereby the United States would end up with three times as many warheads as the USSR. Such proposals are designed to disrupt the existing structure of Soviet strategic forces.

56. The United States is pursuing the same self-seeking and negative course with regard to all other disarmament issues. It is blocking the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. It is sabotaging the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on the non-first-use of nuclear weapons, a freeze on nuclear capabilities, nuclear disarmament, a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, the renunciation of the production of neutron weapons and of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons and on the preparation of a convention on the elimination of chemical warfare capabilities. It should be noted in this regard that, according to reports in the United States press, the Pentagon already has in its possession enough chemical weapons to destroy the entire population of the Earth 50 times over. The United States is opposing a freeze on and a subsequent reduction of military budgets. The United States is not only increasing its own military expenditures but is also asserting its right to dictate to its allies their levels of military spending. As a result, the aggregate military expenditures of capitalist countries increased seventeen-fold from 1950 to 1982.

57. The United States is attempting to justify its obstructionist stand on arms limitation and genuine

disarmament by demagoguery about “Soviet military superiority”, a supposed “passivity” on the part of the United States in the past and the resultant American “lagging behind”. Even favourably disposed Western analysts have failed, however, to come up with a single instance in the entire post-war history of the Soviet Union’s having taken the lead in developing any new kind of arms, thus forcing the United States to take counter-measures. It has always been the other way around, and we should like to point out that in the so-called passive years the United States increased its strategic nuclear potential by a factor of 2.5, developing new kinds of arms and weapons systems, increasing their range and accuracy and multiplying their destructive capabilities many times over. It is also common knowledge that, notwithstanding its mounting propaganda campaign about “lagging behind”, the United States in effect enjoys an advantage over the Soviet Union in the number of nuclear warheads. As stated by Mr. Romulo, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, speaking in the general debate on 26 September [5th meeting], the United States strategic arsenal includes some 9,500 warheads, while the Soviet Union has 7,700. According to his data, the United States has an advantage of 7,000 tactical nuclear weapons. It is also worth recalling that the United States has encircled the Soviet Union with a network of military bases and installations; that since the Second World War it has resorted to military force 260 times to further its foreign policy goals and threatened to use nuclear weapons on 19 occasions, including 4 times against the Soviet Union; and that since 1975 alone it has dispatched its forces abroad in about 50 cases. The United States is building new military bases on foreign soil, expanding existing ones, and sometimes even increasing its payments, as if a higher rent increases the security of the owner of a house who is forced to share it with a sick trespasser who is dangerous to the people around him.

58. It is not concern for international peace and security that motivates the United States. This was acknowledged even by the United States Secretary of Defense, Mr. Weinberger, when he said that much of the energy resources that the United States needs and many strategically important minerals are thousands of miles away from United States shores and that in order to gain access to these resources—to be more exact, other peoples’ resources—the United States must increase its military and naval might. Thus there is a direct link with the imperialist practice of proclaiming vast regions of the globe “spheres of United States vital interests”.

59. Is it surprising, then, that the United States is opposing the preparation in the United Nations of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations and that it is unresponsive to the proposal for a treaty between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries on the mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace?

60. Let us now consider the question of preventing an arms race in outer space. The earlier Soviet proposals on this subject are well known. The current session has before it a draft treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from space against the Earth [see A/38/194]. It has been proposed that agreement should be reached on a comprehensive ban on the testing and deployment of any space-based weapons capable of destroying targets on Earth, in the atmosphere or in outer space, on the elimination of existing anti-satellite systems and on the prohibition of the development of new ones. Meanwhile the USSR has unilaterally assumed the extremely important obligation not to be the first to place any kind of anti-satellite weapons in outer space.

61. What about the position and actions of the United States? They include disruption of Soviet-American talks on banning anti-satellite weapons, opposition to launching talks in the Committee on Disarmament on the prohibition of the placement in outer space of weapons of any kind, the refusal to assume the obligation not to be the first to place anti-satellite weapons in outer space and, at the same time, the implementation of military programmes in outer space and the announcement of a militaristic “star wars” programme.

62. In concluding this part of its statement, devoted to the limitation of the arms race and to disarmament, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR stresses most emphatically the importance and timeliness of the new proposals to condemn nuclear war [A/38/243] and to freeze nuclear arms [A/38/244], submitted by the Soviet Union to the thirty-eighth session.

63. These proposals are a logical extension of the efforts undertaken within the United Nations to save the peoples of the world from the threat of nuclear war.

64. As far back as 1981 the United Nations adopted a Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe [resolution 36/100]. One year later it endorsed the unilaterally assumed obligation of the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and called upon the other nuclear Powers to follow suit [resolution 37/78J]. Now the time has come to adopt a declaration condemning nuclear war as the most hideous crime against the peoples and declaring as criminal acts the formulation, propounding, dissemination and propaganda of political and military doctrines and concepts intended to justify the “legitimacy” of the first use of nuclear weapons and in general the “admissibility” of unleashing nuclear war.

65. Nor can it be denied that if we are seeking nuclear disarmament—and no one dares to challenge that goal openly—then we should start by freezing nuclear weapons and halting, under appropriate verification, the buildup of all components of nuclear arsenals, including all kinds of delivery vehicles and warheads, renouncing the deployment of new kinds and types of such weapons, declaring a moratorium on all nuclear-weapon tests as well as tests of new kinds and types of delivery vehicles, and halting the production of fissionable materials for manufacturing nuclear weapons.

66. That proposal, containing qualitative and quantitative limitations, is addressed to all the nuclear Powers, but the Soviet Union believes that it is possible that initially the United States and the Soviet Union can set a good example for others to follow with an appropriate agreement to freeze their nuclear potentials.

67. We believe that these proposals will enjoy very wide support among States Members of the United Nations. We can and we undoubtedly must solve these problems. Our conviction is based on the success of the Madrid meeting of the States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, where, despite all the tensions in Europe and throughout the world, States with differing social systems still succeeded in finding mutually acceptable agreements on the basis of the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act,² including agreement to convene the Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

68. Now let us, in our imagination, turn from continental Europe to other parts of the world.

69. We see that while the Soviet Union is proposing that the Mediterranean be turned into a zone of stable peace and co-operation, that all ships carrying nuclear weapons be withdrawn from that area and that the deployment

of nuclear weapons on the territory of non-nuclear Mediterranean countries be renounced, the United States is opposing these measures.

70. The Soviet Union is striving to achieve implementation of the United Nations resolutions on the question of Cyprus and has proposed the convening for this purpose of a representative international conference within the framework of the United Nations, while the United States is blocking the settlement of the situation in Cyprus by opposing the demilitarization of Cyprus and attempting to impose on its people NATO-inspired terms that are incompatible with the independence, territorial integrity and non-aligned policy of that country.

71. Let us now turn to another flashpoint on our planet, the long-suffering Middle East. It is well known that the socialist, Arab, non-aligned and many other States are demanding that Israeli troops be withdrawn from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967 and are working towards the achievement of a Middle East settlement through political means, ensuring security for all the States and peoples of the region, providing for the exercise of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people to statehood and restoring the independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon through the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli occupiers from Lebanese soil and the withdrawal of United States and other NATO forces from that country. Socialist and non-aligned States took part in the regional conferences and, in August-September, in the International Conference on the Question of Palestine. They have proposed the convening of an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO].

72. And what is the United States doing about the Middle East problem? It is engaged in "strategic co-operation" with the Israeli aggressors, supplying them with modern weapons. It is the United States that nurtured this militaristic State in the Middle East. As a result, Israel's military expenditures amount to 62 per cent of its gross national product, while its external indebtedness exceeds its annual gross national product. The United States has been supporting Israel's aggressive actions against the Arab peoples, defending it in the Security Council against the wrath and the just demands of the international community. As for the PLO, the United States has no other words for it but torrents of malicious insults. The United States not only has been evading a comprehensive and just settlement in the Middle East but also—at the very time of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, which it sabotaged—proceeded to overt military actions against the Lebanese, thus making a mockery of its promise to protect them.

73. In the Persian Gulf area, the Soviet Union is proposing that the threat of war be eliminated, that a climate of stability and tranquility be ensured, that foreign military bases not be established, that no nuclear or any other kind of weapon of mass destruction be deployed, that there be no resort to the use or threat of force against the countries of that region, that the non-aligned status chosen by the Persian Gulf States be respected, that guarantees be provided for the sovereign rights of those States and for the security of the maritime and other communications linking the region with the rest of the world, and that an international agreement to these ends be concluded.

74. And what is the United States doing there? It is arbitrarily, without the consent of the 19 States concerned, busy setting up the CENTCOM command, assigning to it policing functions, including direct military

intervention in the internal affairs of others. It is also engaged in demonstrations of military might through the rapid deployment force.

75. As for the Indian Ocean, the Soviet Union has consistently supported the efforts of the States of that region to prepare for and hold an international conference to reach agreement on the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, and it is in favour of the return of the Chagos Archipelago, including Diego Garcia, to Mauritius.

76. Seeking as it does an overall reduction in tensions across the seas and oceans, the USSR has proposed, among other things, that naval activities be restricted on a mutual basis, that naval armaments be limited and reduced, that Soviet and United States missile-carrying submarines be withdrawn from their present vast combat patrol zones and that their navigation range be limited by mutually agreed lines, and that confidence-building measures be extended to the sea and ocean areas; that is, the USSR is working towards transforming the largest part of the world's oceans into a zone of peace.

77. The United States, having unilaterally suspended the Soviet-American negotiations on the limitation and reduction of military activities in the Indian Ocean, is escalating its military activities both in the Indian Ocean and in other maritime areas, consolidating its Diego Garcia base, hindering the convening of a conference to transform the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and attempting to undermine the very notion of a zone of peace.

78. In Asia and the Far East, the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries support the idea of negotiations to reach agreement on confidence-building measures. The Mongolian People's Republic has proposed the drafting and conclusion of a convention on mutual non-aggression and the non-use of force in relations between the Asian and Pacific States. The countries of Indo-China advocate the establishment of a zone of peace and stability in South-East Asia. Afghanistan is striving for a political settlement in South-West Asia, defending its freedom and independence and supporting the mediation efforts of the personal representative of the Secretary-General to settle the problem of this region on the basis of a cessation of armed or any other kind of interference in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, with guarantees against any renewal of such interference.

79. On the other hand, the United States is harnessing the countries of this region to its military-strategic plans. For example, Japan has already been assigned the role of "unsinkable aircraft carrier", although under its own constitution it is supposed to be a peace-loving and not a militaristic State. Such a policy constitutes an attempt to persuade people to forget the lessons of the past. United States politicians are inviting the States of ASEAN to violate its charter and transform itself from an organ of peaceful co-operation among its member countries to an instrument of interference in the affairs of its neighbours, Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea, which are now engaged in building a new life in keeping with the will of their peoples. The efforts of the United States to destabilize the situation both inside and around Afghanistan are also well known. The United States has not withdrawn its forces from South Korea but is carrying out provocative manoeuvres there, using South Korean aircraft for intelligence purposes against the USSR. It is planning to deploy neutron weapons in the southern part of the Korean peninsula and is doing everything it can to impede the peaceful, democratic reunification of Korea free of any outside interference.

80. Let us now look at the problems of Africa. There the United States has proclaimed itself the "historical

ally" of the racist régime of South Africa and, moreover, is now pursuing a policy of so-called constructive co-operation with that régime. As a result, decisions of the United Nations, including those of its Security Council, on the struggle against *apartheid* and on the granting of genuine independence to Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO remain unimplemented. In fact the United States has been acting as an accomplice in the continuing aggressive actions against Angola and other African countries. The report prepared by the Secretary-General after his visit to southern Africa³ permits the conclusion that the main reason why the South African régime so brazenly disregards United Nations demands to grant independence to Namibia is indeed the comprehensive support which the racist régime in Pretoria receives from the United States. The most recent example of neo-colonialist schemes in Africa is the armed interference of imperialist forces in Chad, inspired and encouraged by the United States and involving other countries, including African countries, in these criminal actions; and there have been military provocations against Libya, continuing interference in the internal affairs of many African countries and military, political and economic pressure brought to bear upon them. In Africa, too, a policy of crude neo-colonialism is being pursued.

81. The same thing is happening in Micronesia, which the United States is attempting to annex in order to turn it into a militarily strategic springboard, and in Puerto Rico, whose people is being denied the right to self-determination and independence. The same course is being followed by England in the South Atlantic, where it is turning the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands into a military outpost and engaging in colonial piracy in that part of the world.

82. The peoples of the Middle East and Africa are striving to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones in those areas while the United States is co-operating with Israel and South Africa in their plans to develop their own nuclear weapons.

83. The United States is also aggravating the situation in Central America and the Caribbean by interfering in the internal affairs of the countries of that region in a cavalier and flagrant manner. Using military threats and pressure, it is trying to deny to the peoples of that region their right to lead a life of their own choosing. The United States is resisting the constructive efforts of those Latin American countries which are anxious to help in seeking mutually acceptable solutions. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, is supporting those efforts and the constructive proposals of Nicaragua and Cuba. The principles of a settlement which they have put forward constitute a good basis for agreement without prejudice to anyone's interests.

84. It is well known that in recent years the United States has made ceaseless efforts to pose as the champion of human rights, a paragon of freedom and democracy and a fighter against international terrorism. The hypocrisy of such claims is self-evident. The United States is not a party to the international covenants on human rights or other basic international legal instruments on human rights and the struggle against racism and *apartheid*. It is boycotting the efforts of the international community in this area, and that is borne out by its refusal to attend the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The United States continues to harbour Nazi war criminals. It is oppressing its non-white population and, together with other neo-colonialists, is working to resist the wills of other peoples fighting for their freedom, independence and independent development.

85. The United States is rejecting the demands of socialist and developing countries for a restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis, blocking the launching of global negotiations in the United Nations on economic problems and grossly disrupting mutually beneficial ties between States. The United States is trying to bring high-handed economic and political pressure to bear on the socialist States by declaring a crusade against them. It is also threatening the developing nations which have chosen a progressive path of development.

86. Our position on economic problems is predicated on the need to restructure international economic relations on a just, equitable and democratic basis. We are actively fighting imperialist policies which result in the loss by developing nations of more than \$200 billion annually through the outflow of capital and profits, debt servicing and inequitable terms of trade.

87. As to the fight against international terrorism, it is appropriate to point out that it is in fact the United States which is doing all it can to support and install dictatorial militarist régimes in various areas, arming mercenaries and sending them to fight against national liberation movements, blocking the preparation of a convention against mercenarism and taking a direct part in repressive military actions in the Middle East, Africa and Latin America.

88. Thus, no matter what aspect of United States policy we turn our attention to, it is perfectly clear that the present United States Administration is opposed to the Charter of the United Nations and the good name of this Organization. It is opposed to most States of the world and to the international community as a whole. It is ignoring the warning of the first President of the United States that a nation which indulges an habitual hatred towards another is a slave to its animosity. Surely that is dangerous to the cause of peace and co-operation.

89. That is why it is essential for peace-loving peoples to step up their efforts to reconcile the course of international developments with the Charter by abiding by it rather than undermining it, in order to respond to the aspirations of the peoples of the world to peace, disarmament, co-operation and social justice. A programme of concrete steps to achieve these goals is contained in the proposals of the socialist States set forth in the Political Declaration adopted by the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty at Prague in January 1983 [see A/38/67 and Corr.1] and in the joint statement issued in Moscow on 28 June at the meeting of State and party leaders of the countries of the socialist community, as well as in the specific proposals submitted by the socialist States to the General Assembly for its consideration at this session. All these proposals confirm the statement by Mr. Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR that "in our time it is precisely socialism that acts as the most consistent defender of sound elements in international relations, of the interests of peace and détente, of the interests of every people and of the whole of mankind".

90. We greatly appreciate also the position of non-aligned countries and together with them flatly reject the allegation of the United States Department of State that the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi, adopted a declaration which "fails to reflect the principles of non-alignment". In our view, both the previous and the New Delhi documents of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, regardless of what may be said about them on behalf

of the United States from this rostrum, are permeated with concern for peace and co-operation and reaffirm the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist nature of the Non-Aligned Movement. They open up meaningful opportunities for further concerted efforts on the part of all forces of peace and progress to solve key problems of world politics.

91. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, which at the beginning of 1984 will celebrate the sixty-fifth anniversary of its foundation and in the middle of the year will celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the liberation of its territory from the German fascist invaders, is determined to join in the efforts of all peace-loving nations to preserve and strengthen peace on earth, to prevent nuclear catastrophe, to achieve a real breakthrough in disarmament, to improve radically the international situation and to solve all existing problems by political means, through negotiation, on the basis of respect for the sovereign rights and legitimate interests of all peoples.

92. We say this on behalf of a people which lost one fourth of its population and over half of its national wealth in the Second World War; a people which has increased the industrial potential of its republic 33 times in the post-war years as a result of its peaceful, creative work, as compared to the pre-war level, and which is successfully carrying out a programme of economic and social development for the benefit of the working people; a people which is waging an active struggle for peace and taking part in the anti-missile and anti-war movement; a people which gave us the mandate to fight for peace, détente, disarmament and broader co-operation among States; a people which is ready in any circumstances to defend its socialist achievements against any aggressive encroachments or designs.

93. Mr. SOEBERRAS TRIGONA (Malta): Please accept my congratulations, Sir, on your election as President of this session. You merit our full co-operation, not only in your capacity as a representative of Panama, but also by virtue of your experience of Assembly affairs, your country's contribution to the peace of Central America as a member of the Contadora Group and, last but not least, your inspiration as a true son of the ideals of Simón Bolívar, on this the 200th anniversary of the Liberator's birth.

94. We take this opportunity to compliment the Deputy Foreign Minister of Hungary, Imre Hollai, for his tireless efforts in presiding over last year's session.

95. We welcome the new addition to our membership by the admission of Saint Christopher and Nevis. We offer our congratulations on its independence and we extend our best wishes for the peace and prosperity of its people.

96. The system of co-operation and mutual understanding originally envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations is increasingly being threatened by the cynical use of military predominance in inter-State relations. We have to ask ourselves whether this unrestrained scramble for global power and complete influence over men and resources is leading us irresistibly to the 1984 nightmare evoked by Orwell, which would engulf State sovereignty as we know it, or can we as independent nation-States still achieve our freedom and self-respect in peace and harmony?

97. The signs are far from encouraging. In Latin America a number of peoples, in particular in El Salvador and Chile, continue to be suppressed as they demand their basic human rights. Others who have achieved these rights

through bitter struggle, as in Nicaragua, are faced with resolute opposition from outside.

98. In Asia there persists the shameful presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan and Kampuchea. The peaceful reunification of Korea is still thwarted by the imperatives of foreign interests. Two neighbouring countries, Iran and Iraq, remain locked in a festering conflict.

99. The Palestinian people are still engaged in their bitter struggle to secure a homeland. Attempts at national reconciliation in Lebanon are wrecked by the contending pressures of divergent outside interests.

100. In Africa the peoples of Namibia and South Africa still await their liberation from the imposition of racist and immoral bondage.

101. In our own region of the Mediterranean we remain the helpless witnesses of the continuing violation of the sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of the sister island of Cyprus. We live under the constant threat of massive armadas scouring our sea and using our region as a base from which to project their influence to neighbouring countries.

102. In the light of these realities the policies adopted by Malta's socialist Government since 1971 have been inspired so far by our yearning for a community of nations pursuing their individual destinies in peace and co-operation. Yet we cannot ignore the fact that dangerous, radical and even costly choices could be forced upon us in view of the growing number of fellow nations and peoples caught in the vortex of events which threatens to engulf us all.

103. It is therefore necessary to take stock of Malta's achievements and prospects in the military, political and economic fields.

104. In the military field we confront an irrational situation in which a frenetic production and deployment of monstrous armaments is defined as the best safeguard of peace. It is this attitude which has exposed the Mediterranean to the escalating naval confrontation of the two armed alliances.

105. Until 1971 Malta was enmeshed in this confrontation by virtue of the military bases it was obliged to offer NATO. However, from 1964, as soon as Malta was no longer constitutionally a British colony and therefore not considered part of United Kingdom territory, it lost all the protective defence guarantees deriving from the collective security arrangements of the Washington treaty.

106. This situation only increased the attraction of the military bases as a prime target in any eventual hostilities and therefore unashamedly exposed the Maltese to much greater dangers than those tolerable even in any NATO member country. If left unchecked, NATO would have by now been contemplating the deployment of nuclear missiles in Malta. Our unprotected citizens would therefore have become further exposed to the hazards of accidents in time of peace, as well as to the assured destruction by pre-emptive strikes in time of hostilities.

107. It took the workers' movement in Malta to recognize the insanity of such policies and put a stop to them. The options we have exercised since 1971, leading to the closing down of the military bases in 1979 and the ensuing denial of military facilities, eliminated from Malta that military connection which was absurdly jeopardizing our freedom and safety.

108. We have seen the beneficial effects of our choices for peace.

109. Our close neighbour Libya was among the foremost to recognize the significance of our decision to remove all military bases from our territory for the security

of the Mediterranean. It was the first to give us both moral and material assistance to enable us to overcome the violent opposition we faced in the initial stages.

110. From a distant region, China also understood very early the important contribution Malta was making towards a peaceful and co-operative global environment for which it was also striving. China has been a consistent and solid friend of Malta ever since, and the Maltese people deeply appreciate this.

111. Many countries have today recognized and expressed support for our status of neutrality, both at the bilateral level and in the multilateral forums of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Commonwealth and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

112. The options which our workers' movement has exercised for peace and co-operation have so far ensured the greater freedom of the Maltese people and their growing respect within the community of nations. However, in a world experiencing an increasing threat to the institutions of peace, we have to remain extremely vigilant. The options we take in the future have to be conditioned by the realities with which we are faced.

113. At the political level Malta exercised its options for peace by adopting a status of neutrality based on the principles of non-alignment, by maintaining equal distance from the super-Powers and by promoting co-operation and security in the Mediterranean. Over the past year these policies found their principal expression in the Non-Aligned Movement, in the Security Council and in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

114. At New Delhi, in March of this year, Malta joined the non-aligned countries in reaffirming the commitment to the pursuit of peaceful intercourse among nations, the rejection of arms buildup as a basis for security, the desire to avoid the entanglements of bloc alliances, the demand that all peoples be permitted to seek their prosperity in free and sovereign nationhood, and the call for vastly increased global economic co-operation to relieve the misery, hunger and suffering which still cast a dark shadow in the closing twentieth century.

115. Malta steadfastly joins in the pursuit of these objectives because it sees in their implementation the most effective safeguard of the political and economic freedom which it has progressively achieved over the few years since eliminating all unwanted foreign military, political and economic influence from its territory.

116. At New Delhi the non-aligned countries formally expressed their recognition and support of the status of neutrality adopted by Malta in pursuance of its objective to entrench the process of its national development within a larger process of regional security and co-operation in the Mediterranean [see A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2]. In the same spirit the New Delhi meeting welcomed Malta's initiatives on Mediterranean security undertaken within the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and agreed to call a meeting of all Mediterranean non-aligned countries to consider what further action should be taken to consolidate Mediterranean security and co-operation.

117. We cannot forget that it is through the support of the Non-Aligned Movement that Malta finally was given its first opportunity to serve as a member of the Security Council. All our actions in the Council have been inspired by the firm appreciation of its unique role in the pursuit of international peace and security. We have in this way further manifested the active concept of our neutral status. Malta's is not a passive neutrality intent on shying away from a commitment to international obligations.

Neither is it a neutrality inhibited by any purist notions which impose a deliberate avoidance of the super-Powers. On the contrary, by evolving a policy of equal distance we have established a mature relationship with both super-Powers which permits us to fulfil the role we have assumed in the quest for peace and co-operation in our region, as well as in bringing about a co-operative and positive attitude towards the resolution of international problems.

118. Over the past nine months there have arisen in the Security Council frequent occasions calling for our endeavours to promote international peace and security.

119. The situation in Central America, in particular the threat to the sovereignty and freedom of the Nicaraguan people, has figured prominently in Council discussions. Malta's position on this issue has been inspired by two basic objectives: safeguarding the hard-won rights of the Nicaraguan people, and accepting the role of States in shaping the destiny of their own region. We consulted intensively with the Nicaraguan representatives, as well as with, on the one hand, the members of the Contadora Group—Venezuela, Mexico, Panama and Colombia—and, on the other hand, the permanent members of the Security Council, particularly the United States, to identify the most appropriate Council action on this problem. This resulted in the delicately balanced resolution 530 (1983), unanimously adopted, which reaffirmed the right of Nicaragua to live in peace and security, free from outside interference, and gave support to the continuing work of the Contadora Group.

120. Our own region of the Mediterranean has had more than its fair share of problems over the course of this year. The Council has had to deal with a dangerous confrontation between Libya and the United States, with mutual complaints from Chad and Libya against each other, with the international implications of a civil war in Chad and with the even more awesome international implications of the problems of Lebanon. On each occasion Malta sought to steer discussion in the Council to the essential aspects of the issues at stake, the need to avoid interference in the internal affairs of States, respect for human lives, the avoidance of super-Power involvement in regional issues, and the primacy of regional States in defining solutions for problems of their own region.

121. The solutions Malta has sought for these problems are not based on any intention or desire to assign blame or condemnation but rather on the need to identify, through quiet and patient diplomacy, pragmatic steps towards the relaxation of tension. In this context we are satisfied that our role in the Council discussions on Chad has helped towards the adoption by consensus of a President's statement⁴ which continued adequately to cover subsequent developments by urging co-operation rather than exacerbating tension.

122. Similarly, in the recent case of the Korean Air Lines incident, our first and dominant concern was to work to ensure not so much that a culprit be identified but that a collective undertaking be secured to guarantee that no similar incident will ever happen. We voted for the draft resolution eventually submitted in the Council⁵ after we were satisfied that there existed a sufficient commitment to work within ICAO to reinforce the international rules and regulations aimed at avoiding such incidents, particularly by ensuring that in cases of accidental violations of airspace the overflying aircraft would be given due warning, safe landing would be provided and all the countries concerned would be involved in any necessary discussions.

123. Unfortunately, there are instances when direct accusation cannot be avoided simply because the violation

of the basic norms of international behaviour is so persistent and blatant. Such is indeed the case of Israel's policies concerning the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to a homeland of their own. Malta will continue unequivocally to condemn Israel as long as its present policies are maintained, and our support for the Palestinian struggle, under the leadership of the PLO, remains unchanged.

124. Similarly, in the case of Namibia and South Africa, we cannot but continue to voice our horror and disgust at the aggressive and immoral manner in which a small and recalcitrant racist minority continues to defy the most basic norms of human behaviour. Within the very modest means at our disposal, we are giving assistance to the Namibian people in their continuing struggle. As Malta had helped in the educational and technical training of Zimbabwean students before their country's independence, we are now offering similar opportunities to Namibian students.

125. At the same time, in the Council we also worked actively for a unanimously adopted resolution on Namibia, which involved very intensive and delicate negotiations. That resolution [532 (1983)] mandated the Secretary-General to undertake consultations with all the parties involved, and we trust that the basis thus established will be pursued assiduously by all so that the Namibian people will finally achieve their long-awaited independence.

126. The confidence that we have inspired through our approach in the Security Council has been such as to encourage members to entrust us with the complex and time-consuming task of identifying points of convergence in efforts to enhance the Council's effectiveness in fulfilling its role for peace. We shall pursue the efforts we have undertaken over the past months and which by September had already resulted in a note by the President⁶ outlining a number of points on which progress could be achieved.

127. Malta sees the Security Council not only as the body which deals with issues once they reach crisis point, but also as having an important role in laying down the more durable foundations for the improvement of the international environment through effective action which, for example, facilitates the creation of zones of peace in regions like the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean and elsewhere.

128. Over the past three years, in the Madrid follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, Malta has been engaged in another forum where it has sought to consolidate the basis of its own national freedom through the enhancement of the process of regional and global security and co-operation.

129. In 1975, in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe at Helsinki, meeting for the first time since the Second World War, all European States except Albania, together with the United States and Canada, agreed on a broad set of measures aimed at ensuring European security and co-operation. At Madrid, Malta's basic position was that the arrangements being worked out for security in Europe should be reflected in analogous arrangements regarding the Mediterranean region. The tremendous resistance to Malta's position at Madrid showed unmistakably the clear intention of some participants to reject the commitments they had undertaken at Helsinki regarding security in the Mediterranean. This Malta could never accept.

130. By late July of this year Malta had made it clear that, after waiting through two and a half years of bickering and confrontation at Madrid over an extended range

of East-West issues, we would not be forced into a hasty approval of a final document which failed to reflect the Mediterranean dimension of the Conference. Nor would we agree to a proposal that the meeting should simply register a lack of agreement on Malta's position. At that point it was only Romania which stood by Malta to ensure that the consensus procedures of the Conference would continue to be respected.

131. Those who were seeking to orchestrate our apparent isolation at Madrid started to lose ground by the middle of August. Following an approach by Finland on behalf of the Nordic countries, the Prime Minister of Malta was in a position to indicate to President Reagan and President Andropov that a proposal had emerged which, while safeguarding Malta's legitimate Mediterranean concerns, also indicated our clear willingness to reach a solution acceptable to all. A number of participants, including Greece and Italy, expressed their readiness to accept that proposal, while at the same time clearly explaining to us the formidable pressure being put upon them to maintain an intransigent position.

132. That Mediterranean countries supported Malta's stand was to be expected. What was surprising was the hesitation and delay that the Soviet Union showed in coming round, as it eventually did in mid-August, to supporting this proposal aimed at enhancing the process of Mediterranean security and co-operation. After all, the late President Brezhnev himself had clearly enunciated on a number of occasions those steps to which the Soviet Union was committed in seeking to transform the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, in particular the extension of confidence-building measures to the Mediterranean, a co-ordinated reduction of armed forces in the region, the withdrawal of nuclear ships from the Mediterranean and an undertaking by nuclear Powers not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear Mediterranean States.

133. At Madrid, Malta was also fortified by the large measure of support which it was receiving from countries outside the Conference. China firmly gave us this support, and the League of Arab States, in a public declaration made during the last week of August, expressed its strong interest in the Conference proceedings and its whole-hearted support for Malta's proposals regarding Mediterranean security. We are deeply conscious of the positive impact which this support had on developments at Madrid.

134. Indeed, by the beginning of September our persistence had prevailed and, with the assistance of the neutral and non-aligned participants in the Conference, a commitment was obtained from all participants that there would be continuing support by the Conference for further initiatives to strengthen security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region. A last-minute attempt by the United States to make this support conditional upon restricting all such initiatives to Conference procedures was swept away at the eleventh hour.

135. The significance of the resulting agreements is that they create the essential conditions to ensure that issues of Mediterranean security and co-operation will be taken up in at least three follow-up activities.

136. There is, first of all, the Conference on Security and Confidence-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, which is to start work at Stockholm in January 1984 and preparations for which will commence in Helsinki later this month. That Conference will bring together all European States and the super-Powers themselves to discuss confidence-building measures and disarmament not only in northern and central Europe but also in the Mediterranean.

137. In the second place, there will be a seminar on Mediterranean co-operation at Venice next year, as a follow-up to the first meeting on Mediterranean co-operation in the economic, scientific and cultural fields, held in 1979 at Valetta.

138. In the third place, the results of the various *ad hoc* meetings and the initiatives on Mediterranean security which Malta and other States concerned will take during the next three years, in conformity with the final agreement in Madrid, will be taken up at the next Conference follow-up meeting, at Vienna in 1986.

139. It is also significant that at the Madrid meeting the two super-Powers and their respective allies not only accepted Malta's declaration of neutrality as a contribution to security and co-operation in the Mediterranean but also urged other States to respect this neutrality.

140. At this session of the General Assembly Malta intends to take further steps towards Mediterranean security, for which we expect the support of, among others, all States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. The Assembly is already on record as calling for the transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace. We expect that this year this call will find a clearer and more detailed formulation and will also be accompanied by agreement on practical steps to bring about this transformation.

141. In this way we will be consolidating a process which will enable the Stockholm Conference to tackle issues of Mediterranean security in a meaningful manner. This process will also be enhanced by the planned meeting of Mediterranean non-aligned States, as called for in the New Delhi Declaration.

142. Indeed, we have to look closely and carefully at the factors leading to the sharpening of tension in the Mediterranean if our options for peace in the region are to remain viable. The massive naval concentration in our sea, for example, is premised upon too absolute an application of the principles of the freedom of the high seas. Both the theory and practice of international law today already place growing constraints upon this principle so as to make it more consonant with the economic needs of the coastal States. In a closed sea like the Mediterranean, does there not arrive a point beyond which the legitimate interests of coastal States make an absolute application of the principle of the freedom of the high seas no longer tolerable as a basis for justifying the massive naval and nuclear buildup by the super-Powers which we are experiencing? Are not the commitments undertaken in the Helsinki Final Act² themselves a pointer to a growing need for restraint of action where such restraint is necessary for the enhancement of regional security and co-operation?

143. It is therefore evident that the actions we are taking at the political level in asserting our national freedom and sovereignty bring us ever closer to a sharp choice between the options based on co-operation and mutual respect and those which are premised on the unrestrained and selfish grasp for power. As long as the avenues for co-operation remain open, Malta remains determined to utilize them. Increasingly, however, we also have to consider the alternatives which may present themselves if all other action fails.

144. Nowhere is this dilemma more acute than in the economic field. For its part, Malta has sought to ensure that its political assertion of its newly won freedom would itself galvanize and give new dimensions to our endeavour to ensure the economic viability of our people, which will in turn enable them to fulfil their political role for peace.

145. We have found this possible in two related aspects. At the internal level the removal from our midst of an oppressive foreign presence, together with the consequent weakening of the local reactionary forces nourished by that presence, suddenly released a tremendous potential for action. The main pillars of our economic infrastructure finally came under Maltese control. Transport and communications, insurance and banking and the means of information and education could therefore be used for the direct benefit of Malta's economic development.

146. Perhaps the most visible manifestation of this development lies in the major infrastructural transformation we have produced in our Grand Harbour over the last few years. The Grand Harbour of Valetta is justly renowned for natural endowments perhaps unique in the whole of the Mediterranean. Its long coastline, sheltered inlets, deep berthing and strategic location were, however, for centuries exploited only by foreign occupying Powers to bolster their naval supremacy in the region.

147. This has now all been changed. Whereas less than two decades ago the harbour was exclusively devoted to servicing warships, today it has major civil ship-repairing and ship-building facilities and is the centre of a growing trans-shipment trade and the venue of increasing maritime tourist activity.

148. Over a short period of phenomenal capital investment, we have constructed new and modern drydocks and shipyards, opened up major container and berthing facilities, converted old port installations into large and modern ones and are in the process of completing grain-storage facilities equipped to handle over 80,000 tons of grain.

149. These infrastructural developments, which have permitted us to become a major servicing centre for our region, have also necessitated the development of a whole new harbour in Marsaxlokk, on the south-east coast of the island. This is now in an advanced stage of construction and when completed will greatly enlarge Malta's trans-shipment and related potential for the Mediterranean region.

150. I regret to have to reiterate a point I already made at the thirty-seventh session [32nd meeting], namely, that some of the benefits of these projects are being jeopardized by the presence of remnants of war in our harbours and territorial waters. There is, furthermore, good evidence that Britain's continuing arrogant and unco-operative attitude on the question of the removal of bombs and wrecks from our harbour offers yet further evidence that the counsels of those opposed to Malta still prevail in British official circles. This explains why, in spite of Malta's friends in Britain, the potential for an improved relationship between the two countries continues to be frustrated by the lack of adequate responses by Britain on a Government-to-Government basis. How else can one interpret the leading role Britain has arrogated to itself to stifle Malta's special relationship with the European Economic Community [EEC] by obstructing recommendations already submitted by the EEC Commission, recommendations endorsed by the British member of the Commission himself? This opposition is all the more suspect in its motivation as it is based on irrelevant considerations such as the relating of assistance to gross national product per capita, which Britain has already thought to waive in respect of other Mediterranean countries.

151. It is in selfish and short-sighted ways such as these that nations seek to close the options for co-operation and peace for which the majority of people on our globe fervently hope.

152. Yet in another equally important respect, the political freedom of action based on its status of neutrality helps Malta overcome these problems and enlarge its freedom of manoeuvre, even in the economic field. Progressively we have widened the range of our trading and other economic relationships to include most countries, developed and developing alike, from our region and beyond.

153. Those countries which are interested, for their own political reasons, in reinforcing the basis for Malta's neutrality seek to ensure that their expressions of political support be complemented by concrete measures of economic co-operation. Such measures would in turn ensure that no single country or group of countries could exert such a dominating influence through economic involvement as to render Malta's neutrality unstable. For its part, in developing ever closer economic relations with a country or group of countries, Malta is resolved not to permit one set of relations to preclude another set of equally close relations. It is these two principles which inspire Malta to seek a balance in its concurrent approaches with, on the one hand, the EEC and the emerging markets of the Gulf and the Maghreb and, on the other hand, the two super-Powers.

154. With the EEC Malta has long-established economic links which it is seeking to improve. We have found a considerable understanding from our European partners of the need for corresponding economic and financial measures of support for our status of neutrality, in exchange for our guarantee that Malta would not be used as a base for aggression against any EEC member State.

155. There is also a growing understanding that the need to ensure that the special relationship Malta is to establish with the Community, which will be different from full membership, and the concomitant obligation to apply politically inspired economic sanctions entangling us unnecessarily with an economic group against a third country or group of countries would not preclude us from pursuing equally close, though not exclusive, special relationships with other economic groups.

156. In fact, we have already forged close ties with our neighbours in North Africa, especially Libya and Algeria, which are participating actively with us, through joint ventures and in other forms, in various industrial projects, including the construction of an iron foundry, the development of manufacturing enterprises and the building of tourist complexes. Our friends from the Gulf, particularly the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, assist us through grants and loans on conditions which are genuinely adapted to our small and fragile economic and financial potential. This assistance enables a more rapid development of the new port at Marsaxlokk, the grain silo and the Marsa shipbuilding yard, among other projects. We are in this way putting into place the foundation for a special relationship with the Maghreb, as well as with Gulf countries, which, we are assured, will permit us at the appropriate time to gain preferential access to their markets once these are more closely consolidated.

157. Our policy of equal distance from the super-Powers has an economic dimension as much as a political dimension. The super-Powers today are convinced that our actions in the Security Council, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the Non-Aligned Movement, among other bodies, constitute an unequivocal manifestation of our staunch adherence to the policy of equal distance in the political sphere. Malta is resolved to maintain this policy, while fully conscious of the limitations which deny infallibility to even the best among us.

158. Similarly, in the economic sphere, Malta is not seeking to offer one super-Power any advantage over the other but is simply seeking to develop its economic relations with both of them to the greatest possible extent.

159. From the United States of America we have had repeated expressions of political good will. These have yet to be translated into concrete projects of economic co-operation.

160. From the Soviet Union we have had a more formal commitment, entered into on signing the neutrality agreement, that it will develop commercial and economic relations with us in such a way as to reflect its support of our neutrality. Yet, the results of this commitment have so far been disappointing. This tends to confirm the sense that, overall, this agreement is virtually not working, thereby raising doubts as to how much good faith there was behind it in the first place.

161. In contrast, our relations with the People's Republic of China are producing many tangible results of mutual benefit to our two countries. Without even the necessity of formal assurances of friendship, in April this year, Madame Chen Muhua, Minister for Foreign Economic Relations and Trade of China, visited Malta and reached agreements with us on co-operation in the industrial, commercial, tourism, health and ship-building sectors.

162. Forging mutually beneficial relationships with other countries is, in our view, a long-term strategy aimed at consolidating our economic freedom on the basis of co-operation and mutual respect. During a time of almost endemic international economic recession such as we are experiencing, more immediate action is also required. Even in this specific context we have found that the long-term relationships we are building with other countries permit the introduction of various measures which also have remedial aspects, among which reciprocal trading agreements have proved to be most beneficial.

163. These arrangements not only help to maintain our flow of trade at a time of shrinking international commercial activity, but also have the longer-term effect of enlarging our potential export markets, as well as creating a useful mechanism to help balance our trade with partners with which we traditionally have large deficits. Over the last two years Malta has entered into reciprocal trading arrangements with Iraq, Turkey, Libya, Poland, Romania, Albania and Italy, and even more recently with multinational corporations which, in return for the major purchases we make from them, undertake to purchase products manufactured in Malta.

164. We are satisfied that in this way we can give expression to our national aspirations to freedom and progress by making choices based upon co-operation with other peoples. It is unfortunate that such an approach is not always possible. In contrast to the great good will which we have found elsewhere, the unco-operative attitudes and policies we are experiencing in our relations with Japan have been nothing less than disgusting. It is for this reason that, after our trade with that country had accumulated a deficit of over \$100 million within a few years, and in the light of its obstinate refusal to take any remedial action, we stopped all our imports from Japan.

165. The Japanese response continues to be extremely negative. Their proposals for compensation to date have been so minimal that they do not even constitute a basis for useful discussions, much less offer a justification for lifting our ban on their exports. The selfish manner in which the Japanese pursue their trading policies places serious obstacles in the path of international economic co-operation. It should come as no surprise, therefore,

that Malta has taken the action which it has considered necessary and that, within a short time, other countries too will have to do likewise.

166. As a developing country, Malta is highly sensitive to the need for the establishment of a new international economic order. Though our individual problems differ tremendously in nature and degree, all of us in the developing world share a common disadvantage: our economies, for one reason or another, are especially exposed to pressures and influences from outside. For Malta, this exposure is the result of the very small size of our island economy and our lack of exploitable natural resources. In this context, the criteria, based on gross national product per capita and the quantum of foreign exchange reserves, applied by international institutions for their development assistance are completely inapplicable to Malta. In an economy of our size, the more relevant factors are such aspects as the disproportionate onus on the total economy of even the most minimal of infrastructural projects and the absolute need for liquid reserves in the absence of any significant indigenous productive or natural resources capacity.

167. In our view, the irrelevance of development assistance criteria constitutes one aspect of the insensitivity of the international economic system to real needs of development, which affect us more particularly because of our status as a developing island country. Other aspects of the inequitable international system, especially those relating to trade, transfer of technology, and money and finance, affect us in equal measure, as they do most other developing countries.

168. It is yet another expression of our desire to seek the options based on co-operation and understanding that we join other developing countries in calling upon the industrialized countries to respond to our call for major structural reforms in the international economic system, in particular by agreeing to launching global negotiations and convening an international conference on money and finance. The fragile edifice of our present international system is indeed most shaky in its economic foundations. If Orwell's nightmare were to take shape, its roots would probably lie in the debris of a bankrupt and stagnant world economy.

169. In Malta, it is thanks to the painstaking efforts of the workers' movement that our people today appreciate the different options in the road to their development. It has been the workers' movement which has defined and worked for peace and co-operation at the military, political and economic levels: our elimination of all military entanglements, our adoption of a status of neutrality based on the principles of non-alignment, and our expanding relations with so many different countries.

170. The methods of aggression can only frustrate these peaceful choices. While our deep commitment remains to pursue these choices, our ability to do so depends to a large measure upon the international political and economic environment which prevails and for which the individual actions of all of us are ultimately responsible.

171. The workers' movement lit the torch of freedom and peace in Malta, where it now burns brightly. The socialist Government of Malta seeks to project this beacon for peace throughout the Mediterranean.

172. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, Sir, on behalf of the delegation of Zaire and on my own behalf, I warmly congratulate you on your election to the presidency of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

173. It gives me particular pleasure to see you presiding over the work of the General Assembly because you are

a son of the third world, a statesman well versed in the arcana of international life and closely acquainted with the United Nations. Your political and diplomatic experience, together with your thorough knowledge of the workings of the United Nations, are, we believe, an earnest of the success of our deliberations, which are taking place in an international context which is complex and difficult in all respects. I assure you of the whole-hearted co-operation of the delegation of Zaire.

Mr. Bhatt (Nepal), Vice-President, took the Chair.

174. I should also like to express our appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Imre Hollai of Hungary, for the distinction with which he conducted the work of the thirty-seventh session.

175. Lastly, I should like to pay a special tribute to the Secretary-General for his outstanding report on the work of the Organization [A/38/1]. It contains a lucid and detailed analysis of the major problems of international concern, of positions taken and of courageous suggestions made. It bears the imprint of special concern for international peace and security, law, co-operation and particular attention to the development of the countries of the third world. Indeed that is so because he is convinced that the prosperity of the North, and indeed the recovery which has been glimpsed in the industrialized countries, cannot continue without an increased effort for the benefit of the developing countries in the southern hemisphere.

176. We have noted with particular satisfaction all the efforts made by the Secretary-General to enable the United Nations to fulfil the vital role it is called on to play to safeguard peace and security in the world and to bring about a new ethic based on greater sensitivity, solidarity and harmony in relations among nations and peoples.

177. I should also like most warmly to welcome the new State of Saint Christopher and Nevis, which has joined the United Nations family as the 158th Member State. We should like to assure it of our friendship and co-operation.

178. There is no need to recall that the work of this session of the General Assembly is commencing in an international atmosphere characterized by the continuation of wide-ranging crises and the exacerbation of tension and contradictions in international relations.

179. The world in general, and the United Nations in particular, are thus faced by a dual challenge: the challenge to law and to the values of humanism, and hence a challenge to the primary mission of the United Nations; and the challenge to co-operation conceived as a rational and equitable organization of the interdependence of States, and to international solidarity. The first compounds the second and the second explains the first, although in no way justifying it.

180. Peace and security in the world, the *sine qua non* for progress and development, indeed for the survival of civilization and the restoration of confidence in international relations, can be secured only if we are prepared to pay the price to meet that double challenge, and first of all, the challenge to law and to the values of humanism.

181. There is a challenge to law and to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations in the case of Chad, in Namibia, in South Africa, in the Western Sahara, in the Middle East, in Afghanistan, in Kampuchea, in the case of the destruction of a Boeing of the South Korean civilian air transport company and so forth. There are many sources of tension that draw the concern of world opinion and rightly provoke all sorts of questions concerning the future of mankind, at a time when we are less than 20 years from the end of the twentieth century.

182. In Central Africa, and more particularly in Chad, we witness the dramatic calling into question of the principles of international law, principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and in the charter of the Organization of African Unity, particularly with respect to sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity, non-interference in the domestic affairs of States, non-use of force in relations between States and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

183. That situation constitutes a serious threat to peace, stability and security in central Africa but, above all, it is a threat to the maintenance of the necessary balance throughout the African continent.

184. The present problem in Chad is neither more nor less than a challenge to law, to the Charter of the United Nations and to that of the OAU, because even recourse to Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations by a legitimate Government which is the victim of blatant outside aggression has been criticized by certain States Members of the United Nations, illogically, since any of them could be attacked tomorrow by an outside force.

185. I say illogically because at present States other than Chad are also partially occupied by armed forces supported and equipped from outside, inspired by a determination, which they in no way conceal, to overthrow the established governments. If we are unanimous in recognizing that such *de facto* occupations are illegal and constitute threats to peace and security, why should anything be different in the case of Chad?

186. We noted with satisfaction the recent statement by Mr. Hissain Habré, President of the Republic of Chad, in which, on behalf of the State and people of Chad, he made a moving appeal to all the nations of the world to help Chad preserve its territorial integrity, sovereignty and national unity. The head of State of Chad furthermore said he was fully ready to establish the conditions to enable Chad, with the assistance of all its sons, to set about the restoration of peace and reconciliation so as to ensure the development of the country.

187. We, in turn, appeal to all the sons of Chad and address our encouragement to the OAU in order that no honest effort be spared to find a peaceful solution to the drama of Chad, taking into account the rights of that country.

188. Speaking of the withdrawal of foreign troops, I take this opportunity to note that Zaire dispatched its troops to Chad at the request of the legitimate Government recognized by the United Nations, because uninvited forces had intervened there illegally, thereby threatening its security, territorial integrity and sovereignty. If those forces were to leave, the troops from Zaire would not remain in Chad one day longer.

189. Since the adoption in 1966 of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), which put an end to South African administration in Namibia and placed that Territory under the jurisdiction of the United Nations, defiance of the rights of that African Territory continues with quasi-impunity.

190. The United Nations plan for a negotiated settlement of the Namibian question, accepted by the whole international community, has been particularly difficult to apply, especially by those who initiated it and whose influence over the South African régime is, as everybody is aware, enormous.

191. However, Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is fully consistent with the spirit and letter of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

192. In May 1983, on the initiative of the group of non-aligned countries, the Security Council, after debating the question of Namibia, adopted resolution 532 (1983), inviting the Secretary-General to undertake further efforts with the parties concerned to guarantee speedy implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978).

193. However, it does not seem that the response of South Africa to the recent approach by the Secretary-General, who went to that country, is likely to accelerate the accession of Namibia to independence.

194. We should like to take this opportunity to reaffirm that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the sole basis for negotiations for the peaceful settlement of the Namibian problem. For the five members of the contact group which initiated the United Nations plan to resolve the Namibian problem, there is a question of credibility. They must implement the plan and not set aside its objectives.

195. Africa intends to keep out of power rivalries, and it is for that reason that it asks that the Namibian problem be seen as a problem of decolonization and that all the parties abstain from introducing into the Namibian question extraneous elements which could distort the problem and present it in Manichean terms as part of the East-West conflict.

196. We hail the heroic struggle being waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, and we appeal to all nations of the world to contribute to the rapid implementation of the United Nations Plan for the settlement of the Namibian question and to lend their support and assistance to SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people.

197. We reiterate our condemnation of the repeated acts of aggression carried out from Namibian territory by South Africa against neighbouring African States, and in particular the violations of the territorial integrity of our sister republic of Angola, which have resulted in enormous damage to the economy of that developing country.

198. South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia, coupled with its denial of the rights of the Namibian people and use of Namibian territory as a base for attacks against neighbouring countries, constitutes a serious threat to peace and security in that sensitive region of southern Africa.

199. In South Africa itself, the perpetuation of the policy of *apartheid*, condemned by the international community as a crime against humanity, is repugnant to the conscience of all right-thinking people, to all men devoted to peace and justice throughout the world. Although *apartheid* has been unanimously condemned as a crime against humanity, there are some who refuse to draw the logical conclusions of that condemnation both with regard to their own attitudes towards the Pretoria régime and with regard to the actions of that régime and the legitimate struggle for national liberation being waged by movements recognized by the United Nations.

200. What the Africans are demanding is the emergence in South Africa of a truly democratic multiracial society governed by the majority and respecting the rights of all minorities. In an era when the defence of human rights is on the agenda of international gatherings as well as bilateral meetings, particularly between the countries of the North and those of the South, how can we explain the silence of one side in the face of the most serious violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of all time, namely, *apartheid*?

201. It is clear that a State is entitled to organize the repression of crimes, offenses and other breaches in the law in order to protect law and order and the common weal. *Apartheid*, which is a crime, is at the core of national life as organized by the Pretoria régime, and it forms the basic notion upon which the constitution and all official activities of that country are based. Therefore, *apartheid* is a crime unpunishable in South Africa, and South Africa is not a State based upon and governed by law, since its constitution must be regarded as being the instrument *par excellence* of a crime against humanity. Is there a Nuremberg Tribunal or a Tokyo Tribunal to punish this crime, which is unpunishable in South Africa, as there were for the crimes of nazism that were unpunishable in Hitler's Germany? If we are unwilling to punish the crime of *apartheid*, what are we to do, since the idea of *apartheid* with a human face is incorrect, as *apartheid* has been defined as a crime against humanity? These are questions that demonstrate once again that any approach employing double standards is not calculated to strengthen trust in international relations and undermines the credit of those nations that adopt a compliant attitude towards *apartheid*.

202. What meaning can we give to this contempt for law on the part of States based upon and governed by law that do not hesitate to preach humanism and democracy—indeed, respect for human rights—to the States of the third world? Does it reveal the predominance of a unilateral and therefore totalitarian, monopolist and monopolizing approach to human rights, or does it reveal a deliberate indifference to the humiliation of and denial of basic human rights to the black man of Africa or to the so-called coloured of the third world?

203. South Africa's timid approach to this issue, which takes the form of granting some rights to certain mixed or Indian communities or by granting limited trade-union rights to the black mine workers, must be replaced by a clear policy aimed at restoring to the blacks all their rights in the interest of peace in South Africa and of trust and co-operation among all nations and races throughout the world.

204. As it did with other regional organizations, the United Nations, in keeping with Article 52 of the Charter, recognized the competence of the OAU with regard to the maintenance of international peace and security in Africa. On many occasions we have noted that, when either the Security Council or the General Assembly is faced with an important African political problem involving peace and security, it does not hesitate to refer it to the OAU. This happened in the case of Western Sahara. Yet at the same time certain Member States are attempting to impede the actions of OAU by adopting positions contrary to law and to unanimous OAU resolutions.

205. Just and lasting solutions to the problem of Western Sahara can be found only through respect for the decisions adopted at the eighteenth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, as reaffirmed at the nineteenth session held at Addis Ababa last June, namely, by organizing a referendum for self-determination in Western Sahara and through the implementation of the measures drawn up by the Implementation Committee of the OAU. If we wish to achieve real progress on the basis of those measures it is essential that they be scrupulously implemented by the OAU.

206. We therefore appeal to all nations of the world to support the efforts of the OAU in this area. We have noted with satisfaction recent developments in the Arab Maghreb, and we hope that the political thaw and détente

emerging there can contribute to the restoration of peace in that important region of our continent.

207. In the Middle East there is obviously a problem of peace. Peace is indeed the crucial element in a region that has known no peace since 1947.

208. The recent International Conference on the Question of Palestine, at Geneva, in addition to seeking to create a better awareness of the underlying causes of the Palestinian problem—the underlying causes of one of the oldest and most serious hotbeds of tension and war—and to finding ways of enabling the Palestinian people, through a comprehensive international effort, to exercise their legitimate rights, also embodied the will of the international community to achieve peace and called for a comprehensive international effort to enable the protagonists to overcome the psychological, historical, legal and other obstacles to the exercise of the rights of the Palestinians.

209. Peace presupposes, first justice and equity, because the Arab people of Palestine, like the people of Israel, are entitled to a homeland, to a State. The General Assembly understood this at an early date when, on 29 November 1947, it set forth the principle of a Jewish State and a Palestinian Arab State by adopting resolution 181 (II) containing the Plan of Partition for Palestine.

210. Secondly, peace presupposes respect for law, namely, for the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among States, or, in other words, of the recognized principles of peaceful coexistence. The Security Council understood this when it adopted resolution 242 (1967) on 22 November 1967, which set forth the conditions for the establishment of a just and lasting peace and the principles for a comprehensive peaceful settlement of the Middle East crisis.

211. Peace presupposes, thirdly, recognition of the rights of the Palestinians, because it is the breach of those rights that lies at the very heart and origin of the Middle East conflict. The General Assembly recognized this, first in 1969 when, in resolution 2535 (XXIV), it turned its attention towards the search for a comprehensive solution recognizing that the question of Palestine was at the heart of the Middle East conflict, and later, in 1974, in resolution 3236 (XXIX), when it reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

212. Fourthly, peace presupposes the adoption by all parties of the spirit of dialogue and negotiation. This has been the view of the Security Council since 22 October 1973, when it adopted resolution 338 (1973), deciding that negotiations between the parties concerned should start immediately.

213. Within the framework of a comprehensive international effort the United Nations has a vital role to play, based on its historic responsibilities. The United Nations gave a State to the Jews of the Diaspora and decided upon a Palestinian Arab State. It must now succeed in giving that State to the Palestinians.

214. The United Nations, whose work in establishing rules has become part of the heritage of international law, must ensure the triumph of law and justice in the Middle East. The United Nations, whose mission is to preserve present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war, must replace the spirit of war and confrontation with that of dialogue and co-operation. The United Nations, which is the catalyst of the aspirations of peoples to self-determination, must provide all necessary assistance in order to make the Palestinian entity a reality and to foster its economic and social development.

215. If the protagonists were able to solve this thorny problem by themselves we would not be discussing it here.

Each member of the international community must lend its assistance, in keeping with its own approach, resources and conscience, because this is a tragedy that contains the seeds of a serious threat to world peace. If such contributions are to be positive and useful, they must be supportive of efforts made in the spirit of peace, supportive of law, justice and equity, dialogue and co-operation. Then and only then will our debates mark a new and decisive stage in the painful history of Palestine since the end of the Mandate era.

216. Today it seems to us that all the ingredients for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the crisis are present, for all the essential resolutions are mutually complementary.

217. General Assembly resolutions 181 (II), 194 (III) and 2535 (XXIV) and Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), to cite only those, taken together and linked to all the plans, agreements and peace initiatives put forward to date, offer, we feel, a consistent and integrated approach and contain all the elements of a just, comprehensive and lasting peace plan. On these bases the Security Council can, or could, either draw up a plan for the settlement of the Palestinian question or mandate the Secretary-General to attempt to formulate a proposal for consideration by the Security Council and by Member States.

218. Given the fact that since 1947 war has not provided a solution, we conclude that no strategy based on force can make it possible to resolve the thorny problem of the Middle East and Palestine, and that everybody should refrain from becoming involved.

219. What is the problem that arises, objectively speaking, in Afghanistan and Kampuchea, other than the right of all peoples freely to make their own choices and to live as they wish, free from pressure and acts of force, aware that their rights and liberties stop where the rights and freedom of other peoples begin?

220. It is without any doubt the violation of the principles of the sovereign equality of States, respect for the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of States, non-interference, non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes—the violation of the very principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of which we are all Members—that underlies these conflicts.

221. Hegemonist expansion and the desire of some people for political and cultural uniformity throughout the world, with all the disorder, clashes of interest and frustration that would provoke, are possible only through the violation of these principles. We say this to stress the vital importance of these principles and of law in relations between nations and peoples, because the purpose of these principles is precisely to prevent hegemonist expansionism and the desire for domination and political and cultural standardization of the world in the name of peace, international security, trusting co-operation among nations and peoples and the survival of universal civilized values. That is why these principles are impersonal, general and universal.

222. It was the spirit of lawlessness which developed in the world and led to the economic and financial crisis, which gave rise to the crisis of humanism, which we must fight together in order to overcome the demons of insecurity, instability and mistrust in international relations.

223. Otherwise, let us have the courage, after the failure of the idealistic conception of history, to proclaim the failure of the rule of law and justice and yield the field to the excesses of the forces of irrationality.

224. It is because we are all aware that in a world without law no one is safe from anything that we are so

anxious to attempt to justify the frequent violations of law, in the name of narrow interests, thus giving rise to the phenomenon of the automatic rejection of anything coming from the other side, hostile propaganda, hysteria, disinformation, pressure of all kinds, the attempts to force weaker States to become clients and satellites.

225. Even the spirit of Yalta and the division of the world into spheres of influence which flowed from that—and only God knows whether we had a hand in that or opposed it—is no longer respected by those responsible for it, so that peoples are left to their own devices, prey to new dangers.

226. That is why in Zaire we believe that a just and lasting settlement of the Afghanistan crisis and the crisis of Kampuchea necessarily entails the withdrawal of all foreign troops from those territories, which they entered in disregard of law and the principles of the United Nations.

227. Without wishing to associate itself with any campaign or political propaganda gratuitously hostile to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but in all objectivity and quite calmly, the Executive Council of the Republic of Zaire was outraged at the attack which occurred on 1 September 1983 over Sakhalin Island on a South Korean civil airliner, with hundreds of innocent victims, in defiance of the rules of international law and morality.

228. Over and above the massacre of 269 innocent civilian passengers, the gravity of this act, repugnant as it is to our consciences, lies in the fact that if such a precedent, which no appeal to national interest can justify, were to become more general, this would be a deadly blow to international relations and trustful co-operation among States.

229. This act, which occurred in a tense international context, dominated by the resurgence of mistrust, violence and insecurity in relations among States, must be condemned unambiguously by all right-thinking people in the world and by all Governments that cherish peace, if we are to have any confidence in the future.

230. The fact that this act was committed by a super-Power which bears international responsibilities for peace in the world and which is a permanent member of the Security Council is something we find particularly troubling.

231. Here again it can be seen that it is respect for law and humanistic values which has dictated our stand regarding a country with which we maintain excellent diplomatic relations, and we hope that the USSR will make amends for this act and preserve its prestige in the world.

232. Latin America, which has so many affinities with Africa, needs peace and security in order to develop autonomously. We are in full solidarity with the peoples of that region in their desire for peace and to safeguard their own identity in order to create the conditions necessary for growth and bring to the building of a more just and equitable new world order the fruit of their genius. Here again, peace can only be achieved for us all through respect for the principles of international law and of the United Nations.

233. As if all the sufferings of humanity at the present time were not enough, the senseless arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race—a true threat to life of apocalyptic dimensions—adds every day to our distress, indeed our anguish.

234. While the alarming decline in the quality of life is becoming more perceptible from day to day in vast regions of the world, the race in engines of death is

accelerating and swallowing up, as frequently repeated, more than \$800 billion a year. Of course, the stench of the corpses of the victims of hunger, malnutrition and endemic disease is overpowered by the sulphurous fumes of gunfire.

235. It would seem that we have already forgotten the Programme of Action and the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament [*resolution S-10/2*].

236. The sound of the feet of the thousands of citizens of the world who invaded the United Nations Headquarters during the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament to protest the arms race, the appeals of scientists, philosophers, public figures throughout the world, people from the world of art, letters, religion, economics and politics, the entreaties of those crippled in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, underlining the senseless nature of the arms race, seem already to have been consigned to oblivion or to the indifference of those whose power today is measured by the number of their guns, missiles and nuclear warheads.

237. Yet all of us belong to a civilization which teaches us that man is superior to the animal by virtue of his spirit and that true immortality is innate in thought.

238. Yet a consensus had already emerged among all the nations of the world at the end of the tenth special session that the arms race is the centre of the present world crisis, when we perceive it, as we should, from the standpoint of peace, security, development and the measures necessary to establish confidence in international relations.

239. It is for this reason that the General Assembly has called for special studies on the relationship between disarmament and security, disarmament and development, and disarmament and confidence-building measures to make everyone more aware of the many dangers inherent in the arms race and to create the necessary conditions for halting and reversing this race to death.

240. Our common concern to educate man in the spirit of peace and to include peace studies in national programmes has led us to agree to the establishment of a University for Peace in one of our Member States.

241. Now, what is happening today? Have the great Powers forgotten that, in terms of peace, security, progress and development, the arms race is at the centre of the present crisis in the world and is jeopardizing civilization's essential values? Could it be that this race is designed to challenge the values upon which the United Nations is based, values from which certain great Powers seem to wish to depart ever further?

242. The arms race constitutes a powerful lever of the policy of the resort to force in international relations, the policy of intimidation, subjugation, hegemony and expansionism. More weapons no longer provide more security. Since the end of the last world war, how often has a great Power used its sophisticated weapons against another? But then the question arises: against whom are these weapons being manufactured?

243. The arms race widens the gap between the developing and the industrialized countries. It wrecks the efforts to establish the new international economic order, which the industrialized countries are so reluctant to join.

244. Without overlooking the danger of conventional weapons, weapons that have indiscriminate and excessively harmful effects—bacteriological or toxic weapons, chemical weapons which we see being increasingly used in the third world countries, where proxy wars are going on—Zaire wishes to reaffirm its attachment to the philosophy of the Final Document of the Tenth Special

Session of the General Assembly, which gives high priority to nuclear disarmament.

245. We express again our determination to see the nuclear-weapon States give explicit and solemn guarantees to the non-nuclear-weapon States, or States that have renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons, that they will never use them or threaten to use them against such States.

246. The ease with which weapons are circulating in the world today, either because of the profit motive—without any considerations being given to the use to be made of them, even if that use is known in advance—or to serve the designs of power and illegal causes, must be a subject of concern to the United Nations and the international community.

247. We very much hope that the negotiations on the reduction of strategic arms will prove successful as soon as possible. Zaire also appeals to the conscience of all those concerned; we ask them to respect the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], particularly in regard to zones of peace and co-operation and nuclear-weapon-free zones throughout the world.

248. Confronted by all the political problems and problems affecting the maintenance of international peace and security to which I have just referred, we have the duty to meet the challenge to law, to eradicate the flouting of law in international relations. And "law" here means the ensemble of positive rules and norms governing relations between States, but also the ensemble of acknowledged rules of conduct which entail only moral obligations in relations between men and peoples. For the erosion of the essential values of civilization and of humanistic values benefits the various conflicts confronting us. The present crisis in the world is a political crisis, because the rules upon which the human city is based are sustaining severe blows today. And if they are finally swept away, what alternative do we have to offer our children?

249. Man is a reasonable being and is innately motivated to enter into society with his peers. This need to live in a society satisfies, above all, a moral feeling for the welfare of others; it responds to the desire for a condition in which we can at one and the same time find our own satisfaction and ensure that of others.

250. I therefore share the opinion of the Secretary-General that we are now witnessing the collapse of a number of agreements concluded over the years as the result of arduous and lengthy negotiations and that it is vital to reverse this trend, not only in order to confront immediate conflicts but also in order to build a lasting framework of life for future generations.

251. We in Africa can live very comfortably with the principles of international law and of the United Nations. The third world, which is forging the instruments to master its destiny and its future, needs these principles. The small, medium-sized and weak States, which are the majority in this Organization, and which do not produce weapons or have the means to buy them, shelter their sovereignty, their independence, their integrity, their own identity behind these principles of international law, because they know that in a world without law it is essentially they, not the powerful and the rich, who will be the losers. Has Europe turned its back on the rays of light coming from ancient Greece and its own gods?

252. No subject other than that of the arms race could have served as a better introduction to the second challenge of today's world: co-operation and solidarity.

253. We have repeatedly said that the present economic system is unfair and that, if we are not to wreck our

world, we must replace it by a new economic order that is more just and better adapted to the new requirements of the times. Facts confirm this every day. Our protagonists in the North—also facing this crisis, which is the reflection of a profound disarray in structures—have not succeeded in proving the contrary. But they seem to wish to resist—not all of them, happily—change and the establishment of the new international economic order.

254. Certainly, the United Nations has undertaken considerable efforts to this end. Thus, the relevant resolutions adopted at the sixth and seventh special sessions of the General Assembly—containing the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order [*resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI)*] and concerning development and international economic co-operation [*resolution 3362 (S-VII)*—as well as the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States [*resolution 3281 (XXIX)*], fully justify the international community's desire to face up to the present crisis in the world together and responsibly. Democratization of international economic relations is an imperative of our time.

255. Zaire continues to believe that the crisis now afflicting the world results primarily from the policies pursued by the industrialized countries, despite what is often proclaimed by those who have an interest in ensuring that we create no industries of any kind, no steel plants, no airports, no large-scale transport infrastructures. This crisis is the result of basic inadequacies of a world economic system that no longer responds to the requirements of a world in constant evolution, and of the structural gaps and the imbalance in interdependent spheres of which we are all aware—that is, commodities, trade, development, energy, currency and finance.

256. The developing countries have been the most severely shaken by the effects of this crisis because of the decline in international trade caused by inflationary pressures imported from the developed countries and the resurgence of protectionism in those countries; a sharp decline in commodity prices, the principal source of export earnings—a \$20 billion-net loss in export earnings for the year 1981-1982; an appreciable reduction in development aid, increasingly weighed down by unacceptable political conditions; a sizeable decline in the inflow of international capital to the developing countries; a disturbing increase in the indebtedness of the developing countries, which in 1982 reached the sum of \$630 billion for the whole of the third world; and, finally, the tendency on the part of financial circles and international financial institutions to harden their positions and concern themselves more with the establishment of harsh programmes of economic and financial adjustment in the countries with the greatest indebtedness, without any regard to the social obligations of our States. The international financial institutions are becoming agencies for the recovery of the public and private debts of the States of the third world.

257. The economic crisis which has now gone on for almost a decade has attained such a scope that sectorial or partial solutions will not work.

258. Thus, the new international economic order that we seek implies a radical break with the laws and principles that have regulated the economic world since the end of the Second World War. The solutions to this crisis must be global and laid down in a spirit of complementarity and interdependence, for the greatest good of all.

259. This economic crisis, in the face of the unaccommodating attitudes we have noted, calls for our commitment to solidarity and interdependence and our ability to adapt to change.

260. It calls, first of all, for solidarity. We have in many of our statements in the past stressed this aspect of the problem. Solving the world crisis requires the commitment of all. It is not a question of winning at the expense of anyone else; we shall win together or we shall lose together. We have to share equitably in world prosperity. We must be sensitive to the suffering and misfortunes of others and give each people, each nation and each region of the world the opportunity to take part in the recovery of the world economic situation. If we agree that it is only the North that can put the world economy back on its feet, must we also agree that the salvation of the world will come from the North?

261. Interdependence, in our view, is based on mutual interest. In spite of the acceptance of the principle of the interdependence of the States of the North and South, we note with regret that the developed countries, since the fifth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, at Manila in 1979, have shown a marked hardening of their positions and turned their backs on any constructive and mutually advantageous dialogue. The deplorable results of the sixth session stem from this negative attitude of the rich countries.

262. We are told of the economic recovery taking place in the Northern countries, which is going to increase the volume of world trade by about 4.5 per cent. For our part there can be no doubt that the success of the North and its recovery can be sustained only with an extra effort to help the countries of the South. It therefore depends largely on consistent efforts to help the developing countries. Much is said about the magic of market laws, and we are asked to contribute to the expansion of world trade, to produce more and to export more. We are told that we should have fewer loans and more trade and commerce. With what are we going to produce if capital and development aid are so parsimoniously doled out to us? Why export unless commodity prices are stabilized? These are questions which militate in favour of a coherent, integrated and global approach in the search for appropriate joint solutions to the present crisis.

263. We in Zaire do not see interdependence as the subjugation of some to the interests of others but rather as an awareness of the fact that the fate of the North is intimately connected with that of the South. The present prosperity of the North is certainly due to the labours of its own people but everyone knows it is also in many respects due to the labours of the people of the South.

264. I turn now to adaptation to change, for the world is in a state of constant evolution.

265. Adaptation to change means for the North its capacity to understand that the maintenance or improvement of the development of its economies necessarily entails the abandonment of certain privileges born of the Bretton Woods system, which no longer exists except in name. If they fail to understand this truth and seek refuge in delaying tactics, the rich countries will only be maintaining ambiguity and creating a desperate situation with no way out—at least, no satisfactory way out for us all.

266. As for the South, adaptation to change means its capacity fully to assume its new role as an equal partner of the North in the search for and the taking of decisions concerning world matters. In the view of Zaire, this harmonious understanding constitutes the essence of international co-operation, for without real co-operation we should be calling in question the very principles of sovereignty and interdependence. We must therefore reverse the tendency towards the erosion of multilateral co-operation and curb the excesses of politically inspired bilateralism.

267. It was to face all these problems responsibly that the North-South dialogue was started and the new international economic order was conceived.

268. Today, we must note with regret that very little progress has been made in the face of the obduracy and, sometimes, the selfishness of the rich countries.

269. The virtual indifference of the Summit of Industrialized Countries at Williamsburg with regard to the concerns of the developing countries, the recent failure of the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, at Belgrade, and the scanty results achieved by the mini-summit organized by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India and chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries—to whom we should like to pay tribute for her initiative—do not give any grounds to hope for a reversal of these trends in the near future.

270. We must therefore continue to show imagination and alter this state of affairs because, as we were quite rightly reminded by the Secretary-General:

“Unresolved economic conflicts can be, and usually are, a breeding ground for dangerous political tensions.

“A major economic imperative of our times is the accelerated development of the developing countries.”

[See A/38/1.]

271. The Organization must always embark upon its debate on the question of divided countries with the utmost circumspection and responsibility so as to highlight common ground and seek ways and means which could bring the parties to the negotiating table in an atmosphere of trust. Acrimonious debates and maximalist positions which strengthen the division of peoples are contrary to the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

272. We have in mind particularly the questions of Korea and Cyprus.

273. The reunification of the two Koreas, desired by all the Korean people, must be brought about on the basis of the patient and determined continuation of the negotiations begun in 1972 between the North and the South. For our part, we do not reject any peaceful initiative in keeping with the Charter which could help to bring this about. In this context we have noted with satisfaction certain suggestions put forward in this general debate, particularly by the representative of Luxembourg [10th meeting]. We must avoid the crystallization of opposing positions. We must think about this and show collective imagination.

274. Similarly, if we are to bring about a lasting solution of the question of Cyprus, acceptable to all parties, it must be tackled in a comprehensive and impartial manner, because we must guarantee to the two communities the same right to existence. In this context Zaire favours a continuation of the inter-communal talks on an equitable settlement under the auspices of the Secretary-General. The auspices of the Secretary-General means, going beyond mere form, that those talks must be aimed at objectives and must be conducted in conformity with the principles of the Charter. Here again, as can be seen, if sides have to be taken the only side we can take is that of law.

275. I cannot pass over in silence the painful problem of some 13 million refugees in the world who are living in extremely precarious conditions and for whom the future is most uncertain. Most of these refugees are in Africa and Asia, that is in developing countries which are in the most dire straits in view of their poverty.

276. While appreciating the considerable humanitarian work of the United Nations in this field, we believe that

all Governments in the world, particularly those of the rich countries, and also the charitable agencies, must redouble their efforts by devoting particular attention to the elimination of the political causes underlying this phenomenon. These refugees, victims of racism and discrimination, intolerance, poverty because of economic conditions, *apartheid* and political conflict, today weigh heavily on the conscience of the world.

277. The organization of a second international conference on African refugees should, we believe, command the attention of the international community.

278. After having reviewed the disconcerting picture of the present world economic, political and social situation, I cannot conclude my statement without saying something about the role of the United Nations in international relations.

279. At a time when the concepts, notions and ideas which have hitherto governed the life and relations of societies seem to be increasingly challenged, the United Nations stands as the last outpost of great humanistic principles and civilized values against the assaults of intemperance and the claims of the irrational which are born of the present world crisis. For Zaire, the United Nations remains an irreplaceable instrument in the search for and the safeguarding of peace, the centre for peaceful coexistence, a guarantee and a bulwark of the weak against the powerful and of the poor against the rich, the ideal place for dialogue among national differences in the search for a true policy of international co-operation where each can find some advantage and each, with due respect for his right to be different, can contribute to the search for equitable solutions to the many problems facing the international community.

280. The United Nations has existed for 38 years now. If its record is not one of unqualified success, let us give it credit for giving rise to, if not supporting, the positive changes in the world and sustaining all just causes. The failure of the United Nations flows essentially from the inconsistency of States, certain shortcomings in its functioning and a certain lack of adaptability of its machinery to world development. Its principles remain valid and its primary mission remains as noble as ever. Machinery in the service of those principles and that mission can and must be adapted to the lightning speed of the evolution of the world over the last thirty years. The report of the Secretary-General to the thirty-seventh session identifies very clearly all aspects of the problem and thus makes it unnecessary for me to dwell on them.

281. Zaire will always support the multilateral approach and the purposes and principles of the Charter. Despite our difficulties, our limitations and our modest means, we shall always resist fragmentation and the erosion of an international instrument which has all the necessary tools and resources to bring peace, security, stability, progress and justice to humanity.

282. Let us therefore make the United Nations the instrument capable, as it was 38 years ago, of preserving present and future generations from the scourge of war and the indescribable sufferings which would result therefrom and the appropriate framework for defining a new world order.

283. To the extent that we strengthen the role of the United Nations and translate its decisions into national realities within our States shall we come closer to the advent of a more reassuring world order.

284. This new world order involves a profound restructuring of the relations of production and distribution of wealth at the planetary level within the framework of international solidarity.

285. International solidarity will consist, for the developed countries and for the others, of their active participation in the historic task of establishing a more just and equitable world, transcending shortsighted national interests and compensating for any inequalities, in order to improve, on this earth on which mankind lives, the condition of all.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

NOTES

¹ Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saquia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro.

² Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki on 1 August 1975.

³ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1983*, document S/15943.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-eighth Year, Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1983*, p. 8.

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1983*, document S/15966/Rev.1.

⁶ *Ibid.*, *Thirty-eighth Year, Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council, 1983*, p. 21.