



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.43
22 October 1985

ENGLISH

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FORTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 21 October 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. DE PINIÉS (Spain)

later: Mr. BOMBO (Vice-President) (Gabon)

- Commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations [39]
(continued)

Statements made by:

Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar

Mr. Aristides Maria Pereira, President of the Republic of Cape Verde

Mr. Salvador Jorge Blanco, President of the Dominican Republic

Mr. Garret Fitzgerald, Prime Minister of Ireland

Mr. Olof Palme, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Sweden

/...

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Mr. Shinyong Lho, Prime Minister of the Republic of Korea

Mr. Manea Manescu, Vice-President of the State Council and Special Envoy of the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania

Mr. Mitko Grigorov, Vice-President of the People's Republic of Bulgaria

Mr. Ali A. Treiki, Secretary of the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison and Special Envoy of the Leader of the First September Revolution of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

Mr. Dawa Tsering, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Special Envoy of the Government of the Kingdom of Bhutan

Mr. Goshu Wolde, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Special Envoy of the Head of State of Ethiopia

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 39 (continued)

COMMEMORATION OF THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly will first hear a statement by the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, His Excellency Mr. Didier Ratsiraka.

Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, was escorted to the rostrum.

President RATSIRAKA (interpretation from French): In 1835, Clarel de Tocqueville wrote:

"There are today on earth two great peoples which, from different points of departure, seem to be advancing towards the same goal: they are the Russians and the Anglo-Americans. Their point of departure is different and their paths are different, but nevertheless each seems to be chosen by the secret design of Providence to hold in its hands the destiny of half the world!"

History is full of valuable lessons, but unfortunately we must note that it is not only a constant renewal; it also contains dark inevitabilities that man's ingenuity cannot avert.

Until 1914 modern European civilization had no doubt that it was based on solid, unshakeable foundations. But the First World War disillusioned it, for it became painfully aware that the abyss of history was big enough to swallow up everyone and that a civilization was no less fragile than a single life.

The Great War was the result of a mere incident, but one that was inevitable - the assassination of the Archduke of Austria by a Serb.

(President Ratsiraka)

Everyone believed that the firepower of modern weapons was such that war was impossible. Europe was not foolish enough to commit suicide. It dominated the world. Moreover, the balance of forces was guaranteed by the equality of the two blocs. However, Austria declared war on Serbia, and the mechanism of alliances inevitably led to the outbreak of the First World War.

The result was 10 million dead - for nothing, because war has never, so far, at least, brought about any final results. The defeated people rises up once again and girds itself to defeat its conqueror. It was only natural - and inevitable - that Nazi Germany should have provoked the Second World War, which ended with the defeat of the Nazis and the Fascists and the explosion of the first atomic bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

(President Ratsiraka)

Result: 40 million dead for nothing, for nothing because it could have been avoided; for nothing because yesterday's allies became the adversaries, and the enemies of yesterday became the allies.

Today all the political, economic, social and military pre-conditions for a third world war exist. I appeal to this Assembly, to all scientists, to all peoples, to do everything possible to prevent the nuclear apocalypse that a third world war would mean.

I do not say it will be easy; the failure of the League of Nations, and the scanty results of the various international conferences on disarmament proves this, and the clash of ideologies and adversary ambitions make the enterprise even more difficult - difficult, but not impossible.

On the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, Madagascar, a non-aligned developing country, would like to make its own modest contribution to the challenge which faces us all.

It can be claimed that if the USSR did not exist to oppose the power of the United States of America, it would be necessary to invent it; conversely, if the United States of America did not exist to oppose the USSR, it would have to be invented, because nature seeks a balance.

Without the heroic sacrifice of 20 million Soviet citizens, without the intervention of American power in 1939 to 1945, the world today would be dominated by the Nazis and the Fascists, and everyone can imagine what that kind of world might have been like, on the basis of the memories and pictures of the concentration camps and, nearer home, the sufferings of the blacks under the apartheid régime in South Africa.

It was the end of the Second World War and the emergence of the two super-Powers, the USSR and the United States, which hastened political

(President Ratsiraka)

decolonization. It was American and Soviet pressure which prevented the invasion of Egypt after the nationalization of the Suez Canal.

Is there any need to add that it is thanks to the balance of forces in general and to strategic nuclear parity in particular between the two super-Powers that it has been possible to preserve peace for 40 years. But to paraphrase Saint-Exupery, I would say that although it is good for two ideologies to be in opposition to engender a new synthesis, it is monstrous that they should swallow each other up.

With regard to defence and science, history and experience show that defence research promotes the development of science and technology because such research is regarded as imperative, while Governments only grudgingly dole out funds for fundamental research.

There is a similarity between defence and the economy: they both have the aim of safeguarding the life, security and prosperity of the community and reducing elements of vulnerability. Furthermore, they have a common objective basis, the need for acquisition shown by man. This need is the source of the incessant and constant, direct or indirect, struggles, whose goal is first and foremost ownership or domination of the earth, the sea, and now space, all sources of the wealth and natural scientific knowledge necessary for production. The second goal is to acquire ownership of the goods produced by human labour, with a view to their consumption.

Hence, to try to abolish defence in order to establish an economy which would only produce peaceful goods and services just to ensure the well being of man is unrealistic, because it pre-supposes the disappearance of the need for acquisition by man, and by nations, and this is not something that is going to happen overnight. The golden age is still a myth, and violence at one time or another has been an inevitable part of history.

(President Ratsiraka)

Defence activities are necessary for economic activity. Similarly, economic activity is necessary for defence, because only economically strong countries can acquire an effective, valid and credible defence. But everything is a matter of assessment, priorities and indeed of morality.

If we evaluate losses of human life and material damage, that is to say, the socio-economic costs involved in an efficient defence or, in other words, poor preparation in the event that it proves essential to resist an aggressor, the amount of money assigned for this purpose may seem absurdly low. However, if we think of the magnitude of the social, economic and financial sacrifices made by mankind because of the security efforts and demands it undertakes - as is the case today in the USSR and the United States - the costs of the arms race are exorbitant, not to say insane.

We turn now to the "star wars" or the strategic defence initiative. After the "New Deal" and the "New Frontier" of his predecessors, President Reagan has sought a national consensus. On 23 March 1983 he proposed to the American nation his grand design, that is to say, the elimination of the threat constituted, according to him, by the Soviet Union's nuclear missiles, by the use of present and future scientific and technical progress.

I should like to say straight away that my statement is not aimed against the United States; I would have had the same to say about the Soviet Union, in the higher interests of mankind in general and the third world in particular. I raise my voice against the militarization of space with the same conviction with which I call for the creation of a zone of peace, demilitarized and denuclearized, in the Indian Ocean, whether the initiative for that militarization of space comes from the USSR or from the United States, and for several reasons:

(President Ratsiraka)

First, technically speaking, the basic idea is the same as in the BAMBI project, the ballistic missile boost intercept, that is, to detect the launching of enemy missiles (the acquisition and designation of objectives) and to destroy them. During their propellant phase, when they are visible and vulnerable, because of the great heat emitted, these missiles are theoretically easy to destroy, but this phase only lasts from two to five minutes, which is not very long. For this we have to have a very great number of infra-red detectors associated with large-dimension optics. This is the purpose of the High-Altitude Large Optics Programme, known as HALO.

Another version consists in the launching of geo-stationary satellites, orbiting at a distance of 36,000 kilometres from the earth and equipped with high performance radar transmitting at 6,000 megahertz.

As to destruction, use can be made of laser systems or particle beams, which operate at the speed of light, or a system of electro-magnetic propellants. I do not know what kind of lasers might be used: continuous or launch lasers, CO or CO2 lasers, deuterium, dynamic lasers or transverse electrical atmospheric lasers. All that one knows is that the high energy lasers available at present only emit two to five megawatts. Yet such a system requires the development of lasers emitting 50 to 70 megawatts, not something that can be done overnight.

As to electro-magnetic propellants, the projectile must be macroscopic and not microscopic, and its speed is only about 10 kilometres per second. With regard to particle beams the difficulties are even greater, and there is still a long way to go in this field.

Moreover, as the Soviets possess 8,000 missiles with enormous nuclear warheads in their strategic arsenal, if by any chance they were to decide to launch 5,000 at once, they would all have to be detected in five minutes and be destroyed in five minutes, which is hardly likely.

(President Ratsiraka)

The system of destruction, after the acquisition and designation of objectives, even in the case of directed energy with a speed of 300 kilometres a second, must also possess an aiming precision of 10 to 50 nonaradians.

In the post-propellant phase, the problem to be solved is the same, although it is easier because this phase is longer. It would seem that one needs 30 minutes for a missile launched from the USSR to reach vital targets in United States territory. The acquisition and designation of objectives is therefore easier and the destruction of the missile can be carried out either very high in the atmosphere at 1,000 kilometres, or at the medium altitude of 45 kilometres.

In this case of the High Frontier project, which is scheduled to deploy 500 satellites at an altitude of 550 kilometres, each possessing 50 anti-missile missiles, could deal with the problem.

In the terminal phase, the acquisition and designation of objectives would be activated at 100 to 150 kilometres and radar or laser could be used to determine distance, speed and co-ordinates of the missile to be destroyed. For destruction, until high energy lasers, particle beams and electro-magnetic cannon are available, infra-red guided missiles can be used.

(President Ratsiraka)

If this fantastic defence project were carried out, the United States would possess an anti-missile system capable of rendering the territory of the United States invulnerable to Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles while the USSR would be at the mercy of American such missiles.

That would be the end of the present strategic impasse resulting from nuclear parity. America's supremacy would be assured, and the Soviet Union, under the threat of the American nuclear first-strike ultimatum, would be obliged to capitulate.

But strategic and military history teaches us that there are no ultimate weapons or ultimate shields.

I come to the second reason. When man discovered the arrow, man produced shields, but to neutralize shields, man discovered the rifle. When man invented intercontinental or cruise missiles, at the same time he invented anti-missile systems. So if there is to be a mosaic of anti-missile satellites, man will immediately proceed to invent satellite killers. However, we have every reason to believe that the Soviet Union is going to meet the challenge. The arms race in space will be launched, if it has not already begun, and inevitably we will come back to nuclear and strategic parity, but at what a cost.

What is even worse, if the Russians are seriously overtaken by the strategic defence initiative and feel threatened, are they not likely to wage a preventive war, since, according to Western documents, they have a superior capacity in terms of megatons and nuclear warheads? Even if the Soviets incessantly repeat that they will never be the first to use nuclear weapons, they may feel cornered and backed up against the wall, and necessity knows no laws.

In order to avert nuclear war there must be physical, technical and economic constraints on what is known as star wars, and we must be aware of all the implications for the two super-Powers, for Europe and for the third world.

(President Ratsiraka)

I come now to the third reason. The gun and the rifle did not eliminate the use of arrows and daggers. Nuclear armaments have not eliminated conventional or classical armaments. Similarly, "star wars" will never eliminate nuclear weapons and consequently the nuclear threat. The best proof is the efforts of the Americans in continuing to strengthen their strategic nuclear potential: the programme for the MX, Midgetman, submarine-launched Trident II, Ohio-type, cruise and anti-satellite missiles, B-1 strategic bombers, and so on.

The strategic defence initiative is not invulnerable and it does not provide invulnerability for the American sanctuary, for several reasons. First, if the geographical co-ordinates of the Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile silos, or the submarine-launched ballistic missile bases or the bases for strategic bombers are known and theoretically they are easy to destroy, and if the Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles take 30 minutes to reach their targets in the United States of America, the fact remains that, first of all, 10 per cent of the nuclear warheads of the Soviet strategic missiles are of 20 megatons, and since they cannot all be destroyed, the Soviets might be tempted - in fact, they certainly would be tempted - to increase their number and augment and disperse their silos to achieve saturation or overkill capacity. So the territory and strategic targets of the United States are by no means absolutely invulnerable to their striking power.

Then there are the Soviet submarine nuclear missiles, which have a range of 8,800 kilometres, in the case of the SSN 8, and 10,500 kilometres, in the case of the SSN 18. The Soviet medium-range ballistic missiles have a range of more than 2,500 kilometres. So all the Soviet submarines with nuclear missiles, MIRVed or non-MIRVed, launching their missiles near the American coast could achieve their goals in only 5 or 10 minutes, not to mention the cruise missiles and the strategic

(President Ratsiraka)

bombers. Therefore the American sanctuary is vulnerable.

"The ultimate objective of the SDI is to make nuclear weapons useless and obsolete, leading to mutual assured survival, replacing mutual assured destruction. This has become very attractive and reassuring to American public opinion because of the assertion that it is possible to prevent a nuclear war on American soil."

But, as we have seen, this is not true.

Faced with the challenge of the strategic defence initiative, the Soviets have several solutions. They are, as we have seen, in a position to achieve overkill or saturation capacity by increasing the number of nuclear warheads and at the same time improving their accuracy, their probable circular error. Experts estimate that if the Americans are stronger in ballistics, the Soviets are more advanced in the matter of anti-satellite interceptors. The Russians can also put into place a mosaic of anti-missile satellites. They can jam or decoy radar detection systems and the communications systems of the strategic defence initiative.

Furthermore the Soviets, like the Americans incidentally, are capable of manufacturing strategic nuclear missiles with straight or depressed trajectories, and lasers and anti-missile satellites lose a great deal of their effectiveness at the lower and denser levels of the atmosphere, not to mention the use of the cold launching of intercontinental ballistic missiles from their silos.

So much for the countermeasures possible as far as terminal defence is concerned. But when it comes to space defence, other countermeasures are liable to complicate the task of the defender.

There is the hardening of missiles to raise the threshold of lethal aggression; in the face of lasers it is possible to imagine the use of resistant structural materials - ablatives - which melt under the impact of lasers but keep the nuclear

(President Ratsiraka)

warhead intact. Missiles can also be put into rotation, making it necessary for the defender to multiply the power of his weapons by a factor of 10 to 30.

Space defence systems are extremely vulnerable because of the adversary's knowledge of their co-ordinates and trajectory and also because of the difficulty of protecting them because they are made up of dozens or hundreds of satellites gravitating around the Earth. To be effective, such a system must be complete: surveillance radar, communications systems, large-dimension optics and land-based central operation, "without which the network is full of holes, which can be beneficial to the attacker", not to mention "the use of non-ballistic means derived from cruise missiles, which exist today".

I come to the fourth reason, the question of cost effectiveness. Technical studies published in the West provide for slow, long-term deployment in both the United States and the USSR. The deployment of terminal defences will begin between the years 1990 and 2000. These defences will be based on the ground and composed of nuclear anti-missile weapons based on kinetic energy, or the laser, from the year 2000 to 2005. Around the year 2005 there may emerge space-defence armaments including kinetic-energy interceptors, for example, high-speed canons or laser weapons capable of intercepting missiles at their propulsion phase. Around the year 2020 operational systems combining terminal and space defences and with a true capacity for protection may be deployed, but without invulnerability being assured.

The production and functioning of such a global defensive system presupposes, apart from the perfecting of high-performance weapons, the realization and mastery of an automatic complex whose complexity is hard to imagine today. Furthermore, the cost of the space component today seems exorbitant and out of all proportion to the goal to be achieved; the deployment of a protection of 200 stations each weighing 100 tons, which would entail the development of new launching, maintenance

(President Ratsiraka)

and re-supply facilities, would take five years, at the rate of one launch a week, and would cost about \$US 1,000 billion. To ensure a space-defence mosaic of satellites, however incredible this may seem, would require thousands of stations. The cost of such an operation would clearly be exorbitant, if not downright insane.

I come to the fifth reason. An American decision to develop such a fantastic project would inevitably bring about a similar decision by the Soviets, and vice versa.

What would be the consequences of this for Europe and for the other nuclear Powers? The nuclear deterrent forces of Britain, France and China would be obsolete as far as the two super-Powers were concerned because they would be very vulnerable. Of course, they would still have their nuclear submarines, but in view of their number, they would be easily outclassed by the nuclear attack submarines or submarine chasers of the two super-Powers.

If the strategic defence initiative falls within a purely American perspective, since the United States is not vulnerable to anything except the Soviet nuclear threat, the case of Western Europe is quite different. If its protection were assured through the deployment by the United States of anti-ballistic-missile systems, the military threat to which they think they are subject because of their geographic situation would in no way be reduced. There would, in fact, remain the threat of nuclear-weapon systems against which an anti-ballistic system is ineffective - for example, short-range ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, strategic bombers, chemical weapons - as well as the threat of conventional forces.

(President Ratsiraka)

This vulnerability of Western Europe would bring about an asymmetry within the Atlantic Alliance, which would be divided between two theatres with different security needs: Western Europe, threatened by nuclear, chemical or conventional weapons, and the United States, progressively sheltered from Soviet nuclear weapons. This asymmetry would weaken the credibility of the United States commitment to Europe and would give Europeans the feeling that they were being abandoned by the Americans.

The strategic defence initiative could destroy the whole strategy of deterrence in the minds of the European public. The strategic defence initiative might even cause the European public to call in question the very deployment in Europe of nuclear weapons, which might then appear superfluous or even dangerous. The strategic defence initiative is a political, military and strategic project with civilian applications. It supplements and prolongs the United States space programme, which needs an ambitious objective and an incentive for expansion. This space programme is a United States response to the considerable Soviet efforts in similar fields. The fact remains that the strategic defence initiative seems likely to precipitate a perhaps inevitable evolution, if not to give rise to a new arms race.

Therefore the strategic defence initiative is a destabilizing factor, because it tends to upset the strategic balance and the present parity. It is a destabilizing factor because, without underestimating the efforts made by the Soviet Union in the field of anti-missile and anti-satellite weapon systems, the strategic defence initiative might be regarded by the Soviet Union not as a defence system but as a first-strike weapon, the use of which would precede a second nuclear strike. A considerable escalation of the arms race would then ipso facto become inevitable, because of the increase and accelerated diversification of

(President Ratsiraka)

offensive weapon systems through the intensive development of cruise missiles and ballistic missiles, with a view to anticipating future progress in defensive means; by the development and progressive deployment of ballistic anti-missile defence systems and cruise anti-missile defence systems; and by the extension of confrontation in space with the acceleration of the anti-satellite programmes with a view to anticipating deployment of orbital stations for space defence. The strategic relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union would become even more complex and probably less stable as a result.

This arms race would lead to a growth of asymmetric arsenals which would make it difficult to arrive at a fair balance and would consequently reduce the possibility of negotiating agreements on the reduction, limitation and control of armaments. In the face of these prospects, and the uncertainty of the Europeans concerning the United States commitment, as I have said, with regard to the Western European theatre of operations, the EUREKA project, which is a civilian research programme with military applications, could become, like the strategic defence initiative, a political and military project with civilian applications, to avoid placing European high-technology industrial complexes under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The sixth reason relates to the consequences for the third world. This inversion of the initial objectives of EUREKA would cause Europeans to make a greater and more urgent financial effort - for instance in defence research - and thus reduce to the same extent European assistance to the third world in general and to the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries in particular. If the Americans want to spend \$1,000 billion to establish their future defence system, the Soviet Union will certainly spend as much, but I believe it is neither moral nor effective. Furthermore, most developed States share this opinion, and this includes their scientists. Even in the United States, among those opposing the

(President Ratsiraka)

strategic defence initiative we find many scientists, who raise arguments concerning the cost and the vulnerability of the system. This is true of Hans Bethe, Garwin of International Business Machines, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology group and a certain number of members of Congress and representatives of the Department of Defense, such as Air Force generals and former leaders, including Schlesinger and Woolsey. The objections on the part of United States Congressmen and the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment relate to the very slight probability of achieving an absolutely impenetrable shield, particularly if one takes into account cruise missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and strategic bombers. Furthermore, they do not think that systems making possible the partial interception of ballistic missiles would lead to an immediate reduction of nuclear armaments or the nuclear threat itself.

What is really at stake? We have seen that nuclear parity and the strategic deadlock have been able to ensure peace. However, we also know that in strategic history the idea of deadlock is anathema. Each of the two super-Powers wishes to supplant the other, to achieve military superiority; they accuse each other of imperialism and warmongering expansionism.

If the United States and the Soviet Union were alone on the earth they would not risk destroying each other with nuclear weapons, so why are they threatening the existence of the whole of mankind with this arms race and this race for supremacy to the point of taking the competition into outer space? The answer is very simple. It is because of the third world, with its primary commodities but also its consumer populations, which could be allies or enemies, and it is also because of Europe.

I shall now speak of peace, humanism and development. Development is the new name for peace. It is not only the endless spiral of nuclear war that is

(President Ratsiraka)

threatening peace. It is also the iniquitous situation with which we live, which everyone knows about and which is denounced at every international conference. There are two worlds: the world of the rich, industrialized countries, which for the most part have accumulated too much wealth for more than a century, to the detriment of the other, the so-called third world, which is dominated, exploited and robbed of its substance for the benefit of the developed world. If we do not quickly find a solution to this crucial problem, this major contradiction, the world will inevitably explode. Nuclear war, "star wars", satellite attack, later the occupation of planets and war between the planets - this is no longer merely science fiction. But beware: nature cannot be cheated; its laws cannot be broader with impunity, the scientist tells us.

We do not underestimate this vital fact of our time, that the accelerated and dizzying progress of science and technology is largely responsible for the problems of mankind and the mortal peril to our species, by arousing greed for material goods, the desire to dominate, imperialism and hegemonism, bringing new sources of discord among men, peoples and nations. However, we do not believe that it is either possible or desirable to halt the development of science, in view of the progress and the limitless benefits that are made possible. Any backward step would be impossible. Mankind must go to the very limits of the great scientific and technological adventure on which it has embarked. However, if this adventure is not to turn into a nuclear catastrophe, the necessary and sufficient condition is that man raise his wisdom to the level of his power by using his reason fully.

No sensible man could prefer war to peace. One's country is still the most beautiful thing in the world. To die for one's country is very important, to live for it is even more important. When one loves his country, when one loves mankind, one cannot see the suffering of one's fellow man without suffering oneself and

(President Ratsiraka)

without feeling the need to remedy it, as Durkheim says. It is clear that humanism must be the very foundation of life and international law. To resist the twofold economic and military danger that threatens us all, we must create justice - social and economic justice and effective international justice.

What action is possible and desirable? Unfortunately, the advent of such justice and mankind reconciled cannot be brought about by a spontaneous generation. Usually the emergence of a new synthesis, like birth itself, is preceded by crisis and convulsions. Christianity was born of the horror of colonization and oppression by Rome. The idea of liberty, equality, fraternity, was brought into being painfully by the French Revolution, with its massacres and torments. The abolition of slavery was preceded by the Civil War in the United States. The birth of Marxism-Leninism was promoted by the First World War and the October Revolution. Decolonization was a logical consequence of the ending of the Second World War. The same war gave birth to the Marshall Plan. Today the world is in the grip of a serious and lasting crisis, and it is for us to ensure that this crisis does not lead to economic and social chaos or to a nuclear apocalypse.

(President Ratsiraka)

Now, what solutions are possible? The first concrete solution is the maximalist solution. There are not many régimes whether of the right or of the left in the developing countries that can long hold out if they use 50 to 90 per cent of their export earnings to pay off debts and service those debts. And the rich who have become rich to the detriment of the developing countries will never of their own accord or with alacrity give up their exorbitant privileges. The explosion is thus inevitable, but a planned and controlled explosion is preferable to an accidental one. Hence, the extreme solution we are advocating is a moratorium on debt payments for 10 years.

We have been colonized, exploited and dominated for more than a century. And, following the achievement of political independence "they" have continued to exploit us through the decline in the terms of trade; our countries have served as suppliers of labour and cheap raw materials and as outlets for manufactured products sold at the highest possible prices, regardless whether such products come from the East or the West.

The "equal rights ... of nations large or small" and the "economic and social advancement of all peoples" that are proclaimed in the Preamble of the United Nations Charter are for us notions devoid of any substance. However, the moratorium, if it is to be successful, must be financed and sustained. That is why I am appealing to all third-world countries, whatever their ideology, race or religion, to set up the three funds of the third world, namely, a fund for economic development, a fund for the stabilization of raw-material prices and a fund for assistance in balance-of-payments, and in particular, to all developing countries producers of oil and strategic raw materials, materials that are indispensable to the industries of the developed countries.

Today, the third-world countries are complementary - they produce oil, agricultural products, minerals, ocean products and medium-level technology. And

(President Ratsiraka)

if the industrialized countries want to buy our products or sell us theirs they should do so through the joint intra-third-world trade fund at a price that is fair and remunerative for all parties.

However, the oil producers and exporters will not be the only ones to pay for the creation of these free funds. All third-world or borderline countries must contribute. Instead of setting aside 50 to 90 per cent of their export earnings to service their debts to the "centre" countries, they could pay 2 to 7 per cent of that amount each year into the three funds and earmark the rest for development projects. This is feasible, because our products will be sold at a higher price and those that we must import from the industrialized countries will be purchased at reasonable prices. Instead of deteriorating, terms of trade will improve. In that way we will be rendering a service to mankind as a whole because we will be helping to curb the arms race. Let us not miss this appointment with history.

Every one of today's developing countries will eventually make broad progress and will subsequently be able, within a reasonable time and under equitable conditions, to pay their debts because they will have the wherewithal to do so. That is what I mean by a new synthesis in a reconciled mankind. It is the expression of a modern and authentic humanism.

Yet as not everyone will accept this first, extremist solution, there is a second intermediate solution. National and selfish interests will no doubt be exploited by the developed countries. But we, too, can divide and profit from the secondary contradictions between the industrialized countries, not in order to reign but to achieve the triumph of peace and justice. First, Europe and Japan, which have experienced the horror of world war, have no wish to repeat that frightful experience. No European country wishes to go to war against any other European country. Secondly, Europe and Japan need raw materials from third-world countries to keep their industries going and to maintain their growth and to

(President Ratsiraka)

export. It is a vital need for them. Thirdly, Europe and Japan are experiencing competition from and, indeed, domination by their powerful "partners". Should a third world war break out, Europe will be the theatre of operations. Fourthly, the third world needs the advanced technology of Europe.

Sincere, fair and mutually advantageous co-operation must therefore be established between Europe - and, if it so wishes, Japan - and the countries of the third world. I am speaking above all of Western Europe, because it is Western Europe that colonized most of the developing countries, it is for Western Europe that we fought, some in 1914-1918 and some in 1939-1945, and it is Western Europe that has a moral debt to the third world. However, I do not exclude Eastern Europe.

A new financial and commercial economic order and mutually advantageous co-operation among all the countries of the so-called Group of 77 and Europe in the broad sense is possible.

The total debt of the third world amounts to approximately \$1,000 billion. If I have spoken of cartels or syndicates of debtor developing countries, I did not mean that the role of a syndicate is only to proclaim a debt moratorium, for that could bring about a very serious crisis that could affect the entire world: a moratorium is only the last resort.

We therefore propose participation and sincere and fair negotiation that can serve the interests of all. Let me explain: the total third-world debt means that \$100 billion has to be paid every year, assuming an interest rate of 10 per cent per annum. This is impossible.

Public and private "assistance" per annum is woefully inadequate in view of such astronomical figures. The solution is to eradicate non-military public indebtedness by methods I shall explain under my third solution, and to have private indebtedness guaranteed by creditor States. A 10-year moratorium is needed to give the debtor countries time for development.

(President Ratsiraka)

The advantage of such a solution is that the developing countries will be able to combat drought, hunger, poverty and disease. Once developed, each country will become a solvent market for European products. And the third-world countries will export to the Europeans which will, in turn, resell a proportion of those exports to the rest of the world.

Europe and Japan and other industrialized countries will thus be able to give new impetus to their economies, develop their industries and eliminate unemployment.

A bilateral contract may be contemplated between the industrialized countries of the centre and the developing countries on the periphery. In that way Europe, Japan and some industrialized countries that would take part would have exclusive rights to sell their manufactured products to third-world countries. All such countries would thus be able to work effectively for peace and disarmament or, at least, to curb the arms race, because the super-Powers would have to pay a very high price through Europe and Japan for the raw materials they need.

The third solution is the humanist and global solution. Various negotiating processes - the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START), the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and so on - are not achieving results because of problems of confidence and verification. However, we can get around that obstacle by compelling the two super-Powers, the two blocs, to remain in their present strategic deadlock created by nuclear parity while resolving the development and indebtedness problems of the third world.

I said it would be Utopian to think that such confidence could be created by magic and that it would be equally impossible to imagine that we could eliminate defence research because it is so necessary to science and technology in general. Finally, it is obvious that other great Powers will continue to pursue such research

(President Ratsiraka)

because there is no way of preventing them from attempting to attain the level of the super-Powers.

However, should one of the super-Powers implement its Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) programme, the other will inevitably follow suit, and vice versa. If we lack the means of preventing them from doing this, from developing their weapons systems - in other words, from pursuing their research - we can nevertheless prevent them from turning out such systems one after another by exerting political and economic pressure with the assistance of their peoples in view of the astronomical cost of perfecting them. And the great advantage of that course of action is that it will enable us to test the good faith of the two super-Powers by discovering which of them truly wants peace and respects the Charter of the United Nations.

This third comprehensive solution would be called the the Strategic or Joint Development Initiative (SJDI). The annual military expenditures of the great Powers and the super-Powers are estimated as approximately equal to the total debt of the third world, or \$1,000 billion.

(President Ratsiraka)

Let us suppose that those Powers were to reduce their arms expenditures and that the super-Powers were to renounce the implementation of "star wars". To make matters clear - \$US 250 billion a year could be released, one-quarter of the cost of SDI. Half of that sum - \$US 125 billion - would be reserved for development of the major and super-Powers and the elimination of their unemployment, and the rest - \$US 125 billion - would be devoted to third-world development in the form of long-term loans - new money - on soft conditions and to refinancing former back debts, for which we propose a moratorium of 10 years and payment over 17 years.

Furthermore, non-military public debts would be completely or partially cancelled in the light of a certain number of criteria, such as the following.

First, with regard to debts, 100 per cent of debts of less than \$US 2.5 billion would be cancelled, and there would be decreasing percentages for higher amounts - for example, 90 per cent of debts below \$US 5 billion, 80 per cent of debts below \$US 10 billion, and so on.

Secondly, with regard to the per capita gross national product, 100 per cent of the debt of countries whose per capita gross national product is below \$US 400 would be cancelled, and there would be gradually decreasing percentages for up to \$US 1,500.

Thirdly, with regard to debts as expressed on a per capita basis, 100 per cent of the debt of countries whose per capita indebtedness is higher than 50 per cent of per capita gross national product would be cancelled, with decreasing percentages for lower sums.

In each case, the non-cancelled part of the public debt would be readjusted on soft conditions both in terms of interest rates and repayment time.

These three variations of the cancellation of the public debt are also applicable to the second intermediate solution I have mentioned above.

(President Ratsiraka)

But coming back to our own solution, SJDI - the strategic or joint development initiative, it goes without saying that a stabilization fund for primary commodity prices would also be created so that the prices of agricultural and mining primary commodities exported by the third world would be stabilized, with an annual increase of, for example, 5 per cent.

Thus, the developing countries could plan their economic growth. For all the bold adjustment measures we have taken thus far have failed because of fluctuations in the prices of primary commodities - but also because of the consequent lack of new money.

Finally, the nuclear-arms race and the arms race in space would be substantially curbed, because the Soviet Union, the United States and the other great Powers would have to participate in this global financial effort - and not like the World Bank at present - that is to say, to finance the United Nations strategic development initiative.

Hence, to conclude, I address myself to the Soviets, you who have lost 20 million of your fathers and your sons during the Second World War. Make no attempt to relive that terrible experience. I address myself to the American people, you who have never known the horrors of a world war on your own soil. Do not attempt such a catastrophic experience.

All nations, large and small, will send their experts to monitor the strict application of the limitation of the arms race. Peoples of large and small nations alike, let us unite in the only battle worthy of man at the end of the twentieth century, proud as he is of his conquests over matter, time and space. Let us unite to overcome underdevelopment, poverty, malnutrition, hunger, disease and unemployment - those scourges which like gangrene could set our civilization back into the abyss of centuries.

(President Ratsiraka)

Today, on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, I extend my left hand - it is the hand of marriage. For the love of humanity, take my hand.

Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now hear a statement by the President of the Republic of Cape Verde, His Excellency Mr. Aristides Maria Pereira.

Mr. Aristides Maria Pereira, President of the Republic of Cape Verde, was escorted to the rostrum.

President PEREIRA (spoke in Portuguese; interpretation from French text furnished by the delegation): When, on 12 December 1962, for the first time, the Chairman of the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly at its seventeenth session called on a petitioner by the name of Amílcar Cabral, our people, by the authority of the leader of its historic struggle against age-old colonial domination, declared to the whole world not only a special and distinct identity from the colonial Power in the concert of nations, but equally, its total identification with the foundations and objectives of the United Nations which, at the beginning of the 1960s, 15 years after its creation, was already assuming the weight of the crucial changes and political upheavals to come in the international sphere.

Indeed, the adoption by the General Assembly on 14 December 1960 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, contained in resolution 1514 (XV), was to mark a decisive turning-point, not only in the concept of the role of the United Nations because of its juridical and political effects in international relations, but also by its decisive influence on the development of national liberation struggles Non-Self-Governing Territories, particularly in the Portuguese colonies.

(President Pereira)

It is not only that an obsolete system of domination and enslavement was outlawed by that historic declaration, but a page in the history of mankind was turned once and for all and a new hope for peace and freedom was born for the peoples of the world.

From that time on, as was so well pointed out by Cabral, we freedom fighters became "anonymous soldiers in the cause of the United Nations", and the bitter and determined struggle which we waged was raised to the level of international legitimacy propitious for its own development but also beneficial to the consolidation of the foundations of the Organization.

Hence, the significant political and moral contribution made by the United Nations to our national liberation struggle is in keeping with the actions undertaken within it and in its name which promoted greater isolation of the colonial Power and the strengthening of the liberation movement at the international level. Resolutions proclaiming the legitimacy of the struggle by all necessary means, the visit in April 1972 of a special mission to the liberated zones of Guinea-Bissau and the recognition of the national liberation movements as the sole authentic representatives of our peoples - all undoubtedly constituted essential steps in the historical process which was to lead to the elimination of Portuguese colonialism in Africa.

(President Pereira)

In promoting the acceleration of history, the emancipation and affirmation of so many young nations, while strengthening the juridical norms governing relations between States in the international community, General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), whose twenty-fifth anniversary we are celebrating this year, will have left its indelible imprint on United Nations activities and the future of the world. So we can state that Cape Verde's full membership in the international community of sovereign nations represented in this Assembly is in large measure to the existence of the United Nations.

In recalling these facts, which have so rightly linked the destinies of a whole people to the inevitable march of the international community, through its world Organization, towards a future more radiant and serene, our intention at this time, when we are commemorating the fortieth anniversary of our Organization, is not only to pay it a warm and well-deserved tribute. It is above all a matter of testifying here and now to the great importance and significance the people and the Government of Cape Verde attach to the sole, unique and irreplaceable role played by the United Nations, a role it must continue to play in today's complex and tormented world, and in so doing committing ourselves to the historic imperatives of our times.

Since it emerged into the international arena Cape Verde has upheld, as has the United Nations, dialogue and the search for peaceful solutions to international conflicts, for our country aspires to peace. The immense and difficult task of development needs a climate of social peace, political stability and renewed confidence among peoples and States. Cape Verde and its Government are dedicated resolutely to this task, not only fully aware of the demands of the development process and its constraints, but equally strictly abiding by the duties incumbent upon it towards the international community and the United Nations system.

(President Pereira)

Hence, it is a matter of particular satisfaction to me to be able, within the framework of this commemoration and on behalf of the people of Cape Verde, to associate myself with those representatives of Member States who at this exceptional time of our meeting here and in keeping with the spirit and action of our Organization, have brought the fruit of their thinking to the work of building peace and universal concord, which is the task of the United Nations, while contributing to the affirmation of the cardinal principles and noble objectives of the Charter.

Much has been said over the last few years to the detriment of the United Nations and on the difficulties experienced by the Organisation in resolving the major questions of our time - war, hunger, poverty - that is to say, the present problems facing mankind. In condemnation, reference has also been made to its incapacity to enforce decisions taken here and often to exhibit self-inflicted paralysis where the situation called for dynamic and energetic political action. This, it seems to me, is to overlook the limits to which it is subject owing to the very order that prevails at present in the international community and because of the problems caused by various conflicting interests which are reflected even in the Organization's very functioning.

However, it should be recalled that the primary intention of the founders of the United Nations was precisely to provide a framework in which Governments having different political and social orientations could together seek solutions to international problems, on the basis of the principle that all States have a fundamental interest in the maintenance of peace and the creation of a just and more open order in which economic and social progress, the dignity of man and the rule of law would constitute the universal objectives of mankind.

In examining the fundamental political factors of our time and the strategic trends growing stronger on the international scene, we must note, that today narrow and passing national interests tend to supplant collective interests and to be

(President Pereira)

in conflict with the common desire for peace and security, while the establishment of zones of influence incompatible with the political realities of our time would become an alternative to multilateral co-operation in the solution of global problems affecting the whole international community.

This trend, whose effects have been increasingly felt in recent years, in response to the wave of emancipation of many countries in previous years, not only endangers general respect for the principles of the Charter as rules governing relations between States but would remove from the United Nations and from the multilateral process in general the search for common solutions to global problems.

I am convinced that the future cannot be fashioned along these lines, and the many challenges before us as we near the year 2000 cannot be met by stifling our common interest.

To a sense, we are today living in a world where problems know neither frontiers nor the obstacles of sovereignty, and this calls for a more objective view of one's own reality, for making national sacrifices and for adopting genuine solutions based on a firm political will.

Interdependence is no longer an empty word; it is a basic element in daily relations among nations and a fundamental given in the future. When we consider the present structures of the international economy and the flow of trade throughout the world; when we think about the scourges affecting vast areas of the world, such as drought and desertification, which require a wide-scale co-ordinated response going even beyond the regional framework; when we think about the growth of the North which is challenged by worsening underdevelopment in the South - it is easy to appreciate the dimension of this dominant feature of our era, namely, interdependence, which is becoming increasingly pronounced among peoples and nations and gradually embracing new areas of general concern.

(President Pereira)

The need to have recourse, on an equal footing and on the basis of mutual advantage, to multilateralism for the solution of crucial problems of collective interest is daily becoming a basic fact of the twentieth century. Since problems are increasingly of global dimension, solutions must accordingly be at the world level.

Drawing lessons from the past as it faces the future the United Nations has in the course of the 40 years of its existence elaborated a set of rules, instruments and modalities which, although not infallible and hence still needing improvement, has none the less promoted a clearer awareness in the international community of this interdependence - which is experienced in different ways by different peoples, depending on whether one enjoys its benefits or suffers its consequences. This contemporary fact which is interdependence must one day be placed on the sound footing of solidarity and the sharing of responsibilities rather than on a desire for power and unilateralism. Much to its credit, the United Nations has made multilateralism a necessary and indispensable process in co-operation among States, capable of overcoming old rivalries and reluctance based on protectionism and distrust.

The United Nations has thus shown a deep and objective understanding of the global phenomena, both political and economic, that characterize our time, while clearly identifying the challenges facing mankind which must now be urgently met.

Indeed, the international situation of our time, which in its complex dynamics is increasingly revealing contradictions, has thereby assigned greater responsibilities to States and peoples.

The international community as a whole, but in its diversity as well, is equally concerned over various upheavals in the international arena: from the survival of systems that are doomed by history, such as colonialism and apartheid; repeated flagrant violations of the laws and norms governing relations among its members; the further round in the nuclear-arms race; a serious deterioration in the

(President Pereira)

economic and financial situation in the developing countries, to the extension and aggravation of scourges and disasters affecting all continents.

It can never be over-emphasized at this juncture that, although the present system of apartheid is universally condemned, it is daily proving to be a grave threat to international peace and security.

All these aspects of the current international situation constitute a sword of Damocles hanging over our Organization; it is a situation the world is calling in question.

(President Pereira)

The question of peace, more than at any other time in the past, owing to the world-wide danger represented by nuclear weapons, is a problem to be posed in general terms and highlights the role played by international forums.

Today we must also recognize the positive role being played by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries which, on the basis of dialogue, the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes and its policy of non-alignment with any bloc, has made a valuable contribution to the search for global solutions and the creation of a climate of détente in international relations.

Rising from the ruins of the most devastating war of all times, the United Nations was entrusted with the task of becoming the instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security. The United Nations Charter assigned that function primarily to the Security Council and created the necessary machinery through its system of collective security to curb the use of force in international relations. This system, embodied in the Charter, has lost some of its effectiveness for well-known reasons that have to do primarily with conflicts resulting from the cold war and bipolarization brought about by confrontation between blocs.

It is generally recognized that, in practice, the Security Council has not been able to discharge all its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security. Consequently, as a result of the shortcomings of the collective security system there has been a proliferation of military alliances and regional self-defence arrangements, thus increasing the likelihood of the internationalization of local conflicts, the failure of détente and deadlocks in dialogues at various levels. Against this background, the deployment of peace-keeping forces and the mediation and good-office efforts made by the Secretary-General with a view to creating a climate conducive to peace have - although indispensable - been inadequate.

(President Pereira)

Consequently there is an urgent need to make the Security Council more effective and improve its procedures so that it can do all that is expected of it under the Charter.

Although we must strengthen the instruments that we have created as well as practical procedures, they cannot play their role effectively unless States as a whole, and in particular the nuclear-weapon Powers, work together to make those instruments more effective. From this standpoint, the example of the blocking of global negotiations on a new international economic order, for which there is a growing need, is eloquent.

The United Nations has made development, through its specialized agencies, the challenge of the century. The battle, marked by self-denial and self-sacrifice but also by mistakes and errors, being fought tirelessly by the developing countries, and particularly by some of the least developed, would certainly have been lost before it even started if United Nations organs and the international community as a whole did not stand by them. However, it is a fact that, without global negotiations, the gap between rich and poor countries would continue to widen and underdevelopment would have an ever more serious impact on the development of the world. That is why all Member States must work together to make these negotiations succeed so as to remedy an economic situation which is in a state of crisis and to a great extent unsuited to the needs of the hour.

The United Nations is certainly is a valuable and irreplaceable instrument in the service of all countries for the solution of problems that they face individually and collectively. Indeed, owing to the complex political demands of the present international situation, our survival depends on and coexists with the United Nations which, in spite of everything, is a place for fruitful dialogue and exchanges of view, a vital centre for thoughtful reflection on the future prospects of our planet, and a vital shield that protects justice and right for all.

(President Pereira)

In spite of failures and abortive actions, in spite of its vulnerability and disappointments, the United Nations can be proud of its immense achievements in many areas over the four decades of its existence. The transcendent events of the contemporary world have had an impact, and the word peace is now synonymous with the United Nations.

That is why it is in the interest of all countries, and all the peoples of the world, while recognizing their collective responsibility "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", to work to defend and strengthen the United Nations. This, so that the United Nations message of hope will reach the heart of the most remote areas of the world, that everywhere people will benefit from justice, and that freedom will coincide with the right not to be hungry, the right not to live in fear, and the right to see one's children grow up in peace.

Mr. Aristides Maria Pereira, President of the Republic of Cape Verde, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now hear a statement by the President of the Dominican Republic, His Excellency Mr. Salvador Jorge Blanco.

Mr. Salvador Jorge Blanco, President of the Dominican Republic, was escorted to the rostrum.

President BLANCO (interpretation from Spanish): It is an extraordinary honour for me to take part as the Constitutional President of the Dominican Republic, a signatory country of the San Francisco Charter, in this commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

Forty years ago the great statesmen of a world in ruins, torn apart by the effects of war and in a state of destitution, but with faith in the future, decided to make every effort and join forces to prevent the tragedy of another conflagration from affecting future generations.

(President Blanco)

After four decades we now have a magnificent opportunity to ponder the great act of the peoples of the world who sought to create, through this Organization, guarantees for a truly international community united in a co-ordinated effort to bring about a new and better future.

The decision of so many Heads of State to be present at this special session of the General Assembly is a reaffirmation of the continuing faith of the international community in the validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter.

(President Blanco)

I can therefore state with legitimate pride that the Dominican Republic carries out its international relations in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter; that our country lives in peace and for peace, fully respecting the principle of non-intervention and the self-determination of peoples and ensuring that no act of aggression or destabilization is committed from our territory against any State; that we promote and guarantee human rights and public freedoms; that through our actions we promote co-operation in the struggle against underdevelopment and for the establishment of true international justice; and that, above all, we advocate total respect for the fundamental principle of peaceful coexistence - that is, the principle that obliges States to settle their disputes solely and exclusively through the means offered by international law.

Furthermore, the rebirth of democracy - and with it full recognition of the will of the people - in many countries of Latin America, is an encouraging sign of a comprehensive, wise policy by the great majority of the small and large nations, from the Potomac to the Rio de la Plata. That rebirth has eliminated causes of disruption and has promoted human rights, making them a tangible fact for many of our brother peoples.

This is the proper time to have a frank exchange of views on the future of the Organization, its function in regard to international peace and the social and economic development of the peoples. Above all, however, this is the occasion to lay the groundwork for continued discussions of the question of the very existence of the Organization.

The Dominican Republic wishes clearly and concisely to state its position in defence of the United Nations system, as the supreme forum for discussions in which all States, large and small, industrialized, powerful, poor or developing, can participate, where the major problems of mankind can be discussed.

(President Blanco)

In the world of 1945, anything and everything seemed possible for the international community, for there did not at that time exist the general feeling that mankind could actually disappear in a nuclear war. This terrifying possibility has now made it even more imperative that the international community support this Organization's decisions and resolutions with good faith and tenacity.

A glance back at these 40 years of the Organization's existence reveals that on balance the work of the Organization during that period can well be regarded as positive, notwithstanding the great expectations that have not been fulfilled by the United Nations. It need only be said that a world war has been prevented, that the process of decolonization has been carried out, that there has been a substantial increase in the number of Member States as a result of that process of decolonization and that the protection of fundamental human rights has been raised to a principle of international law. In view of all that, one cannot help but agree with my positive assessment of the work and role of the United Nations in international relations.

We are witnessing a partial eclipse of multilateralism - that is, of international co-operation. Nevertheless, the proliferation of international institutions and machinery demonstrates that States are aware that only through joint action in solidarity can they tackle and settle the growing number of international problems of all kinds. For that reason, compliance with and implementation of the decisions of the Security Council is fundamental.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, visited my country this year. I express our appreciation for the work of this distinguished Latin American.

The world economic situation continues to require our constant attention. We are very concerned that the industrialized countries still have low economic growth

(President Blanco)

rates, for that has a negative effect on the underdeveloped countries. The latter countries must therefore concentrate more on neutralizing inflationary pressures than on giving greater impetus to their productive forces. We have seen the reappearance of the dangerous spectre of protectionism precisely when the indebted countries of the world need greater access for their exports on the large international markets. To make matters worse, the prices and volume of our commodities and traditional export products have declined. Can there be growth in a small nation like the Dominican Republic with the present prices of sugar on the international market and with the reduction in our quotas on the North American preferential market?

Furthermore, the debt has transcended geographical boundaries, and now the debt of Latin America alone has reached the astronomical sum of \$370 billion.

The developing countries - with a few exceptions - are burdened by debts that make it impossible for them to sustain growth rates sufficient to re-establish the proper income levels for their peoples, which cannot be asked to bear the weight of adjustment programmes indefinitely. Particularly in Latin America, the serious crisis caused by the increase in the external debt has given rise to a new surge of solidarity, which took shape at the Quito Conference and in the Cartagena consensus, where we stated that it must be understood that this situation cannot be dealt with by traditional means and that a new political approach is needed.

We recognize that the money that generated the debt was not always wisely spent and that much of it fled our countries. But the indebted countries are poor countries; there are a few that could be regarded as the "rich but poor" because they cannot pay. All the adjustment programmes are based on the contraction of demand and the decline in investment. All of this has prompted us to scale back production. This only swells the ranks of the unemployed.

(President Blanco)

The Dominican Republic has carried out adjustment programmes, but we must promote economic growth. The efforts and discipline that we have demonstrated in carrying out the programmes have been titanic. The United Nations recently said that social tolerance for adjustment has reached its limit. We say here and now that the international community must produce a policy that recognizes that fact. In regard to the very burdensome external debt, the international community's assistance and co-operation have not had the effect of other types of programmes. For example, our country is living proof of the success of programmes of the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Health Organization and the Pan American Health Organization.

Our Government has a firm political commitment to ensure the health of all the people of the Dominican Republic.

(President Blanco)

In 1983 we initiated a national effort to eliminate diseases which were preventable by vaccination. We protected 95 per cent of our children with two doses of the Sabin antipolio vaccine, and since then we have not had a single case of infantile paralysis in the country. More than 40,000 volunteers participated in this campaign and they visited every home in the Dominican Republic. By waging similar campaigns we have achieved similar coverage for diptheria, whooping cough, tetanus and small pox. By the end of 1985 we shall have protected all the women of childbearing age with tetanus toxoid, thus eliminating tetanus in the newborn. We shall also during this period have achieved universal access to rehydration rooms, thus eliminating deaths from acute infantile diarrhoea.

Generic medicines have been made available throughout the country now as part of these health programmes, in order to provide more cheaply the essential medicaments, formerly available to the consumer only as very expensive patent drugs. We have so organized arrangements that 300 basic medicaments meet all the needs of our people in this vital area. In only three years we have reached the goals that the Pan American Health Organisation set for 1990.

Similarly, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has done significant work in the Dominican Republic. The programmes of this United Nations agency have benefited our predominantly agricultural economy, and are still doing so. However, in this specific case more international resources are needed, because the hunger which affects many of our people jeopardizes democratic stability, making it impossible for the democracy that we desire to take root and prosper.

I am referring to these many matters which concern my country because they show that whenever there are problems in the traditional areas of education, housing and health, this world Organization, through its excellent programmes of

(President Blanco)

co-operation and assistance, has been there to help us to find appropriate solutions, always guided by noble humanitarian sentiments.

How different is the case of our external debt, where solutions and contributions on the part of the international community, which are so sorely needed, are hard to find, since they are blocked by the bogging down of the negotiations on the establishment of the New International Economic Order and the global negotiations on international co-operation for development.

All of us, creditors and debtors, rich and poor, must fully understand that the problem of the external debt, which we are facing today, requires new efforts directed to the reactivation of the world economy, if we are to get out of this dangerous situation and at the same time meet our commitments.

We also wish to say that the Dominican Government, pursuing an unchanging policy of promoting human rights, is taking part with great interest in the Working Group dealing with the rights of migratory workers and the improvement of their conditions, and we shall do all we can to ensure that the draft convention submitted to the Committee concerned with social and humanitarian affairs will be adopted as soon as possible.

This year, on 24 October, the date internationally recognized as United Nations Day, by happy coincidence 1986 will be solemnly declared International Peace Year, in accordance with a General Assembly resolution.

At the present time, mankind is living in a constant state of common anxiety as it contemplates the possible devastating effects on our planet of the outbreak of a third world conflagration. It is no exaggeration to say that the peace that we enjoy is the result of the terror inspired by a total holocaust. In other words, mankind is prisoner of its own fear. This new syndrome which troubles the conscience of the peoples of the world hangs like the sword of Damocles over the

(President Blanco)

future of all nations. We must therefore eradicate this gloomy prospect from our minds. In this state of common anxiety two new elements have recently appeared to escalate the world crisis. I would like to refer briefly to terrorism and drug trafficking.

We reject the terrorism that holds the world in fear, whether it is organized, remote controlled or in the form of wanton isolated acts. The nearly unanimous response of political leaders is admirable, for leaving on one side their ideological preferences they have all condemned terrorism and exercised their influence to resist it.

Terrorism has tried to undermine society in order to impose violent solutions to the detriment of the self-determination of communities, free transit, the physical and spiritual integrity of man and all his essential attributes, as recognized and enshrined in the great Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is the credo of mankind and the foundation for the birth of the United Nations and for its future. In addition, terrorism violates world peace, for it encourages the use of force with all the risks entailed when immediate action is taken to oppose action internationally recognized as criminal.

It has always been understood that peace is the solution to war. The United Nations came about as a result of that belief. Today peace, which is indivisible, is the solution to any manifestation of world violence which might lead to hostilities. In that connection, the teachings of Pope John Paul II should move us all to a deep sense of appreciation.

Let us all reject and condemn drug trafficking. It is a terrible and difficult struggle which must be waged. It is a challenge to all communities and societies. We are making immense efforts to deal with this international crime which is trying to destroy the individual, the family, society and our young

(President Blanco)

people. We must intensify bilateral and multilateral efforts to form a common front against drug trafficking.

We are happy to see that the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have expressed a willingness to deal with all problems pertaining to disarmament, including nuclear disarmament. We are confident that the forthcoming meeting between their leaders in November will contribute to lessening tension and laying the groundwork for a better understanding of these problems.

Central America is of great concern to us; what great bloodshed we see there, what failure of understanding. Regrettably, we find proof of the truism that wars about ideological frontiers are more terrible than wars over geographical frontiers. This war seems unending, like the cloth woven by Penelope. Peace must no longer be delayed.

(President Blanco)

We support the Contadora Group and the Support Group, but there must be a new political will for peace within the forces pitted against one another in the conflict threatening America and the rest of the world.

The commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations is the best time to reflect on the past and present of our Organization. From our dispassionate objective contemplation which must continue throughout the entire session, a consensus should emerge on the role the Organization should play in the future in its search for a better world.

A High Commissioner for Human Rights could make a significant contribution to the Organization. No country, whether weak or powerful, can live in isolation, and we all need this great forum to bring about the changes we propose. This great forum has the same standing as law has in internal affairs. The Dominican Republic participated actively with other Latin American countries in the formulation of the San Francisco Charter, and we consider that instrument continues as the best one to promote social justice and raise the living standards of the peoples of the world within a broader understanding of freedom, by promoting effective co-operation among States and bringing about solutions to international problems of an economic, social, cultural and humanitarian nature. It is a place to promote development and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without any distinction as to race, sex, language or creed, as prescribed by the Charter itself.

As I solemnly reiterate, on behalf of the people and Government of the Dominican Republic, our profound attachment to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, I wish, in conclusion, to commit the Dominican Republic to international efforts to achieve the ultimate goal of our Organization, the common welfare of all mankind.

Mr. Salvadore Jorge Blanco, President of the Dominican Republic, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister of Ireland, His Excellency Mr. Garret Fitzgerald.

Mr. Garret Fitzgerald, Prime Minister of Ireland, was escorted to the rostrum.

Mr. FITZGERALD (Ireland): Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to address this historic fortieth session of the General Assembly under your presidency. I wish also to take this opportunity to commend the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, for his constructive endeavours to enhance the role of the United Nations and his tireless dedication to the search for effective and peaceful solutions to the crucial issues facing the world today.

Forty years ago, shaken by the most brutal, most technologically advanced war that mankind had ever known, the representatives of 51 nations met in San Francisco and committed themselves to build an enduring and just peace. Thirty years ago my country was, with some delay, admitted to the Organization that had been established at that meeting.

We who represent a later generation must not pretend that we have adequately lived up to this commitment. The rivalry of the super-Powers and its debilitating effect on so much of our proceedings, the regional conflicts which have erupted so frequently over the past four decades, the lack of respect even today for the right of peoples to self-determination, the gross violations of human rights in all parts of the world, the imbalances of wealth, education, and health care, which characterize the North-South divide - these are scarcely the hallmarks of the successful functioning of a new world order.

Of course, peace of a kind has reigned in our world over the last 40 years, and despite the many regional conflicts, global war has been avoided. But this has been a peace largely based on fear, fear of the consequences of a conflict that might unleash the forces that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It has not been a global peace based on collective security achieved through the United Nations.

(Mr. Fitzgerald, Ireland)

The failures and disappointments of these four decades are not, of course, the particular responsibility of the United Nations. But they are a sobering reminder that the establishment of this Organization has not in itself produced a panacea for resolving the tensions and the conflicts that divide mankind. The fact that progress has thus fallen short of aspiration should, nevertheless, not blind us to the real achievements of the United Nations during these 40 years. In areas such as decolonization, disarmament, the promotion of a new approach to development, the relief of hunger and disease, and peace-keeping. Still further progress is on the horizon. To take but one example, the programme of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) for immunization of all children promises elimination of a series of deadly diseases within the next decade.

Above all, the United Nations has symbolized the principle of the rule of law in international relations, to which all States for the first time in history have felt obliged to commit themselves. Against this standard they have seen it necessary to justify their actions, however distorted many of their justificatory arguments may at times have been. There is now a world order, to which all feel obliged to pay at least lip service, one which in greater or lesser degree constrains the actions of States.

But if this body is to play the role it should, and the role the peoples of the world need and expect it to play, in steering us safely through the next 40 years, we, the Members of the United Nations, must be more willing than we have been hitherto to provide it with the capacity to realize the purposes to which the Organization is committed by the Charter: the maintenance of international peace and security, the fostering of economic and social progress, the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, the development of friendly relations among nations.

(Mr. Fitzgerald, Ireland)

How do we stand today in each of these four areas, all of them vital to international well-being? What more needs to be done?

The preservation of peace and security among nations is more than merely the first item on a list of objectives. To the authors of the Charter, fresh from their experience of world-wide war and of genocide on an unprecedented scale, it was the pre-condition for the achievement of all other goals that the world community has set itself. It remains just such a pre-condition.

Man has now the capability to destroy not only his own kind but the planet on which we live. This fearsome reality must impel us in this Organisation and in the countries we represent to transcend one of the most elemental instincts of humanity: the urge to compete, then to confront, and then to destroy. I urge this thought once again upon those who will, we all hope, soon be taking up the question of disarmament in Geneva.

(Mr. Fitzgerald, Ireland)

Many regional conflicts are sustained either in defiance of the solemn decisions of the United Nations or, worse still, involve a deliberate effort by States to frustrate the peace-making efforts of this Organization.

One area of peace-making where the United Nations has a record of practical achievement of which it can be rightly proud is that of peace-keeping. This unique concept constitutes perhaps the most remarkable innovation of the United Nations system. It exemplifies best the new order in international affairs.

And for countries like my own, the armed forces of which are required by law to limit to United Nations peace-keeping activities their operations outside the State and the waters over which it has jurisdiction, this has fundamentally altered the whole concept of the employment of these forces. For a world that has grown accustomed to armies as means of conquest and the defence of conquest, this represents a most radical departure.

In areas like the Congo, Cyprus and the Middle East, United Nations troops have served with distinction. The fact that many of the problems which brought United Nations forces into being in those areas are still unresolved is not a reflection on those forces; it is rather a commentary on the inability of States to avail themselves of the opportunity which the presence of a peace-keeping force provides to tackle in earnest the matters which divide them.

We in Ireland have been privileged to contribute to almost every major peace-keeping and observer mission established in our 30 years of membership, beginning with the first dispatch of observers and troops to the Middle East and the Congo over a quarter of a century ago. Informed by this experience, we are acutely conscious of the necessity for Members of the Organization to lend to each such mission their full political and financial support. Nothing less is worthy of those, who from many nations, have over the years served with dedication and courage under the United Nations banner in the cause of world peace.

(Mr. Fitzgerald, Ireland)

In this connection, I must add that, given my country's significant involvement in the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), with which we have been associated since its inception, and participation in which our Government decided last Thursday to renew for a further period, we are naturally concerned at the difficulties that have been placed in its path. We hope that in south Lebanon UNIFIL will, without further delay, receive the co-operation from all parties that is called for in the relevant Security Council resolutions and will be allowed to discharge its mandate in full.

I turn now to the second area I have identified. A consequence of the universality symbolized by our Organization must be a fuller understanding of the place of balanced economic relationships in creating a genuinely stable international order. In marked contrast to the long period when colonial exploitation was a norm accepted complacently by the beneficiaries of this exploitation, there is now widespread acceptance by public opinion in the democratic countries of the developed world of a totally opposite concept, that of a moral and political responsibility on their part for the economic and social condition of the remainder of mankind.

This concept, however imperfect its expression at this stage, is motivated by genuine humanitarian considerations, of which we have recently seen some most striking manifestations. But it also reflects a growing awareness of the economic interdependence of the developed and developing worlds. It is now widely understood that policies for growth and expansion in the developed world that fail to take account of the impact of such policies on lesser-developed economies are deficient as a basis for action and are, in the end, self-defeating. There has indeed in recent times been an awareness also of the dangerous and unstable impact of the debt relationship that has emerged between developing and developed countries.

(Mr. Fitzgerald, Ireland)

Some progress has been made in creating a more equitable framework for our economic relationship, but there is a great need now to invigorate and intensify the dialogue in this area - a dialogue which 10 years ago was, I believe, being pursued with much greater concern and commitment than it is today. For a great part of the globe, and for a sizeable majority of the Members of this body, progress in relation to the further reform of the international monetary system, the removal of barriers to trade, the provision of adequate bilateral and multilateral aid and the debt question are the international issues.

Hunger, poverty and tyranny are causes of war. We cannot look forward to the twenty-first century with anything but the deepest foreboding if we have not by then succeeded in reversing the present plight of over one billion of our people, a quarter of the population of the planet, who suffer from malnutrition and ill-health. The international community has in fact within the past year made significant efforts to deal with the consequences of this vast human crisis as it has manifested itself in sub-Saharan Africa, and some, although by no means sufficient, progress has been made in meeting immediate needs. A significant part of this progress is owed to the voluntary efforts of our peoples, including my own people in Ireland, who within the past 12 months have contributed voluntarily an average of over \$20 per family towards relief of this problem. Were such a target of \$20 per family to be set and attained in the rest of the developed world, enormous progress could be made with the longer term, as well as the immediate, needs of these deprived regions of the world. Our concern for the relief of hunger and sickness is an outcome of a new universal perspective. It is a function of the developing consciousness of our common humanity.

This new consciousness has manifested itself also in a heightened realization of the necessity to limit the power of the State and to ensure everywhere respect for human rights.

(Mr. Fitzgerald, Ireland)

We have come to realize that these rights transcend national boundaries and that national sovereignty may no longer be legitimately invoked anywhere in defence of State inhumanity. If the odious apartheid system in South Africa is today to some degree a little less assured, a little less confident, the international spotlight, which we through this forum, have been able to focus on the situation in that country, has played some part. We must continue our efforts on this front, with the clear aim of securing the complete elimination of apartheid in all its aspects.

And we must recognize and be willing to face frankly the fact that human rights are today being abused in other ways by Members of our Organization, despite the fact that the Universal Declaration adopted and proclaimed by this Assembly in 1948 rejects all forms of discrimination irrespective of where or by whom they are practised. In the name of our vocation to be universal we are bound to take all possible steps to uphold that Declaration and to act with complete impartiality in this area, which we as an Organization have signally failed to do hitherto.

In this area the member States of the Council of Europe have set an example for the rest of the world community. These member States have not only agreed to a Convention which sets out rights to which all of our citizens are entitled, but their Governments have committed themselves to respect the jurisdiction of an international tribunal established under the Convention to monitor its implementation - however inconvenient this may be for States that are found from time to time to be in breach of its provisions. In many of our countries our citizens have direct access to this tribunal.

In the years ahead, I believe, the cause of human rights would be best served by a concentration of our efforts in this direction, rather than by the elaboration

(Mr. Fitzgerald, Ireland)

of further lists of rights and entitlements, whose cumulative non-implementation risks bringing the work of the United Nations in the area of human rights into disrepute.

The task of developing friendly relations among 159 Member States of widely diverse political philosophies, economic systems and cultural backgrounds is very different now from that which faced the statesmen of 40 years ago. If the United Nations is no longer the relatively cohesive body it was in those early days, this is a consequence of the evolution of this Organisation into an almost universally representative forum.

(Mr. Fitzgerald, Ireland)

The part played by the United Nations in giving effect to the Charter principle of self-determination, and thereby helping many young nations to take their rightful place in the international community, is indeed one of its most significant achievements. The divisions and disagreements with which we are sometimes faced in this Assembly are in reality a reflection of this universality. The value of the United Nations lies, precisely, in providing a platform where the conflicts of interest that exist between the organized political communities of the globe can find expression, and sometimes resolution, in an international forum.

In some parts of the world we have been more fortunate in developing friendly relations between States. Since my country joined the United Nations it has become a member of the European Community, a grouping which is soon to be further enlarged to 12 States. As one earnest of its goal of ever-closer co-operation, the Community seeks progressively to co-ordinate the positions of its Member States at the United Nations. The statement of my colleague, the Prime Minister of Luxembourg, who will speak in the name of the Ten in this debate, is an instance of our joint approach to many of the issues facing the world.

I now turn briefly to one area of conflict that is a most pressing and immediate concern of my own Government. The single greatest concern of successive Irish Governments has been the tragic situation in Northern Ireland, where conflicting identities and loyalties created by history have been a source of violence, instability and strife. This problem has also been a source of disharmony between the British and Irish Governments since the political division of Ireland in the early 1920s.

Two and a half years ago the constitutional nationalist parties in the island of Ireland, North and South, joined together in a New Ireland Forum, within which they undertook consultations on the manner in which lasting peace and stability

(Mr. Fitzgerald, Ireland)

could be achieved in a new Ireland through the democratic process. Central to the endeavours of the Forum was the conviction that it is possible to tackle problems, however complex or intractable they may be, by peaceful means.

The New Ireland Forum concluded that progress towards ending the current violence in Northern Ireland, as well as towards improving relations between Ireland and Britain, necessarily required new structures that would accommodate two sets of legitimate rights, nationalist and unionist: the right of nationalists to effective political, symbolic and administrative expression of their identity; and the right of unionists to effective political, symbolic and administrative expression of their identity, their ethos and their way of life.

For over a year now the British and Irish Governments have been holding discussions with a view to identifying measures that would help to establish such structures. The British Prime Minister and I decided at our meeting a year ago that this dialogue should concentrate on the principles that, first,

"the identities of both the majority and minority communities in Northern Ireland should be recognized and respected, and reflected in the structures and processes of Northern Ireland in ways acceptable to both communities" and that

"the process of government in Northern Ireland should be such as to provide the people of both communities with the confidence that their rights will be safeguarded".

Those Anglo-Irish negotiations are now approaching their end, and the two Governments will have to decide in the immediate future whether there exists a sufficient basis for an agreement that would secure real progress towards peace and stability, the two objectives which the New Ireland Forum set itself.

(Mr. Fitzgerald, Ireland)

Neither Government believes that it would at this stage be possible to resolve all the fundamental political problems relating to Northern Ireland. There is, nevertheless, a possibility that the two Governments may be able to identify a number of measures that would together reverse the alienation of the nationalist community in Northern Ireland, thus creating conditions in which both communities could be reassured about their future. In this way, we could open the prospect of a genuine reconciliation between those communities, between North and South in the island, and between the peoples of Britain and of Ireland.

I would like to avail myself of this solemn occasion, addressing the nations of the world here today, to pledge to one group in particular, the unionists of Northern Ireland, that in those Anglo-Irish discussions the Irish Government has no desire to seek any relationship that does not fully respect their identity, their ethos and their way of life. The purpose of all our actions has been to achieve peace and stability, the absence of which has created for many in both communities a sense of being under threat for years past. That threat, expressed in a most vicious form by acts of terrorism directed relentlessly against the unionist community must be ended by the combined political action of all in Ireland and in Britain who have power to influence events.

Our approach in the matter is based on the fundamental principles of the United Nations. If the British and Irish Governments find it possible to make progress towards peace and stability through following this approach - one that is a totally new approach to the problem of reconciling the interests of different communities living within the same geographical space - we would thereby reinforce by example the principles upon which this great institution is founded. We might also perhaps provide a model, aspects of which might be found to be relevant in other parts of the world where history has left a heritage of mixed peoples, races or religions.

(Mr. Fitzgerald, Ireland)

It is in that spirit that I conclude my remarks by expressing the hope that, despite the perils and dangers which threaten on all sides, this Organization can survive and prosper, and that humanity itself can be led to a more stable, more equitable, more just order. We commit ourselves to work to that end in this Organization, as we are working within the island of Ireland. There is no other way.

Mr. Garret Fitzgerald, Prime Minister of Ireland, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Sweden, His Excellency Mr. Olof Palme.

Mr. Olof Palme, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Sweden, was escorted to the rostrum.

Mr. PALME (Sweden): Let me at the outset convey the following message from the people of Sweden and their elected representatives to all assembled here:

We believe in this Organization and we are committed to it. We are all aware of the problems of the Organization and can look back at both failures and successes. But the experience of 40 years has not weakened our dedication to the purposes and principles laid down in the Charter. And, more important, we look at our world today and remain convinced that the United Nations is only at the beginning of its history.

Let us not make the United Nations the scapegoat for problems that reflect our own shortcomings. It is not the United Nations that has not lived up to us; it is we who have not lived up to the ideals of the United Nations. It is by improving ourselves and our policies that we can improve the United Nations.

The United Nations is contemporary with the atomic bomb. For 40 years it has been our common fate to live under the nuclear threat, under the risk of the total destruction of civilized life on earth.

(Mr. Palme, Sweden)

There is no more urgent task than to try to reduce, and ultimately eliminate, this risk. Negotiations have produced some concrete results, but by and large the nuclear arms race continues unabated. The main responsibility for halting and reversing this ominous process falls on the nuclear Powers themselves. However, as pointed out in the five-continent Delhi Declaration, during the last 40 years, almost imperceptibly, all nations and human beings have lost ultimate control over their own life and death.

(Mr. Palme, Sweden)

Many countries are technically able to produce nuclear weapons. When they have decided to forgo this option, it has been in the knowledge that they would not increase their own security but decrease the security of all. Many of us have formally committed ourselves by acceding to the Non-Proliferation Treaty which was brought about by the joint efforts of the two leading nuclear Powers. We are now entitled to demand that the nuclear Powers fulfil in the near future their part of the deal, that is, measures of real disarmament and, as a first step, a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

We also have to make it perfectly clear to the nuclear Powers that although there were, at the time, no international rules prohibiting them from acquiring these awful weapons they should certainly not consider themselves free to put them to use at their own discretion. The non-nuclear countries, which would also suffer death and destruction in case of nuclear war, have a legitimate claim to make their voices heard and to discuss with the nuclear Powers ways and means of reducing the risk of the planet being blown up, be it by mistake or adventurous calculation.

Any use of nuclear weapons would be deeply reprehensible. One can speak of an international norm which is gradually gaining acceptance. The time has come to consider whether mankind should not begin to study in earnest how this utter moral reprobation can be translated into binding international agreements. We should consider the possibility of prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons, by international law, as part of a process leading to general and complete disarmament.

The United Nations offers a machinery for co-operation between the large and the many smaller States in the world. It offers every nation an opportunity to participate in the work for peace and a better future.

The veto has far too often prevented the Security Council from taking action. The cure does not lie in an abrogation of this rule, but in the creation of an

(Mr. Palme, Sweden)

international climate in which the leading Powers recognize the necessity, also in their own interests, of reducing tensions between themselves and of taking collective action against disturbances of the peace.

Much can be done within the Charter to strengthen the ability of the United Nations to maintain peace and prevent conflict. The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues has put forward some proposals. The Secretary-General has in his annual reports described several concrete ways to strengthen the United Nations, and he should have our full support in his admirable efforts to improve the Organization's functioning.

The Nordic countries have presented concrete proposals in this regard. The potential of the United Nations could be better used if actions were taken early to prevent conflicts. The Secretary-General should be given full co-operation by all members of the Security Council in creating a more active role for the Organization in this field. In this regard the possibility of peace-keeping operations, not only to contain but also to prevent conflicts, should be considered.

The United Nations has financial problems. Let me say quite frankly that it is deeply disturbing that the United Nations should have to struggle year after year with these difficulties. The sums involved are small according to any yardstick. The United Nations system cannot possibly be a heavy financial burden to any country. Selective withholding of assessed contributions and refusal to participate in the financing of certain United Nations activities do not reflect an economic necessity but a political consideration on the part of some countries. Ideas have been put forward to reduce the maximum share of the assessed contributions that any one Member State is required to pay. A more even distribution of the assessed contributions would better reflect the fact that this

(Mr. Palme, Sweden)

Organization is the instrument of all nations and make it less dependent on contributions from any single Member State. In that case the rest of us would have to shoulder a somewhat greater financial responsibility. Sweden, for its part, is ready to participate in discussions to explore these ideas.

Peace is, of course, the fundamental aim of the United Nations. We have come to recognize that peace is certainly more than the absence of military violence. It is also stability in relations between States, based on the observance of legal principles. One field where co-operation between States is absolutely necessary is the fight against terrorism in all its forms, these cruel slayings of innocent civilians.

The rule of law is of vital importance to peaceful international relations. In particular, this is strongly felt in the smaller countries. When the integrity and independence of one small country is violated, it often sends a vibration of anger and anxiety through the hearts and minds of the citizens in other small countries. For them, the rule of law and the observance of our common commitments under the Charter are seen as imperatives for a future in peace and security.

My own country has experienced serious violations of its territorial integrity. This has brought home to us the seriousness of breaches of international law.

Article 51 of the Charter entitles a Member State to act in self-defence if subjected to armed attack. Unfortunately this provision has many times been twisted to justify all kinds of military action. Should we continue on this road, the prohibition of the use of force, which is basic to the United Nations system, will become a farce, and the law of the jungle will become legitimised. You may sympathize with the motives behind some of these actions. They may serve national security interests, as perceived by the different States. They may be caused by

(Mr. Palme, Sweden)

provocation from others and they may be very popular among the citizens and voters of the respective countries. But the fact remains that these acts break the rules of international law and infringe in some way or another upon the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States.

In such situations, we must react and protest, in the interest of world peace and international law, but in the long run also in our own interests.

This is not a question of working against anyone's interests, of favouring one Power over another. It is simply a question of upholding certain rules and laws which are there for the benefit of all.

In our era of growing international interdependence we have to recognize that threats to peace frequently originate from conditions inside the countries. Misery, hunger, denial of basic human rights are the causes of political and social upheaval.

(Mr. Palme, Sweden)

Many speakers at this session of the General Assembly have voiced their concern over the world debt crisis. I share this concern. We sense a growing rebellion among the debtor countries against what they perceive to be a lack of fairness in the international economic structure. Demands for internal adjustment efforts are testing the limits of political tolerance.

We cannot allow heavy debt burdens to tear at the fabric of society. Relations between the developed and the developing countries must always be based on the realities of economic and political interdependence. The solution of the debt crisis will be a test case of the possibilities for sensible co-operation between North and South.

Brutal violations of human rights occur in many countries, but in South Africa they are written into the very laws of the country. In this way the policy of apartheid is unique in all its moral abomination. Apartheid is doomed, as is South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. While fearing that it will end in a chaos of destruction and bloodshed for which the white régime will bear full responsibility, we should not abandon the hope that a peaceful transition to a non-racial democratic society may still be possible through dialogue and agreement. It is the duty of the outside world to assist this struggle for freedom, for instance by applying sanctions.

We are witnessing massive migrations on an unprecedented scale between States and between continents. The reasons are many, among them hunger, war, natural disasters, persecution. The cultural clashes that are inevitable in this process have led in many countries to a renewal of chauvinism and racism. It is time we became more attentive to this particular danger. We are helped in this task by the rising anger, enthusiasm and readiness to act demonstrated by some people of the younger generations. It does honour to them, in this International Youth Year,

(Mr. Palme, Sweden)

that they have adopted the watchword "Don't touch my pal". There are many adults, in and out of Government, who would do well to listen and take notice.

For many people around the world the United Nations stands for something very concrete, a significant element in their personal everyday life.

A child in Africa learns to read in a school financed by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). A farmer in Asia receives a sack of seed labelled "FAO" - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations - or "WFP" - World Food Programme. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with its technical projects, touches almost every developing country in the world. Refugees in all continents are protected by the activities of the High Commissioner for Refugees. Women fighting for equality and dignity are encouraged by discussions in United Nations forums such as the recent Nairobi Conference. Many civilians in many countries have felt more secure because of the presence of United Nations peace-keeping forces. If, as we sincerely hope, the initiative taken by the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) to immunise all children in the world against serious infectious diseases by 1990 is crowned with success, innumerable families will think of the United Nations as a benefactor.

Many of the people who have such direct experience of what the United Nations stands for may have scant knowledge of the intricacies of great-Power politics and the workings of the United Nations organs. But they instinctively feel that the United Nations is essential, in various ways, to their well-being, perhaps to their survival. It can be hoped that they will form, over time, a much needed United Nations constituency, that they will make their voices heard, claiming a say, demanding that power politics, high over their heads, do not jeopardize their lives.

(Mr. Palme, Sweden)

But there is already a large United Nations constituency. It is all those people who believe in the United Nations as an idea. There are tendencies, in times of cynical power politics, to underestimate this idea. But it carries a strong moral force. All people who believe in international co-operation, in the peaceful solution of conflicts, in solidarity with others, make up this force.

There are groups and organizations in many countries which actively work for recognition of the imperative of peace. A fine example is the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, which has won the Nobel Peace Prize. Their members, doctors all over the world, say that there is no cure for the effects of nuclear war; the only way is prevention.

The United Nations must be permitted to succeed, succeed in the efforts to promote peace and disarmament, succeed in preventing ecological catastrophe, succeed in the fight against hunger and deprivation. There is simply no alternative to international co-operation. Only through joint endeavours can we hope to move from common fear to common security.

Mr. Olof Palme, Prime Minister of Sweden, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the Prime Minister of the Republic of Korea, His Excellency Mr. Shinyong Lho.

Mr. Shinyong Lho, Prime Minister of the Republic of Korea, was escorted to the rostrum.

Mr. LHO (Republic of Korea): It is a great honour to speak on behalf of the Government and people of the Republic of Korea at this momentous session of the General Assembly, which commemorates the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

I wish first to extend my sincere congratulations to Ambassador Jaime de Pinés on his election as President of the General Assembly and to express my highest respect to Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar.

(Mr. Lho, Republic of Korea)

I wish, secondly, to take special notice of the North Korean delegation attending this commemorative session of the General Assembly and to extend a sincerely warm greeting to our compatriots from North Korea.

I come from a divided nation. Korea was liberated from foreign rule at the close of the Second World War. For the 40 years since then the Korean people have endured the tragedy of living as a divided people in a divided territory - divided against their will, through no fault of their own.

(Mr. Lho, Republic of Korea)

I am not here to talk about past misfortunes of the Korean people or to apportion blame for them. Instead, I appear before this body, in the spirit of hope and in the name of peace, to elucidate how the Government and people of the Republic of Korea can make their contribution to a brighter future for succeeding generations and "United Nations for a better world".

It is with profound emotion that the people of the Republic of Korea mark the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, with which they have long maintained a special relationship.

It was the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea which observed the elections that brought the Government of the Republic of Korea into being on 15 August 1948.

It was the United Nations General Assembly which declared our Government to be the only lawful government in Korea, on 12 December 1948, and adopted a series of resolutions, the last of which was resolution 3390 A (XIX) of 1975, urging the South and the North of Korea to embark on talks as soon as possible to find a peaceful solution to the Korean problem.

It was in 1950 that the United Nations Security Council helped the Republic of Korea defend its freedom and independence against the unprovoked North Korean aggression and restore peace to the Korean peninsula.

It has been the armed forces stationed in the Republic of Korea under the flag of the United Nations that have helped ever since to prevent a recurrence of war and to maintain peace and security on the Korean peninsula. Any proposal to withdraw those forces in the absence of effective alternatives can only jeopardize the security system that has for over 30 years prevented a renewal of armed hostilities in the Korean peninsula.

(Mr. Lho, Republic of Korea)

Finally, it is the Secretary-General of the United Nations who has encouraged dialogue between and promoted the reconciliation of South and North Korea. We welcome these efforts and thank the Secretary-General for them.

For 5,000 years the homogeneous, peace-loving Korean people spoke a single language, shared a single culture and took pride in a single ethnic family. It is our destiny to live on one land as one people. Instead, as the result of the forced territorial bisection and the fratricidal war, we live at this moment in a historically unprecedented state of military confrontation across one of the most heavily armed borders in the world.

I firmly believe that the most devout aspiration of all 60 million Korean people is to end this national division, to achieve true peace and reunification at the earliest possible date and thereby to secure not only our own survival and economic success but also a significant advance in the creation of a new international system based on reconciliation and common prosperity. That reunification can be achieved only through peaceful dialogue; it can never be achieved by war, violence or another national tragedy or fratricide such as the Korean War of 1950.

It is in this context that the Republic of Korea, despite the brutal acts of terrorism in Rangoon two years ago, has persevered in its efforts to persuade the North Korean authorities to join us in a return to dialogue. I take pleasure in reporting today to the General Assembly that, as a result of these efforts, dialogue between South and North Korea was resumed last year for the first time since its suspension in 1973; that talks on humanitarian problems are currently under way between delegates of our respective Red Cross Societies; that other officials are discussing possible future co-operation in the economic and sport fields; and, especially, that between 20 and 23 September the first exchanges since the division of the Korean peninsula brought members of separated families and performing arts groups to Seoul and Pyongyang.

(Mr. Lho, Republic of Korea)

In his report to this fortieth session of the General Assembly the Secretary-General wisely observed:

"We face today a world of almost infinite promise which is also a world of potentially terminal danger. The choice between these alternatives is ours." (A/40/L, p. 2)

That choice, that warning, those words, are especially applicable to the Korean peninsula, for our little peninsula is one of the most dangerous areas in the world, the only area where the interests of four Powers - the United States of America, Japan, the People's Republic of China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics - directly intersect.

A recurrence of war in the Korean peninsula could well lead to another world war. The most important tasks facing us today are, therefore, the prevention of war and the building of a lasting peace in the Korean peninsula.

In this solemn context, I wish to outline briefly the policy for peace of the Republic of Korea.

First, the Republic of Korea remains firmly committed to the objectives and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We regard peace and good-neighbourliness as the foundation of our foreign policy. We are committed by our Constitution to peaceful reunification and to the rejection of all forms of war or aggression. Accordingly, the Republic of Korea will never resort to war or the use of military force to resolve the Korean question.

Secondly, we believe that the Korean question must be resolved through dialogue and negotiation between South and North Korea, the parties directly concerned. We seek to replace deeply rooted mutual mistrust with firmly based mutual trust, step by step, through inter-Korean dialogue, through exchanges, through conditions of peace in the Korean peninsula and, ultimately, through

(Mr. Lho, Republic of Korea)

peaceful reunification. We will, therefore, continue to pursue dialogue between the South and the North of Korea with patience and sincerity, whatever obstacles and temporary setbacks we may encounter. President Chun Doo Hwan's 1981 proposal for a meeting between the top leaders of the South and the North of Korea is a manifestation of our unshakable determination in this regard, and we continue to hope for the realization of such a meeting at an early date.

(Mr. Lho, Republic of Korea)

Thirdly, in pursuit of peace and prosperity we intend to co-operate with all nations of the world regardless of differences in ideology or political system. We are prepared to normalize relations and to expand mutual co-operation with any country in the world on the basis of reciprocity, for that kind of mutual relationship among nations based on international reality is indispensable to world peace.

In that spirit, the Republic of Korea, as host to the 1988 Olympics, welcomes the athletes of all countries of the world to Seoul and guarantees their free and safe participation.

Fourthly, the Republic of Korea will continue to seek full and active membership in the United Nations, enabling us better to serve the cause of world peace and international co-operation. The Republic of Korea maintains diplomatic relations with 118 of the 159 States Members of the United Nations. Its population of over 40 million places it among the top 20 per cent of the world's largest nations. Its growing economy makes it the world's 15th-largest trading nation. It is quite abnormal, therefore, that the Republic of Korea should continue to be excluded from full membership in the United Nations, contrary to the principle of universality enshrined in the Charter.

I call upon the leaders of North Korea to take steps at the earliest possible date to become a Member of this world body. The argument that the admission of both Koreas to the United Nations would only perpetuate the division of the Korean peninsula has no validity. As many as nine specialized agencies of the United Nations now have both South Korea and North Korea as member States. In total, 67 countries maintain diplomatic relations with both Koreas. The admission of both South and North Korea to the United Nations, as an interim measure pending reunification, can only increase the opportunities for dialogue and co-operation and encourage the establishment of peace on the Korean peninsula and its eventual reunification.

(Mr. Lho, Republic of Korea)

Fifthly, we welcome the active support of all countries of the world for the efforts of the Korean people to reach a peaceful solution to the Korean question. In particular, those major Powers with special interests in the Korean peninsula are called upon to play constructive roles to that end. Specifically, by supporting direct inter-Korean dialogue and by simultaneously normalizing relations with both South and North Korea, the United States, Japan, China and the Soviet Union could facilitate the process of peace and security on the Korean peninsula and help to bring about its peaceful reunification.

Sixthly and finally, I wish to reaffirm that the Republic of Korea desires to expand its co-operation with the developing countries, drawing upon our own experience in economic development. Today, a stagnant world economy, increasing protectionist trends in trade and the chronic poverty and debt problems of the third-world nations are major challenges facing mankind as a whole. Prolonged delay in solving these problems threatens the peace and stability of us all. We urge both the developed and the developing countries to work together to explore every possible means for their early solution. To the developing countries we stress the importance of accelerating their own collaborative efforts through expanded South-South co-operation, in a spirit of collective self help.

Before concluding I wish to take note of the many and divergent evaluations of the successes and failures of the United Nations during the past four decades. No one can deny that this Organization has contributed substantially to maintaining international peace and promoting international co-operation. Yet even now wars continue in some parts of the globe and force is openly employed to intervene in the internal affairs of others or to occupy their territories. In southern Africa brutal criminal acts are being committed against human dignity, and vestiges of past colonialism continue to aggravate the situation. Such situations naturally give rise to concern about the erosion of the spirit of the United Nations Charter and to criticism of the competence of the United Nations in general.

(Mr. Lho, Republic of Korea)

Whatever limits to the capabilities and role of the United Nations may exist, they do so, I believe, not because of any basic defects in the system of the United Nations itself but rather as a result of narrow-mindedness and selfishness in individual countries. No matter how sublime the objectives and spirit of the Charter, it is nothing more than antiquated paper if the individual countries lack the will to observe and implement its provisions.

As we move towards the twenty-first century, all of us should be prepared to make a new start towards real peace and prosperity, towards reconciliation and co-operation among nations and towards the full realization of the principle of self-determination. It is fortunate, therefore, that on the occasion of this fortieth anniversary alternative ways and means of revitalising the role of the United Nations are being considered in the General Assembly.

We in the Republic of Korea are ready and willing to work actively with the world community in making the United Nations the foundation of a truly better world.

Mr. Shiyong Lho, Prime Minister of the Republic of Korea, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the Vice-President of the State Council and Special Envoy of the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, His Excellency Mr. Manea Manescu.

Mr. Manea Manescu, Vice-President of the State Council and Special Envoy of the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, was escorted to the rostrum.

Mr. MANESCU (Romania) (spoke in Romanian; English text furnished by the delegation): On behalf of the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, I have the particular honour to convey to you, Mr. President, and to all the participants in the commemorative session of the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations, his cordial greetings and also to convey through them to the peoples and countries that they represent, best wishes for the fulfilment of their aspirations to prosperity and peace.

(Mr. Manescu, Romania)

Romania and President Nicolae Ceasescu attach great importance to this anniversary, holding that it must constitute an opportunity for all States Members to intensify their efforts so that the United Nations can play a more active role in democratic deliberations on the grave issues confronting the contemporary world and in their solution, in the promotion of détente and in the establishment of a climate of peace and co-operation on our planet.

This year the peoples of the world are celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the victory over fascism and the end of the Second World War. Many conclusions have been drawn, for that harsh lesson of history must not be repeated and the need to act in the defence and strengthening of peace has been highlighted.

Romania believes that the general settlement of the problems left unsolved after the Second World War would be of particular importance in establishing confidence and co-operation among all nations of the world. In this spirit, Romania holds that it is high time for the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other States and to work to overcome mistrust and tension between States and to ensure respect for the inalienable right of every nation to decide freely and independently its economic and social course of development, without any outside interference.

International life in the past 40 years has undergone far-reaching social, economic and political changes. As a result of the struggles for national liberation, scores of newly independent States have appeared on the world map. Having freed themselves from the colonial yoke, those States are playing an increasingly active role in the international arena. That reality is also mirrored in the fact that there are today 159 States within the great family of the United Nations as compared with 51 States when the Organization was created.

(Mr. Manescu, Romania)

One of the greatest achievements of the peoples, however, is that during this period they have succeeded in preventing the outbreak of a new world war and securing peace on our planet. The United Nations has played a positive role in the settlement of some cardinal problems of the contemporary world. It has considered the major aspects of international life and the crisis situations that have arisen and has provided the conditions for all Member States to speak their minds and to seek jointly the most appropriate solutions, in conformity with their fundamental interests and in the interest of international peace and co-operation.

At the same time, it is Romania's view that the maximum potential of the United Nations has not always been used by Member States. Time and again, important issues of fundamental concern to all peoples, to peace and to the future of mankind have not been the subject of the concern and deliberations of the United Nations; the world forum has been bypassed and solutions have been sought outside it.

Ever since its admission to the United Nations Romania has worked consistently and responsibly, in the spirit of the Charter, to ensure that the Organisation can make an effective contribution to the fulfilment of the mission for which it was created and play an even more active role in international life, in the interest of achieving disarmament and creating a climate of peace and co-operation in the world.

The proposals and initiatives of Romania and President Nicolae Ceausescu concerning problems of vital interest for the present and future of all peoples are well known. Romania's action in the United Nations is part and parcel of its foreign policy of broad co-operation with all States of the world irrespective of their social system, a policy of support for national liberation struggles, a policy of independence, disarmament, détente and peace.

(Mr. Manescu, Romania)

Romania has always based and continues to base its relations with all States on the principles of full equality of rights, respect for national independence and sovereignty, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and the renunciation of force and the threat of force, and to affirm those principles widely in international life. Romania is also in favour of new relations based on justice, ethics and equity. It is our firm conviction that only such a policy of strengthening the independence of each nation and world peace, a policy of close co-operation among all nations, can ensure for all peoples the fulfilment of their aspirations to a better and freer life of well-being and happiness.

The Socialist Republic of Romania and President Nicolae Ceausescu reaffirm once again their determination to develop on a broad basis their co-operation with all States and peoples, being firmly convinced that by acting together it is possible to work out a new policy of disarmament, full equality, peace and co-operation.

The international community is celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations at a time when the international situation is particularly grave as a result of the unprecedented escalation of the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race. Tension persists, as does the danger of a new world war, which, in present circumstances, would inevitably lead to a nuclear catastrophe resulting in the destruction of the very conditions for life on our planet.

The fundamental issues of our time are therefore those of halting the arms race, first and foremost the nuclear arms race, achieving disarmament, ceasing all actions designed to militarize outer space and securing a lasting peace in the world.

(Mr. Manescu, Romania)

At present nothing is more important than to act before it is too late to halt the dangerous course of events, to defend mankind from destruction and to guarantee the supreme right of peoples and individuals to existence, freedom, independence and peace.

Regardless of different social systems or political and philosophical conceptions and irrespective of the existence of certain differences between States, in the final analysis it is the interests of peace and co-operation that should prevail. In the name of that noble ideal of humanity, it is the duty of States, peoples and the United Nations to combine their efforts in order to achieve disarmament and peace both on earth and in outer space, thus responding to the expectations of all the nations of the world.

Another cause of the present grave state of tension in the international arena is the continuing policy of the use of force and the threat of force, of the consolidation and carving out of spheres of influence and of interference in the internal affairs of other States. The persistence of old conflicts and the emergence of new ones in various parts of the world, economic underdevelopment, the considerable deterioration in the situation of the developing countries and the growth of phenomena related to economic crisis are also factors that have given rise to tension.

(Mr. Manescu, Romania)

The President of Romania, by the stands he has taken, and his assessments, has consistently pointed out to the international community the need for the United Nations to play an increasingly active role in international life and to make a greater contribution to the policy of promoting détente, reducing armaments and military expenditures, and achieving a climate of peace and co-operation throughout the world.

"We consider" - President Nicolae Ceausescu has said - "that an important role devolves upon the United Nations and other international bodies which should contribute ever more actively to ensuring participation, on an equal basis, of all peoples in international life, and to settling major complex problems confronting the contemporary world in the interest of détente, independence and peace."

As a European country, Romania is deeply concerned over the particularly grave situation created on the continent because of the deployment by the United States of America of intermediate-range missiles in some Western countries and the consequent nuclear countermeasures taken by the Soviet Union.

Romania and the Romanian people welcomed the Geneva negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, as well as the meeting to be held in November between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the President of the United States of America, Ronald Reagan, and like other peoples we expect these meetings to result in specific agreements in the area of nuclear disarmament and in the non-militarization of outer space. At the same time we hold that the countries of the European continent and all States of the world should not passively await the outcome of the Soviet/United States negotiations in Geneva and the meeting between the leaders of the two countries. Rather they should assume a greater direct

(Mr. Manescu, Romania)

responsibility, and contribute actively to bringing about the halting of the nuclear-arms race, which should be followed by real measures of nuclear disarmament, cessation of the deployment of intermediate-range missiles in Europe and the withdrawal of those already in place, the halting of nuclear-weapon tests, and the renunciation of any undertaking leading to the militarization of outer space.

We welcome the initiatives of the Soviet Union and the measures put forward by the General Secretary, Mikhail Gorbachev, regarding the establishment of a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of nuclear weapons and the cessation of all tests of such weapons, the reduction by 50 per cent of nuclear weapons, and the halting of actions towards the militarization of outer space.

Under present circumstances it is particularly important that the United Nations and other international bodies and conferences which consider disarmament issues should increase their activities in order to arrive at specific, practical measures designed to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction and, indeed, all armaments.

In view of the importance of settling the conflicts in different regions of the world which aggravate the international situation, resolute measures and initiatives must be undertaken in order to end those conflicts and resolve them through negotiations. It is in that spirit that the Socialist Republic of Romania has proposed that the General Assembly of the United Nations should address a solemn appeal to all States involved in military conflicts to cease hostilities immediately and to move towards a solution of the problems dividing them, through negotiations. The appeal also calls on Member States of the United Nations to undertake a solemn commitment to comply with the obligation not to resort to the threat or use of force and not to interfere, in any way whatsoever, in the internal

(Mr. Manescu, Romania)

affairs of other States. The adoption of such an appeal and such a solemn undertaking at the present time, when we are commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations, would demonstrate, as President Nicolae Ceausescu of Romania has stressed, the political will of all States to respect the United Nations Charter. It would constitute a particularly significant contribution to the policy of détente, the improvement of international relations, the strengthening of trust among nations, and disarmament and peace.

In the context of such a complex and contradictory international situation, we are witnessing the manifestations of an economic crisis widening throughout the world and affecting all States, but in particular the developing countries. The situation of those countries has considerably worsened as a result of the increase in the external debt and excessively high interest rates, the protectionist and discriminatory measures hampering international trade, and monetary and financial policy.

Romania, which is itself a developing country, has, as we know, put forward a series of proposals in order to arrive at a global solution of the problems of underdevelopment, including the debt problem facing the developing countries. In view of the existing situation, and the need to involve the United Nations more directly in solving international economic problems, eliminating underdevelopment and establishing a new international economic order, Romania believes that an international conference should be organized, under United Nations auspices, to bring about an appropriate agreement between the developed and developing countries.

In order to build a world of peace and international co-operation, particular attention must be paid to the younger generation. Accordingly, we highly value the proclamation by the United Nations of International Youth Year (1985) under the motto "Participation, Development, Peace". We express the conviction that the

(Mr. Manescu, Romania)

forthcoming United Nations World Conference for the International Youth Year, which is to take place during this session of the General Assembly, will constitute an important factor in uniting young people throughout the world to defend and uphold their fundamental right to live and develop in a climate of peace and security.

The fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations is an appropriate occasion to emphasize the objective need for the United Nations faithfully to reflect the realities of today's world, to be truly a forum for the international community as a whole, and to ensure the participation of all States, in particular the small and medium-sized, the developing and non-aligned States, in solving all world issues. It therefore seems necessary further to improve the activities of the United Nations and of other international bodies, by democratizing these international forums and increasing the effectiveness of their activities.

(Mr. Manescu, Romania)

Romania believes that everything possible should be done to enhance the role and contribution of the United Nations to the solution of current international problems, and to strengthen the Organization's ability to take action, in keeping with the requirements of peace and the security of peoples. The United Nations must be a decisive factor in bringing about new relations in international affairs and in creating favourable conditions for the building of a better and more just world.

The President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, calls on all Heads of State or Government of the States Members of the United Nations to unite their efforts in order to bar the way to a new world war, to a nuclear catastrophe, and to work actively in the interests of peace, understanding, freedom and independence for all nations.

On the occasion of this commemorative session, Romania reaffirms once again its deep commitment to the United Nations and the purposes and principles of the Charter adopted four decades ago, and undertakes solemnly to strive in the future to achieve the triumph of reason and peace throughout the world. We are profoundly convinced that, by acting in complete unity, the countries, the peoples, the United Nations, have the necessary strength to set a new course in international affairs favourable to peace, disarmament and broad co-operation among all nations of the world.

Mr. Manea Manescu, Vice-President of the State Council and Special Envoy of the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Vice-President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, His Excellency Mr. Mitko Grigorov.

Mr. Mitko Grigorov, Vice-President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, was escorted to the rostrum.

Mr. GRIGOROV (Bulgaria) (spoke in Bulgarian; English text furnished by the Delegation). It is a special honour for me to participate in this commemorative session of the General Assembly devoted to the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. This session is an appropriate occasion for reviewing and assessing the overall activities of the United Nations during that period as well as for pointing out its successes and difficulties and specific measures aimed at enhancing its effectiveness.

I should like from the very outset to emphasize that the People's Republic of Bulgaria greatly appreciates the importance and role of the United Nations in solving the basic problems of our time, and above all in maintaining international peace and security.

Experience has confirmed the need for the United Nations to become increasingly a centre for co-ordinating the activities of States in this direction. Only in conditions of lasting peace can broad and mutually-advantageous international co-operation flourish and the all-round progress of human society be ensured.

The road travelled has shown convincingly that in cases when Member States, in the name of peace and understanding, have been able to rise above their political, ideological and other differences, the world Organization has been able to contribute successfully to the settlement of the problems faced by mankind.

We firmly believe that the strengthening of international peace and security can be achieved only by taking the road of constructive negotiations aimed at elaborating effective agreements to end the arms race and to prevent its extension into outer space. In this connection we support the important new Soviet proposals announced by Mikhail Gorbachev. It is of vital importance for mankind to preserve and strengthen the positive results that were achieved during the period of détente when peoples were able to taste the fruits of peaceful coexistence and co-operation among States.

(Mr. Grigorov, Bulgaria)

The United Nations can and must play an important role in the just and lasting settlement of disputes which are a threat to international peace and security. Enhancing the effectiveness of the world Organization in this area implies strict observance by all States of the Charter of the United Nations and the existence of a political will to find mutually acceptable solutions to all contentious issues. We greatly appreciate the role and efforts of the Secretary-General, who is duty bound to contribute, within the purview of his mandate, to the peaceful settlement of disputes.

There is universal recognition of the fact that, in this nuclear and space age, not a single one of the global problems of the present day can be resolved through the will of any single State or group of States. The attainment of results in the economic, social, ecological and other fields is unthinkable without broad international co-operation with the participation of all States on an equal footing.

I should like to stress that, in the years of its membership in the United Nations, the People's Republic of Bulgaria has always been faithful to the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter and has contributed to their implementation. Likewise, my country has been participating most actively in the activities of the specialized agencies within the United Nations system. The latest demonstration of this is the ongoing twenty-third session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) being held in our capital city of Sofia.

(Mr. Grigorov, Bulgaria)

Bulgaria has been pursuing a peace-loving foreign policy and has been striving to develop good relations with all countries, irrespective of their socio-political systems. It has been exerting efforts to the best of its abilities to strengthen world peace and security. As is known, the President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, has proposed concrete steps to turn the Balkans into a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

I take this opportunity to express our gratitude to all those who supported the candidature of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to be a non-permanent member of the Security Council. I wish to assure the General Assembly that we are aware of the high responsibility that comes with this and that we shall contribute to the just and lasting settlement of conflicts, to the peaceful elimination of hotbeds of tension and to the building of a better world.

Allow me to read out the following message to the Secretary-General from the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov:

"On behalf of the Council of State and the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and on my own behalf, please accept most cordial congratulations on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

"The United Nations, established immediately after the historic victory over Nazi fascism and Japanese militarism, has come to embody the readiness and determination of peoples to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to live together in peace with one another.

(Mr. Grigorov, Bulgaria)

"Today, four decades after the founding of the United Nations, we note with satisfaction the constructive efforts and contribution of the world Organization to the realization of these noble and lofty goals. The United Nations has proved its viability; it has successfully played the role of an international instrument for the maintenance and strengthening of peace and security, for the elimination of colonialism, racism, racial discrimination and apartheid, for the promotion and development of mutually advantageous co-operation among States in resolving such global problems of mankind as the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis, the elimination of poverty and hunger, the protection of the environment, and so forth. The United Nations has gained recognition as a forum for multilateral negotiations, for permanent contacts and exchanges of view and for the elaboration and adoption of important international documents.

"The State Council, the Government and the citizens of the People's Republic of Bulgaria are convinced that the United Nations possesses an even greater potential for having a positive effect on the development of international relations.

"The danger of a nuclear catastrophe, now looming over the planet, makes it more imperative than ever before for all States to undertake concerted and effective actions to curb the arms race, achieve the peaceful settlement of conflicts and restore and consolidate confidence and understanding among peoples. The decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, particularly in the field of disarmament, are a sound basis for the attainment of these objectives. Their implementation would provide reliable guarantees for world peace and security.

(Mr. Grigorov, Bulgaria)

"This year our people are celebrating also the thirtieth anniversary of the admission of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to membership in the United Nations. My country has always striven most actively to assist the Organization in realizing the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter, as well as to contribute to the positive solution of the urgent problems in various parts of the planet. The participation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria in the activities of the United Nations is fully in keeping with its consistent and constructive foreign policy, based on the principles of the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems and aimed at strengthening peace and security and promoting broad and mutually advantageous co-operation.

"Allow me to assure you, Mr. Secretary-General, that the People's Republic of Bulgaria will continue to assist in enhancing the authority and effectiveness of the United Nations in accordance with its Charter and will contribute in a constructive spirit to the successful carrying out of the responsible tasks before the Organization."

Mr. Mitko Grigorov, Vice-President of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, was escorted from the rostrum.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The next speaker is the Secretary of the People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison and Special Envoy of the Leader of the First September Revolution of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, His Excellency Mr. Ali Treiki. I now call on him.

Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): It is a pleasure and an honour for me to attend this session commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and to convey to you the greetings of the leader of the glorious First September Revolution, Colonel Muammar Qaddafi. Colonel Qaddafi would have liked to participate in this

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

commemoration personally, but because of circumstances that he has set forth in his message to the Heads of State and the Secretary-General, he was not able to do so.

We are commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the founding of this international Organization. It came into being after a devastating war of global proportions which took a toll of millions of human lives. The most repugnant weapons of mass destruction were used - including the nuclear weapon that was used against Japanese civilian targets in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Despite the many years that have passed since that happened, the effects are still visible.

The United Nations emerged as a result of a long struggle by mankind for the achievement of peace and security, and for the achievement of freedom - freedom for everyone, regardless of colour, creed or origin. Mankind chose this Organization over the devastation and destruction of successive wars.*

* Mr. Bongo (Gabon), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

We are today celebrating the foundation of this Organization in an international atmosphere fraught with tension and with conflicts and wars in many parts of the world. Despite this bleak picture of the international scene, however, the whole world is represented here by presidents and high officials who have come to take part in the celebrations, and in spite of the hardship that exists, to express the desires, hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world for the preservation of this Organization and support for it in order that it may fulfil its mission and achieve its goals.

The peoples that created this Organization and formulated the Charter have a real stake in its existence, and rely on its strength for the attainment of justice, security, peace, social and economic advancement and equality among peoples and individuals. Those peoples suffer frustration when they see that their hope and desire for peace and freedom through this international Organization are being gradually eroded. Many peoples of the world are still subjected to racism, Zionism and colonialism in occupied Palestine and in southern Africa, where the most hideous racial discrimination on the basis of religion, race and colour is still practised.

The peoples' faith in this Organization may vanish altogether if it remains immobilized and unable to fulfil its role in the achievement of world peace and security and the freedom of man. The freedom of man does not mean the free expression of his aspirations but the right to self-determination. The political freedom of man cannot be divided from his social and economic freedom. A hungry man has no freedom. An oppressed man, fettered by unjust economic bonds, has no freedom. The freedom of man, in its widest concept, must be won, including his right to control wealth and weapons, as well as authority.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

As we speak today about peace, security and the future and praise the role of the United Nations, affirming the hope that humanity places in it, we cannot afford to disregard or condone the human tragedies taking place in our world, as reflected in the annihilation of entire peoples and the persistence of acts of genocide in Palestine and southern Africa.

The racist régimes receive all kinds of support from the imperialist Powers inimical to peoples. The Palestinian people, which is languishing under the yoke of Zionist racist imperialism, is not inferior to other peoples. The Arab people in Palestine is paying the price for a crime for which it is not responsible, a crime perpetrated by nazism in Germany against the Jews. That self-same Zionist nazism commits more heinous crimes against the Palestinian people than those committed by Hitler against the Jews. The struggle of the Arab nation against racism and Zionism is a conflict of existence, not a conflict of borders. Zionism can have no place on Arab territory unless the whole Arab nation is annihilated. The Arab nation will remain and emerge victorious and Zionism will disappear once and for all. This is historically inevitable.

In his statement the representative of the Zionist entity, in an attempt to deceive, referred to so-called proposals but this carried no conviction for us because Zionism is in contradiction with peace. The annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan cannot be accepted, nor can the continued occupation of territories and continued flouting of United Nations resolutions. The representative of the Zionist entity spoke of peace, but what kind of peace? The peace that he means is the annihilation of the Palestinian people and acts of aggression and arrogance against the Arab nation.

The racist régime in South Africa, the organic ally of the Zionist entity and supported by the same imperialism, practises the most invidious form of racial

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

discrimination against the people of South Africa and attempts to hoodwink the world. The so-called economic boycott of that régime is nothing but a ploy, as are what are called the peace efforts in the Arab region. The single, drastic solution is to eliminate those Zionist and racist régimes and all the peoples of the world must close their ranks in order to eradicate them.

We see an imminent danger in the acquisition of nuclear weapons by those Zionist and racist régimes, with the support of the imperialist Powers under different names. We know the racist nature of those régimes, therefore we have to consider the matter carefully. The acquisition of the nuclear weapon by the racist régimes in occupied Palestine and South Africa is a danger not only to the Arab nation and Africa but to international peace and security as a whole.

As we commemorate the founding of the United Nations, one of whose primary goals is the achievement of peace and disarmament, we see that the world is moving rapidly to the edge of an abyss owing to the frightening escalation of the arms race and its extension beyond our planet to outer space. The imperialist forces' propensity for evil and war increases day by day, thus jeopardizing international peace and security. Despite the constructive proposals put forward by the Soviet Union and the non-aligned group to end the arms race and achieve disarmament, the imperialist Powers persist in their plans to increase tension and escalate the arms race.

International terrorism by the imperialist Powers against small nations also increases day by day. The peoples that make up the majority of the Members of the United Nations can no longer assure their future or even their independence.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan
Arab Jamahiriya)

What happened in Grenada, the action against other small countries, including Libya, the act of aggression against the Tunisian people and the act of piracy against a civilian Egyptian aircraft are extremely grave matters that should alert us to the fact that the preservation of international peace and security is our common responsibility and can be achieved only through the cessation of aggression and the establishment of justice.

The people of the Jamahiriya, which has dismantled foreign bases on its territory, eliminated foreign monopolies and harnessed its potential to ambitious developmental plans, has gained full control of its own affairs and yet is subjected, along with other nations in Africa, Central America and Asia, to acts of aggression and seige, as well as the most tendentious media campaigns. Our peoples belief in the freedom of man, which is indivisible, will never be shaken, regardless of the threats of the imperialist Powers.

As we celebrate the founding of the United Nations and renew our hopes and our faith in it as representatives of small peoples, we are hopeful of being able to work together to strengthen and support it. This can be achieved only through amendment of its Charter in such a way as to ensure equality among the Member States and to reinforce the effectiveness of the Organization. The control of the Security Council by a handful of nations and resort to the veto by certain permanent members to impede the freedom march of peoples and the implementation of United Nations resolutions designed to put an end to Zionism and racist régimes will, if they continue, end the role of the United Nations and even lead to its demise.

(Mr. Treiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriyah)

In assessing the 40 years of the existence of the United Nations, we cannot hold it solely accountable for the failure to concretize its Charter and to achieve its goals. Responsibility for this failure must be borne primarily by those major Powers which incessantly work to weaken the United Nations, to put an end to its role, and even to dismantle it. Responsibility must also be assumed by these States which persist in a policy of hegemony and the use of armed force, as well as by States which disregard the irrevocable march of history, States which desire to return to the law of the jungle and the age of force.

But at the same time we, too, are responsible. We, and especially the small countries, have to close our ranks to preserve and reinforce this Organization, and to ensure respect for its Charter and resolutions. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which constitutes an important phenomenon in international relations, is constantly growing, despite the pressures and hardships to which it is subjected. The non-aligned countries, which represent the aspirations of the peoples of the world to freedom and peace, are sparing no effort to eliminate hotbeds of tension and to ease tension among the major Powers, to achieve peace and security in the world.

Libya, which is a founding member of this Movement and is committed to its goals, hopes that the objectives of this Movement will be wholeheartedly supported by the major Powers so that the cold war can be ended and peace and justice achieved.

I cannot fail, before concluding, to refer briefly to the deteriorating international economic situation which is a result of the economic order created by the imperialist Powers, the swingeing exploitation of the developing countries by the developed countries, and unjust economic practices, such as boycotts, protectionist measures, monopoly of technology, and the imposition of conditions on the part of economic international institutions.

(Mr. Traiki, Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya)

It is therefore high time to replace the old order by a new one based on equality and justice and compensation for the losses incurred by the developing countries during the period of colonialism. The colonial countries which colonized the peoples of the world must offer proper compensation in respect of the period of colonisation and pay a high price for their exploitation of the riches of the people. The developing countries should spare no effort to protect their rights, so as to achieve their freedom, security and independence.

Mr. TSERING (Bhutan): I have the honour to convey the warm greetings and good wishes of His Majesty Jigme Singye Wangchuck, King of Bhutan, to the President and all the representatives for the success of this historic session of the General Assembly.

May I also extend the warmest felicitations of my delegation to you, Sir, on your unanimous election as President of the fortieth anniversary session of the General Assembly. Given your distinguished career and long association with the United Nations, there could have been no better choice for this high office.

I also wish to place on record our deep appreciation for the skill with which Mr. Paul Lusaka guided the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. His fine stewardship of the General Assembly earned for him, and for his country Zambia, the respect of the international community.

Our Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, deserves our highest commendation for his zeal and dedication in upholding the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. I would also like to express our admiration for his remarkably incisive and constructive annual reports.

The representatives who gathered together in San Francisco in 1945 had high hopes for the future. Multilateralism and the spirit of co-operation was to be the wave of the future, represented by this parliament of nations. In the United

(Mr. Tsering, Bhutan)

States House of Representatives, one Congressman expressed the view that "this Charter is the most hopeful and important document in the history of world statesmanship" and "the greatest and most hopeful public event in history". No less enthusiastic was Mr. V. M. Molotov, Chairman of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, who was present at the opening session of the United Nations in San Francisco. He described as "this noble cause" the "common cause of the creation of such a post-war organization of peace and security of nations". Mr. Anthony Eden, Chairman of the delegation of the United Kingdom, who was also present in San Francisco, saw in the United Nations "hope to realize a world in which justice for nations as well as for individuals can prevail". And the United States President, Harry Truman, commended the representatives at their final plenary session by saying: "What you have accomplished in San Francisco shows how well ... lessons of military and economic co-operation have been learned."

Representatives of the developing nations looked to the Charter as protecting the weak nations from the strong, and looked forward to a world free of colonialism and its attendant evils.

Times and circumstances have changed since 1945, and so inevitably has the United Nations. We have seen radical changes in geopolitics and economics, and enormous changes brought about by the revolution in computer technology and telecommunications. Sadly, we have also seen a movement away from a multilateral approach to the world's problems, a movement born of frustration and cynicism. Indeed, many changes that have taken place are not consonant with the noble visions of our founding fathers.

With all its blemishes and imperfections, the United Nations, however, still represents man's best hope for the orderly conduct of international relations, based not on the actual power of the strongest States as in the past, but on the

(Mr. Tsering, Bhutan)

rule of law and the universal principles of equity and justice. For the majority of small States, the United Nations continues to be the main bulwark against infringements of their sovereignty and territorial integrity. An effective and functioning United Nations has become essential for the security and survival of small States in the present-day world.

The Charter states the determination to "unite our strength to maintain international peace and security". Clearly, we must strengthen this determination as peace is an essential prerequisite for all human advancement. Economic insecurity, chronic unemployment and underemployment for large sections of the population, hunger, poverty, underdevelopment, do not help to foster social development or political stability.

(Mr. Tsering, Bhutan)

In the circumstances, the North-South dialogue must be revived with new vigour. Trade restrictions, deteriorating commodity prices, reduced and restricted capital flows and high interest rates combine to hurt the economies of the developing countries. In the long run, such policies work to no one's advantage. Indeed, current reports before us point to such factors as the risk of disintegration of the trading system and instability in the international monetary and financial system as ominous signs connected with the decline of multilateralism, with fearful consequences ahead if present trends continue.

Fully two-thirds of the world's population live below the poverty level. Most of these people live in the developing countries and the least developed countries (LDCs). International co-operation is therefore imperative to help these countries, particularly the least developed countries. The plight of people living in the LDCs is fast deteriorating. The per capita gross domestic product (GDP) of the LDCs is less than a quarter of the level for developing countries as a group. The gap between the LDCs and other developing countries is rapidly widening. As an LDC, Bhutan had high hopes of the Mid-term Global Review of the Implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action (SNPA) for the 1990s for the LDCs, which was held in Geneva recently, particularly as international co-operation during the first half of the 1990s in fulfilling the objectives set out in the SNPA was disappointing. Preliminary reports emanating from Geneva unfortunately indicate that the Global Review was less than successful. We now look forward to the Round Table Meeting to be convened by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Geneva next spring in the hope that the international community will be more sympathetic and responsive to the modest aid requirements of small landlocked LDCs like Bhutan.

(Mr. Tsering, Bhutan)

In our view, the long-term solution to the problems faced by the developing countries and to the overall global economic malaise, is the implementation of the new international economic order. This new economic order would ensure equitable economic relations and, in the words of the Charter, "promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." The alternative to this is the present scenario of a widening gap between rich and poor countries, with rising tensions and polarization, accompanied by never-ending political upheavals. Economic well-being will bring with it many social and humanitarian improvements.

Perhaps our primary area of concern at the present moment is the weakening of the aims of the Charter in terms of international peace and security due to the constant threat of a nuclear holocaust. While the possibility of total annihilation hangs over all, there can be no true security for any one. The unabated arms race which now even threatens to reach out to the heavens in the form of "star wars", is cause for serious alarm. In our opinion, the ever-escalating arms race instead of strengthening international peace and security only serves to aggravate existing tensions. And the net result appears to be a colossal diversion of scarce resources to unproductive ends when millions of children around our tiny planet go to bed hungry every night.

Nothing less than total disarmament can be acceptable to the international community and, as a first step, we join in calling for a complete halt to the testing of new nuclear weapons systems and a freeze in the production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

We also call for a halt in the production and proliferation of conventional weapons.

We have mentioned some of the ways in which we must strengthen our adherence to the Charter, from which the international community has in some respects fallen

(Mr. Tsering, Bhutan)

away. We must not only strengthen the Charter and our determination to fulfil its goals, but we are also of the opinion that the United Nations system itself requires certain changes in terms of the proceedings of the General Assembly and the proliferation of meetings, committees, working papers and the creation of a large bureaucratic apparatus in which there is duplication of work. This kind of proliferation, and the expenses involved, must be minimized as far as possible, and we welcome the recommendations of our Secretary-General to prune what is unnecessary and merely duplicates past efforts, and to streamline the work of the Organisation.

One atrocity on which the international community must take immediate action is apartheid. This abhorrent practice is in direct violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The brutal state of emergency, in which the rights of blacks in the affected areas have been totally crushed, must be ended at once. This measure is one of desperation, and exposes the bankruptcy of the institutionalized brutality of apartheid. The arrogance and intransigence of the racist Pretoria régime, which refuses even at this eleventh hour to meet moderate black leaders, is a sign that the world must work with more determination than ever to support the African National Congress. "Constructive engagement" only abets the arrogance of the régime. Instead, all must work together to isolate South Africa totally - economically, culturally and politically.

South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia, bulldozing all opposition to its bloody reign, conscripting its young men into the army and plundering the resources of the territory. Furthermore, South Africa has once more trotted out the discredited "Multi-Party Conference" as a way of granting so-called independence to Namibia. Even the adherents of constructive engagement have totally rejected this fraudulent scheme. Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the only acceptable plan for the independence of Namibia.

(Mr. Tsering, Bhutan)

The situation in the Middle East continues to demand our urgent attention. The plight of the Palestinians remains the crux of the problem. The Palestinians must be granted the right to self-determination, including the right to national self-determination in their homeland.

We support the security and right to exist in safety of all States in the area, including Israel.

These are some of the problems we confront. But there are optimistic signs as well.

We welcome the forthcoming meeting between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union in November. We hope the summit meeting will give an impetus to the current Geneva arms control talks between the two super-Powers and will lead to a lessening of international tension.

As we look back on the 40-year history of the United Nations, we see much to encourage and inspire us. Our Secretary-General and the many distinguished representatives who have spoken during the past few weeks have mentioned several of the reasons why we can take pride in the Organization. Many conflicts have been alleviated or prevented. We have avoided another world war. United Nations peace-keeping forces have been stationed in many parts of the world and have been a key factor in keeping many situations from deteriorating.

But the story does not stop here. Perhaps the most dramatic successes of the United Nations are the day-to-day activities of the specialized agencies and affiliated bodies in the field - activities which do not make the headlines, such as those devoted to health, education, agriculture and all aspects of development. The triumphs here have often been extraordinary. Drinking water supplies, sanitation facilities and smokeless stoves are springing up everywhere, particularly in the rural areas, thanks to efforts sponsored by the United Nations.

(Mr. Tsering, Bhutan)

Smallpox has been eradicated. Special all-out drives are being made to reduce illiteracy, protect children from a host of diseases, teach men and women a variety of usable skills, increase self-sufficiency in food production, and in general improve the quality of life for millions of poor and deprived people. Battles are quietly being won every day.

My own country, Bhutan, has been a member of the United Nations only since 1971. Within that short span of time we have benefited enormously from the specialized agencies and affiliated bodies of the United Nations, which have worked together with our Government in our development programmes. In particular, I should like to express our deep gratitude to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), the World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the World Food Programme (WFP), the United Nations Volunteers (UNV), the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) for their valuable assistance.

The tasks that the international community faces today are monumental. That is why the United Nations must be the institution to tackle them. Only a concerted, multilateral approach can effectively deal with many of the problems we face in this interdependent world. The current global economic malaise, or the problem of pollution or nuclear weapons, can be resolved only through the collective will and action of the international community.

Located in a region which has the largest concentration of people living below the poverty level in the world, Bhutan has been an ardent supporter of the concept of regional co-operation in South Asia. The forum of South Asian Regional

(Mr. Tsering, Bhutan)

Co-operation (SARC) seeks to establish harmonious and co-operative relations among the seven member countries in order to promote the welfare of the peoples of the region. This co-operative endeavour has been successful in creating a climate of understanding, good will and trust among the seven regional countries. We are confident that the historic Summit Meeting of the members of SARC in Dhaka in December will usher in a new era in inter-State relations in South Asia.

When all is said and done, the United Nations still remains our best hope for the future. Whether we wish to build on the existing foundation of the United Nations a stable, orderly and co-operative world, or whether we wish to pursue our own narrow, short-sighted national interests in the exercise of the sovereign powers vested in each of us, depends entirely on ourselves. I hope all of us, big and small, rich and poor, will have the wisdom to make the right choice, and the political will to act on it. The Kingdom of Bhutan, for its part, would like to reaffirm its full, unwavering and unqualified commitment to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Special Envoy of the Head of State of Ethiopia, His Excellency Mr. Goshu Wolde.

Mr. WOLDE (Ethiopia): It is an honour and a privilege for me to convey, on this solemn occasion, the warmest greetings and felicitations of Comrade Mengistu Haile-Mariam, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia, Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council and Commander-in-Chief of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Ethiopia, as well as those of the Government and people of socialist Ethiopia to you, Sir, and through you, to all eminent leaders and representatives assembled at the Headquarters of the United Nations to mark the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the Organization, as well as to our Secretary-General.

(Mr. Wolde, Ethiopia)

As we observe this most historic event - the birth 40 years ago of the first universal international organization - our thoughts go back to the perilous and unstable situation which confronted mankind before and during the cataclysmic years of the Second World War. That conflagration resulted in the death of scores of millions of people and the destruction of whole societies on several continents.

After the defeat of the evil forces of fascism and nazism, the call for a new global structure which would replace the conflict-prone system of international relations and promote peace and co-operation between nations was heard loud and clear throughout the globe. That world-wide yearning for peace, justice, democracy and progress formed the basis of, and received concrete expression in, the founding of the United Nations.

With the emergence of the United Nations, despair gave way to hope, heralding a new era of universal optimism, wherein nations were to live in peace with one another, rearmament was to give way to general and complete disarmament, subjugated peoples were to be freed from colonial bondage and the dignity of peoples was to be collectively upheld. These aspirations were enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations by the founders, who sought to provide humanity with a potent instrument in the service of peace. The Charter thus became a solemn covenant entered into by the peoples of the world, with a view to frustrating the widely-held view that war was inevitable and to creating a world organization through whose instrumentality solutions to problems likely to have adverse effects on international peace and security were to be sought.

Over the past 40 years the United Nations has undergone major structural transformations of truly historic proportions. Through the instrumentality of the various specialized agencies and other bodies, it has contributed to the

(Mr. Wolde, Ethiopia)

realisation of some of the objectives enshrined in its Charter. Any assessment of the performance of the United Nations must, however, focus not on its achievements or failures in isolated instances, but, rather, on its overall contribution to the systematic restructuring of international relations.

In addition to providing suitable forums for the discussion and resolution of global problems, the United Nations has established irreversible patterns and trends in international relations. Indeed, if the last 40 years have witnessed a marked move towards multilateralism, if most of the hitherto colonized peoples have today gained their independence, and if the nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America are actively engaged in complex international negotiations affecting the fate and well-being of mankind, it is largely due to the painstaking and persistent efforts of the United Nations. It can be said without any fear of contradiction that the United Nations has strengthened and deepened multilateral co-operation in all spheres of international life.

(Mr. Wolde, Ethiopia)

Because of its universality, reflecting the diverse cultures and civilizations in its membership, the United Nations has become the most important single source of international law. Many of the international treaties, conventions and other legal instruments which have been concluded over the last four decades have either originated in or were scrutinized and endorsed by the United Nations. Today, these legal instruments govern and regulate international relations in a manner unprecedented in the history of mankind.

In the realm of economic and social development, the activities of the United Nations are even more visible. Through its 32 specialized agencies and its various programmes, the United Nations continues to deal with a variety of problems affecting the socio-economic development of mankind. The specialized agencies and programmes continue among other things to spread and advance education, look after the needs of children, the aged and the displaced, tend the ecological wounds sustained by the environment, enhance global communication, facilitate trade and industrialization, and serve as vital centres for the mobilization and channelling of humanitarian and development aid.

However, all this notwithstanding, much remains to be done. The persistence of and increase in hotbeds of tension, the unbridled and spiralling arms race, including the militarization of outer space, the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia and the consolidation of the evil system of apartheid by the racist régime of South Africa, the flagrant violation of the norms of international law by some States, the accelerating deterioration of the economic and social condition of the developing countries, particularly in Africa, and the unjust international economic order are some of the challenges with which the United Nations is currently confronted.

(Mr. Wolde, Ethiopia)

All these and the other explosive situations around the globe are, by and large, old problems, perhaps under new conditions. But they all underline the growing intensification of the contradictions that exist between the ambitions and perceived interests of a few States on the one hand and the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations on the other. Sometimes the challenge posed by these problems appears to be far greater and stronger than our political will to stand united and face up to it.

However, the United Nations must work for the speedy dismantling of the abhorrent system of apartheid in South Africa, the immediate withdrawal of the occupying South African forces from Namibia and the attainment of independence by the oppressed people of that international Territory. It should also, as a matter of urgent priority, pay increased attention to the war on poverty, disease, hunger and underdevelopment, which continue to sap the energy and the vitality of the developing countries in general and those of Africa in particular.

Equally vital is the role of the United Nations in halting and reversing the macabre march into apocalyptic nuclear confrontation. The reaching of agreements on the non-first-use of nuclear weapons, a comprehensive ban on all nuclear tests and an immediate freeze on the production of nuclear weapons and delivery systems at their present level, as well as the immediate cessation of all efforts and plans to militarize outer space, must all be given urgent attention.

Efforts should also be made to strengthen the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations and its capacity to react more effectively to breaches of the peace and acts of aggression. In this connection, States should be urged to respect the principles of sovereign equality, the territorial integrity of all States, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the right of all States to a socio-economic order of their choice.

(Mr. Wolde, Ethiopia)

These are some of the challenges of our time, and we have no doubt that these challenges will be successfully tackled by the United Nations if all Member States give it the requisite support through their active loyalty and dedication to the purposes and principles of the Charter. If, on the other hand, we deny it that support, our Organization will surely fail to address the burning issues of our time and history will undoubtedly ascribe that failure to lack of political will on the part of the Member States and not to shortcomings in the structure and functioning of the United Nations.

Indeed, as we all recognize, the purposes and principles of the Charter have proved their universal and long-lasting validity. The structural set-up of the Organization, too, while it can certainly be improved upon, has adequately served its purpose. So, when we talk of the failures of the United Nations, we cannot but refer to the shortcomings of the Member States. I submit that any organization is the qualitative and quantitative synthesis of its component parts; it cannot be otherwise.

Our task today should therefore be one of introspection. Have we all been faithful to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter? Have we all complied with the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, which by their very nature reflect the views of the international community? Has our contribution to the well-being and strengthening of the Organization been commensurate with the obligations we have undertaken under the Charter? These are some of the questions we all have to ask ourselves today, and the answers must come from each one of us individually.

(Mr. Wolde, Ethiopia)

At any rate, we are of the conviction that no time is more opportune or propitious for Member States to renew their unequivocal commitment and dedication to the lofty ideals of the Charter than the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. This anniversary could be and, indeed, should be the dawn of a new era in international relations. Henceforth, suspicion must give way to mutual trust and confrontation to co-operation. The scope of multilateral co-operation must be widened and deepened. Narrowly conceived national interests must give precedence to the broad and common interests of humanity. Domination and exploitation must be eliminated and replaced by a system of harmonious relationships based on equality, justice and mutual benefit. I submit that these are not unattainable dreams but realizable goals.

It is often asked whether humanity can survive without the United Nations. Our answer is yes. But without the United Nations can it achieve its cherished goals of global peace and prosperity? The response should be a resounding no.

(Mr. Wolde, Ethiopia)

Based on this conviction, we in Ethiopia advocate that the role of the United Nations and that of the Secretary-General be further strengthened. We believe that it is imperative for all Member States to accept the central role of the United Nations in all the negotiations and deliberations directed at finding solutions to the burning issues of our times. It is equally incumbent upon Member States to make effective use of the good offices of the Secretary-General in their attempts at conflict resolution.

As a member of the now defunct League of Nations, my country, Ethiopia, had first-hand experience of the consequences of any breakdown in international legality and morality. As a result, Ethiopia firmly believes that the United Nations not only represents the highest and the best that can be achieved through multilateral efforts but remains humanity's only hope for a better world. Any deficiencies in either the structure or the working of the United Nations system should be corrected not by withdrawals or threatened withdrawals but by working within the system in collaboration with others.

I take this opportunity, therefore, to reaffirm once again Ethiopia's unwavering commitment to the strengthening of the United Nations and its unequivocal pledge to strive at all times for the full and effective realization of the purposes and principles of its Charter.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.