



UN LIBRARY
1987
29 SEP 1987

General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.13
29 September 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 25 September 1987, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)

later: Mr. MAHBUBANI (Singapore)
(Vice-President)

later: Mr. SALDIVAR (Paraguay)
(Vice-President)

- General debate [9]: (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Poos (Luxembourg)
Mr. Aziz (Iraq)
Mr. Caputo (Argentina)
Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia)
Mr. Lenihan (Ireland)
Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez (Spain)

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.

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 9 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. POOS (Luxembourg) (interpretation from French): First of all, Sir, I should like to take this opportunity to offer you my congratulations on your election to the presidency of the forty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly. Your long experience in diplomacy and international relations and your personal talent are great assets that assure us of your enlightened and vigorous conduct of this session's proceedings.

I should also like to express my gratitude and admiration to the Secretary-General. With dedication, wisdom and tenacity, and assisted by outstanding associates, he has performed year after year the delicate and complex tasks entrusted to him. At a time when certain world and regional conflicts have entered a critical phase, his initiatives and his efforts at mediation and conciliation have taken on a special importance. I need refer only to the Iran-Iraq war and the occupation of Afghanistan. I want to say how very pleased my Government is that his mandate has been renewed and assure him once again of all our confidence.

Last Tuesday, Mr. Ellemann-Jensen, the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, addressed the Assembly as the current President of the European Community and its 12 member States. I entirely endorse the positions he expounded here on the various international questions in today's world, and shall therefore confine my remarks to the following observations.

The review of the international situation in which we traditionally engage at this time of year leads us on this occasion to make an assessment that is more subtle and, indeed, more positive. We are, of course, still disturbed to see that

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

confrontation and military occupation persist in various parts of the world. There are new outbursts of violence, and breaches of human rights are still as widespread as ever. At the same time, a majority of member countries continue to endure the hardships inflicted by the state of the world economy.

However, a number of recent developments appear to indicate a more positive turn and, indeed, to justify new hopes. I have in mind, in particular, the situation in Central America, to which I shall revert later, and the situation in Sri Lanka, where a balanced agreement has been signed between the President of Sri Lanka and the Prime Minister of India providing for a conclusion to the bloody war that has been waged between that country's two communities.

I should also mention the very encouraging results of the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), which has just completed its work at Geneva.

I would be remiss if I did not reiterate our common commitment to the fight against terrorism. Glimmers of hope have appeared with regard to the possibility of convening a Middle East peace conference. The emerging consensus in the aftermath of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development also demonstrates a new state of mind and greater convergence of interests and views.

Above all, however, the evolution in East-West relations, in which my country has the greatest interest, situated as it is in the heart of Europe, is a matter that gives ground for new optimism. The question of utmost interest to us is whether international relations have indeed reached a turning point.

For the first time it is my impression that we are witnessing the slow demise of the cold war and the old dogmas that have characterised post-war politics, dogmas based on the dialectic of the world class struggle, unrelenting confrontation between ideologies, hostility and fundamental mistrust between blocs.

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

The desire to avoid nuclear disaster, to guarantee the survival of mankind and to offer prosperity to the greatest possible number is, I believe, compelling peoples, and consequently their political leaders, to do some clear thinking.

No one can deny that in our day the development of modern technology and the continual internationalization of production and trade have led to interdependence among economies and States. It is only natural and realistic for political leaders of whatever persuasion to recognize the situation and resolutely and without ulterior motives adopt a policy that will bring about the conditions necessary for broader, more creative and mutually advantageous co-operation.

For the present, our attention is focused on the prospects for the first real disarmament agreement, concerning intermediate nuclear forces, which should be concluded before the end of the year. This has in particular resulted from a fortunate initiative of NATO, dating from 1981. It is therefore with keen hope that we look forward to the formalization of the next summit, which should result in the signing of this historic agreement.

Such an agreement would bring about a decisive strengthening of the climate of trust and the spirit of co-operation between the United States and the Soviet Union, between East and West. It would help reduce tensions to the lowest level known by Europe since the end of the Second World War.

It is our hope that in the wake of that initial agreement, which is of vital importance politically and psychologically, negotiations on a drastic reduction of strategic nuclear forces will also be completed. In the same spirit, we very much hope that the work of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva - where many hurdles have been overcome - on the prohibition and elimination of all chemical weapons will be completed promptly.

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

From the same standpoint of the need for stability and increased security in Europe, my country also advocates parallel negotiations on conventional forces, which we hope will lead to a balanced reduction, also properly verifiable, of such armaments.

The need further to enhance the spirit of trust and co-operation requires that in the mean time existing treaties and agreements be complied with and that the establishment and development of new categories of intra- or extra-atmospheric weapons not be encouraged, for they would only create additional confusion in the already highly complex technical rivalry and would put the arms race on a new and entirely different path.

It is with pleasure that we note the new directions of Soviet domestic and foreign policy. During my recent trip to Moscow I had the privilege of speaking to important Soviet leaders, and I came away believing that a change in policy really is under way. This should help bring about profound and lasting progress in all spheres, in particular respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, which many justifiably expect. In this context I would recall and emphasize our political will to act with our partners in the European Community so that the work of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe will lead to the total implementation by all participant countries of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

Just as we feel entitled to consider the implications of recent developments in international relations, so we must make it clear that only actions - not resolutions - will remove the doubts and reservations that history and experience have rooted within us.

In this regard, the increasingly murderous war in Afghanistan causes serious doubts to persist as to the Soviet Union's desire for peace and change in its

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

foreign policy. How can it be otherwise, while foreign troops remain stationed there and prevent the Afghan people from fully exercising their right to self-determination and to build a new society that is truly non-aligned and independent? Only the rapid withdrawal of those troops according to a precise timetable will make possible progress in the talks being held by the Secretary-General.

The agreement on a plan for the restoration of peace in Central America, reached on 7 August by the five Presidents of Central America, is another source of satisfaction to us. Luxembourg, acting together with the other member countries of the European Community, has constantly advocated a negotiated settlement, particularly at Ministerial Conferences at which its representatives have met with those of the Central American countries and the Contadora Group - first in San José in 1984, then in Luxembourg in 1985, and, recently, in Guatemala in February of this year.

Resisting outside pressures and demonstrating a common political will, the Heads of those five nations have given the world a lesson in courage and political wisdom by saying no to any armed solution and choosing peace through a negotiated regional agreement based on dialogue, reconciliation and democracy.

The first steps towards implementation of the peace process, which is certainly as difficult and delicate as any process ever has been, are encouraging and consolidate the restored climate of trust. It is therefore desirable that all countries involved in the region accept that agreement and contribute to its conversion into a genuine peace with due respect for international law.

In two countries of East Asia which have for too long been subject to oppression and dictatorship, democracy has also been given a chance.

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

In the Philippines, President Aquino has worked with determination to establish institutions truly representative of the people of the Philippines. She deserves our support as she moves along this road, which is strewn with formidable dangers. Her efforts to bring about economic recovery, to curb corruption, and to carry out the necessary social and economic reforms, particularly agrarian reform, deserve our esteem.

In the Philippines, Latin America and elsewhere, success in the attainment of democracy is closely linked to the bold measures required for progress and social justice, of which those countries have so long been deprived.

In South Korea, an intelligent people has succeeded in securing recognition of the legitimacy of its political and social demands, thus opening the way to political amnesty, freedom of expression and free elections. We are pleased that, as the Seoul Olympic Games draw near, this process is helping bring about a truly democratic régime through the responsible contribution of all parties concerned, including the present Government and the leaders of the opposition. The absence of any representative of the Korean people in this Hall thus deserves to be re-examined at this session.

On the question of the war between Iran and Iraq, we wish to welcome the unanimous agreement reached in the Security Council, based on an identical assessment by the five permanent members of the Security Council. This is an encouraging sign which is promising for the future of the United Nations. It signals a new trend which deserves to be highlighted and sustained.

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

That decision proves that all the members of the Security Council, diverse as they are, are capable of finding a common political will and of shouldering the special responsibilities that the Charter and the Members of this Organization have entrusted to them for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Even though this diplomatic breakthrough cannot erase from our minds the suffering of the war, we should like, from this rostrum, to applaud this magnificent precedent, achieved with a unanimity unparalleled in recent history, which should enable East and West, North and South, to work more resolutely and on a larger scale towards the restoration of international peace and co-operation.

It is my firm belief that the great majority of the Members of the United Nations expect to see the Council, in keeping with the spirit of the Charter, examine with equal determination other important questions and other acute conflicts that have been too long neglected.

It is true that Security Council resolution 598 (1987), of 20 July, has not yet brought peace. But that only shows that that while the agreement of the Council is certainly indispensable in order to stop the conflict, it is not yet necessarily sufficient. In fact, the war is continuing, more destructive than ever. More than seven years of armed aggression have resulted in the death and injury of more than a million civilians or military personnel, most of them innocent young people. Whole cities have been laid waste by attacks from the air and incessant bombardments. There has been repeated use of chemical weapons, inflicting atrocious suffering, in flagrant violation of the Geneva Protocol of 1925. We should unreservedly condemn their use.

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

The war is tearing apart two peoples who are the heirs of ancient and outstanding civilizations. It has sown disquiet and caused social divisions in a number of Arab countries, and even beyond the Arab world. Because of the risks that it might spread - the tragic incidents in Mecca are proof of that - the conflict now threatens international freedom of navigation in the Persian Gulf, requiring the intervention of friendly and allied countries to safeguard free passage in those international sea lanes.

I join all those who have expressed encouragement of the Secretary-General's action, which is continuing, in close consultation with the Security Council, with the aim of securing acceptance by the two parties of the Security Council resolution, which alone is capable of leading to a comprehensive, just and honourable settlement.

The call for the holding of an international conference on the Middle East has created a momentum which returns to the United Nations the initiative in the search for a comprehensive solution. It has become evident that this is the only forum capable of setting in motion and successfully completing a genuine peace process in the region. My country, with the other member States of the Community, supports such a conference.

The consultations conducted by the Secretary-General with all the parties concerned and with the members of the Security Council strengthen our belief that holding an international peace conference under United Nations auspices has now gained an increasingly broad measure of support, as there is no alternative to a negotiated solution. We hope that the consultations will be continued and intensified.

The twelve States members of the Community have several times set out the principles on which a just and comprehensive solution should be based. I refer in

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

particular to the Declaration they made in Venice in 1980. It was based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which set forth in particular the principle of withdrawal from all the territories occupied during the 1967 conflict. The Declaration also emphasizes the principle of the right to existence and security of all States in the region, particularly the State of Israel, as well as equality of treatment for all peoples, which implies recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

I am convinced that the remaining resistance, in Israel and elsewhere, to the idea of this international conference will eventually be overcome, and that consequently the chance of a negotiated settlement will at long last be taken.

However, we view with the gravest concern the present situation in Lebanon, a country that has been bled dry and torn apart by 10 years of civil war and foreign occupation. The regular eruption of violence continues relentlessly, with its macabre procession of bombardments, hostage-taking, massacre of innocents, and inter-communal strife. Only by ensuring reconciliation between its different communities will Lebanon be able to recover its sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity.

Like the Secretary-General, I wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to the United Nations peace-keeping forces, which, in Lebanon as elsewhere, continue to supervise - despite a heavy toll of dead and injured - the separation of the parties concerned and the maintenance of a truce which, in the absence of a definitive settlement, continues to be precarious.

In South Africa the situation continues to be extremely serious and explosive. The white minority Government is committed to maintaining the system of apartheid, which is in many ways a cause of shame to mankind. Since the elections of 6 May all the promises of reform seem to have been forgotten. There is no sign

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

of any fundamental change, and no willingness to engage in dialogue has emerged. The state of emergency continues. Thousands of people remain in detention without trial. Censorship is constantly being intensified.

Externally, South Africa rides roughshod over the sovereignty of neighbouring countries. It is continuing the illegal occupation of Namibia. My Government unreservedly condemns this policy and these actions of South Africa.

In 1985, under the presidency of Luxembourg, and again in 1986 the countries of the European Community enacted a number of measures designed to punish the Pretoria Government for its repressive policy towards the black majority. Those measures are reviewed and where appropriate strengthened in the light of developments in the situation. The Assembly and the Security Council should act likewise.

Above all, the international community should respond to the desire to retain apartheid, not with ineffective steps and disunity, but with a determination to demand its total and irreversible elimination.

The pressure of the international community must also be brought to bear unrelentingly to end the flagrant and systematic violations of human rights in many other countries. Here I refer in particular to the situation in Chile, whose people have now been unjustly deprived of democracy, freedom and fundamental human rights for 14 years.

The world economic situation continues to give rise to grave concern. Wherever one looks, economic growth is still slow and inadequate. The world's gross domestic product grew by only 3 per cent in 1986, and prospects for 1987 and later are not much better, especially in view of the 1.6 per cent per annum growth of world population.

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

In the northern hemisphere - that is, in the industrialized countries - the situation is in most cases reflected by the persistence of high rates of unemployment, marked external imbalances and, here and there, profound and painful restructuring.

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

In the Southern hemisphere, we note that development has been severely hindered by a number of factors: exceptionally low and unstable commodity prices, a deterioration in exchange terms, a drop in export earnings, increasingly crushing debt servicing, and obstacles to trade. In addition, adjustment policies often cause a worsening of already precarious living conditions, particularly for the most deprived sectors of the people of those countries.

Generally speaking, the gap between the developed and the developing countries is becoming wider rather than narrower. In particular, the per capita income in the industrialized countries - both East and West - grew by about 3.5 per cent in 1986, whereas it declined by about 4 per cent in the developing countries. Of course, all those percentages are average figures; that tends to blur not only the disparities between countries but also the inequalities within many countries themselves.

Given that gloomy picture, the countries that took part in the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD VII), held two months ago in Geneva, reached a consensus which I welcome. They proved able to show moderation and realism - I would go so far as to say a new sense of individual and collective responsibility.

In that regard, I draw attention to the conduct of the countries with Communist régimes, which, for the first time in history, associated themselves with the analysis of the other participants. In particular, I must emphasize the positive action of the People's Republic of China. That country distinguished itself at UNCTAD VII - as, indeed, it has done in other spheres - by its moderating and constructive efforts, which redounded to the greatest benefit of all the participants.

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

The conclusions reached by that Conference do not of course, provide any miraculous solutions with direct, short-term effects. They do, however, involve the acceptance of fundamental principles which are dictated by the mounting interdependence of economies and respect for which is a pre-condition for the general resumption of growth, development and international trade.

It is also to be hoped that the new financial and structural solidarity that is envisaged will be quickly given concrete form and that the commitments entered into by all concerned will be sufficiently precise to make possible the creation of the environment necessary to bring about recovery. The multilateral trade negotiations now going on, which are designed to ensure a greater opening up of markets, will provide an initial response in that regard.

Growth is without doubt a necessary condition for the improvement of living standards in all countries, particularly the developing countries. Each of them, of course, must bear the primary responsibility for its own development. None the less, I venture to state that a development policy of some depth must devote equal attention to the effective participation of all the people, the distribution of national income, and the social effects thereof. There are clear reasons of justice for that - and also the fundamental idea that development cannot be imposed.

In conclusion, let me state again - if there is really a need to do so - our commitment to the Organization. How can we still doubt that the United Nations system is irreplaceable, when we consider the crucial role played, for example, by the Security Council in such questions as the Iran-Iraq war, the Middle East, Afghanistan and the search for solutions in Cambodia and Cyprus? Can we still afford the luxury of a multilateral crisis when we realize the outstanding service rendered to peace day and night by United Nations forces in various flashpoints

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

around the world? Can we afford the luxury of a crisis at a time when we want to see international action strengthened in order to secure universal respect for human rights? Can we afford the luxury of a crisis when countless economic and ecological challenges make sustained international co-operation more essential with the passing of each day?

In that spirit, I would refer to the remarkable report just published by the international Commission presided over by the Norwegian Prime Minister, Mrs. Gro Harlem Brundtland, which shows how very alarming is the state of the world environment as well as its grave consequences for future development. These problems, transcending national boundaries, require deep thought and vigorous action, which can be harmonized only at the international level.

It therefore seems to me most desirable to find a solution as soon as possible to the financial crisis of the United Nations, which not only paralyses our work but also undermines confidence. The legal commitments solemnly subscribed to in regard to this Organization, just like the primacy of international law, require this of all of us. The necessary restructuring undertaken by the Secretary-General in implementation of the relevant resolution, which was adopted unanimously, must be encouraged and quickly completed.

Forty-two years ago the United Nations was established in America, this welcoming land of democracy where we meet each year with so much pleasure. This time, I have deliberately focused my remarks on the more realistic and more pragmatic new trends in international relations.

It is for us, together and in solidarity, to make the United Nations a more coherent, more integrated and better-structured centre where the efforts of all nations to ensure prosperity can be more effectively harmonized. Without this, there cannot be a more secure, and therefore all-encompassing, peace.

(Mr. Poos, Luxembourg)

Finally, I would refer to the annual report on the work of the Organization that the Secretary-General has just submitted to us. I share very broadly the assessment made in it of the serious international problems. I therefore readily endorse the following relevant and deeply poetic words used by the Secretary-General in describing the present international context:

"It is as if the sails of the small boat in which all the people of the earth are gathered had caught again, in the midst of a perilous sea, a light but favourable wind. ... [But] our global vessel will need skilful piloting and the assistance of dedicated oarsmen to navigate the many shoals and reach safe landfall in the next century". (A/42/1, p. 2)

Mr. AZIZ (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): It gives me pleasure to begin my statement by congratulating you, Sir, on the great trust accorded you by the representatives of Member States in electing you President of the General Assembly. I wish you every success in your task.

I should also like on this occasion to express my appreciation for the efforts of your predecessor, Mr. Choudhury, President of the last session of the General Assembly, who was entrusted with important tasks.

More than seven years have now passed since the outbreak of the conflict between Iraq and Iran, during which time it has been discussed on many occasions in both the General Assembly and the Security Council. On all those occasions we expressed our views on the subject and my present statement will be limited to it alone.

The war imposed on Iraq, as representatives know, is in the forefront of the issues that concern my country at present and is also in the forefront of the issues which preoccupy this Organization and the international community.

Members will no doubt recall that 1986 was an important year in the course of the aggressive, expansionist war imposed by the Iranian régime on Iraq. In February of that year the Iranian régime invaded and occupied the Iraqi port city of Fao. Following its consideration of the grave situation in the area resulting from that act of aggression, the Security Council on the twenty-fourth of that month unanimously adopted its resolution 582 (1986), which the members of the Council formulated independently, uninfluenced by either party to the conflict, and in which they set out the procedures for a comprehensive settlement in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and the rules of international law. In the face of the rejection of that resolution by the Iranian régime, the Security Council considered the conflict once again and adopted unanimously, on 8 October 1986,

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

resolution 588 (1986), which affirmed the necessity of compliance with the previous resolution. Once again the Iranian régime rejected the resolution - a matter which led the Security Council to issue its statement of 22 December 1986 in which it reiterated its call for implementation of the comprehensive settlement procedures set forth in its resolution 582 (1986). The Iranian régime rejected that call, too

Throughout that period the Iranian régime was making preparations for a large-scale operation to invade Iraq which its leaders named "the final and decisive offensive". At the same time, those very leaders were preparing for a meeting of their agents in Tehran for the purpose, as they claimed, of "determining the future of Iraq" in all its aspects. The said meeting began on 24 December 1986 and continued until the twenty-ninth of the same month, with direct and active participation of Iranian officials at the highest levels. On the night of 24/25 of that month, while the meeting was still in session, the Iranian régime launched a new invasion with the object of occupying the Basrah area. When its attempt was foiled, it undertook another operation on the night of 8/9 January 1987, also in the Basrah area. Yet another attempt was staged on the night of 13/14 of the same month in the central area of the front.

The aims the Iranian régime intended to achieve by those operations are quite clear. Having failed over six years to occupy the whole of Iraq by large-scale offensives launched every year, that régime, in December 1986 and January 1987, targeted the Basrah area with a view to establishing therein a puppet government controlled by Iran, and proceeding thereafter to realize its dream of occupying the whole of Iraq, threatening the Arab Gulf States, and achieving regional expansion at their expense. The Iraqi people and its armed forces, however, thwarted those pernicious designs by dint of an ability based on deep faith in what is right and on the just cause of self-defence in the face of aggression and evil.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Amidst these grave developments, on 13 January 1987 the Secretary-General of the United Nations issued a call for a meeting of the Security Council at the foreign ministers' level to discuss the situation between Iran and Iraq. The Secretary-General's initiative reflected a heightened state of concern for the grave implications of the continuation of the aggressive, expansionist war waged by Iran against Iraq. The intensified international efforts undertaken on the basis of this initiative were crowned by the unanimous adoption on 20 July last of a binding Security Council resolution, namely, resolution 598 (1987), which expressed the wish of the international community to achieve peace without delay and promote a comprehensive, durable settlement of the conflict.

Iraq expressed its position on the resolution in clear terms only two days after its adoption: it welcomed the resolution on the basis of a firm position of principle rooted in a commitment to peace and faith in resolving the conflict by peaceful means. Iraq stressed that it was prepared to implement the resolution as an indivisible whole and that it was keenly interested in having its provisions applied in full.

Now Iraq did not welcome the resolution because it was an Iraqi resolution; nor did it do so because the resolution entailed any gains for Iraq. As a matter of fact, all the considerations pressed by Iran and those who worked behind the scenes in the Security Council to further Iran's interests were included in that resolution. Iraq welcomed resolution 598 (1987) because, in its view, it was a balanced resolution which contained the elements for a comprehensive settlement and because from the very beginning Iraq adopted the position of accepting the settlement of the conflict by peaceful means through the international Organization, on the basis of the Charter and international law.

By contrast, from 20 July to date, the Iranian régime has manoeuvred for position vis-à-vis the resolution and engaged in procrastinatory and delaying

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

tactics, while contriving such ruses in expressing its position on the resolution as have no parallel in the history of dealing with Security Council resolutions. This attitude of Iran can mean only rejection of the resolution and insistence on continuing the war and aggression. Then, after the Secretary-General's visit to Tehran the Iranian régime began to present its position on the resolution in evasive terms by focusing on the question of responsibility for starting the aggression as the principal issue - and that was what the President of Iran focused on in his statement here.

I shall therefore concentrate in my statement on this important question and its details so as to reveal the truth and make it clear to representatives as it is, not as those who call for the continuation of the war, the killing and destruction wish to project it - although we have explained this question on previous occasions and in many documents circulated in this Organization, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of the Islamic Conference, and to the Member States.

In 1979 when the new régime came to power in Iran, Iraq made a point of establishing good-neighbourly relations with it. That position by Iraq was an extension of its foreign policy and consistent with Iraq's paramount interests on the national and international levels. Iraq had among its priority concerns to ensure continuation of the comprehensive development plan that it had launched following the July 1968 Revolution, the advancement of the standard of living of the Iraqi people, the achievement of general evolution in the economic, cultural and social fields, and construction of the political and social institutions that enable the people to exercise their democratic rights.

In the field of external relations the objectives of Iraqi foreign policy included the achievement of stability in the region, non-intervention in the

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

internal affairs of neighbouring countries, and settlement of differences by peaceful means. Those were the principles proclaimed in President Saddam Hussein's declaration of February 1980. It was a policy which it pursued both officially and actually, internally and externally, and which qualified Iraq to be selected to host the Seventh Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Second Summit Conference marking the twentieth anniversary of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC).

The basic interests of Iraq and its prominent international position were most closely linked to the preservation of security and stability and the maintenance of the best of relations with its neighbours and the other countries of the world. Iraq had no interest in creating problems either with those neighbours or with any other country of the world.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

In line with that approach in its foreign policy, Iraq gave the new régime in Iran a friendly reception and was among the first States to accord it recognition. At a meeting with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Iran at the Havana Conference in 1979, President Saddam Hussein emphasized Iraq's concern to maintain neighbourly relations based on non-interference in internal affairs and co-operation aimed at serving the interests of peace and stability in the region. Iraq emphasized this approach again at a meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the two countries at the United Nations.

The Iranian régime, on the other hand, pursued an entirely different policy from the very beginning. The Iranian régime has, since its inception, maintained a hostile attitude towards Iraq. The régime's leadership expressed that attitude even before it came to power when, during his stay in France in 1978, Khomeini declared that changing the Government of Iraq constituted one of his priority objectives.

The Iranian régime, by reason of its ideology based on the theory of the divine jurisdiction of the claimed Imam over the whole Muslim community in the world as expounded in Khomeini's book The Jurisdiction of the Fagih, that is, the leading theologian - a book which assumes in the Iranian system the same role as that of Hitler's Mein Kampf in Nazi theory - proclaims the principle of the exportation of the revolution outside Iran as a binding obligation on the constitutional authorities of the Iranian State. That is why work on the so-called export of the Iranian revolution has been the main preoccupation of the Iranian Government, the most important element in defining its external relations and activities, and the major cause of all the aggression, disorder and insecurity from which the region has been suffering from the time that régime came to power in Iran until today. In line with this anomalous course which it has insistently

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

pursued, the Iranian régime has not concealed the fact that the primary objective of its revolution-exporting programme is to destroy the political and social system of Iraq, occupy Iraq and annex it as an Iranian dependency.

While the occupation and subjugation of Iraq continue to be the primary objectives of Iranian expansionist plans, they are not by any means the only objectives. Ever since its inception the Iranian régime has resorted to terrorism and subversion and conducted propaganda campaigns against all the countries of the region and many countries of the world. It has committed open, armed aggression against Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and other countries of the region; and Iranian armed forces have occupied parts of Lebanon and raised the Iranian flag there.

It was supposed that relations between Iraq and Iran would be governed by a standing Agreement, namely, the 1975 Agreement. The 1975 Agreement, with its special characteristics, had been concluded to regulate border issues between the two countries and questions of security and stability along these borders, as well as to ensure non-interference in internal affairs. Article 4 states that any violation of any part of the Agreement shall constitute a violation of the Agreement as a whole.

From the beginning the Iranian régime proceeded to attack this Agreement and to treat it as suspect. Officials of the régime at various levels began to issue declarations of non-compliance with its provisions. Those declarations are documented in the records we have submitted to this Organization and to other international bodies and institutions. Furthermore, the Iranian Government brought back to Iran the puppet Barzani gang of plotters, who pose a threat to the unity of Iraq, and assisted that gang in committing acts of sabotage against Iraq. Iran had supported that same gang in all sorts of ways before the conclusion of the 1975

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Agreement, but then ceased to support it, in compliance with the provisions of that Agreement.

These attitudes and acts constitute a deliberate, flagrant violation of the 1975 Agreement, as does the violation of other clauses providing for the return of Iraqi territories which Iran has been occupying since the time of the Shah's régime, and constitute an assault on the Agreement as a whole. By committing these deliberate acts Iran brought back the state of insecurity and instability along the common borders of the two countries. This state of affairs was the actual beginning of Iran's aggression against Iraq.

Those hostile acts and attitudes, which threaten Iraq's sovereignty and its internal security and stability, continued throughout 1979 and for the first nine months of 1980. Iraq was careful to deal with these issues by diplomatic means and through dialogue. On scores of occasions Iraq drew the attention of the Iranian authorities to the fact that those acts constituted violation of the 1975 Agreement. On 27 June 1979 Iraq requested the Iranian Government to clarify its position on that Agreement. In spite of the gravity of this question as far as the relations between the two neighbouring countries were concerned, Iran did not take the trouble to respond to that substantive inquiry from Iraq.

Those violations were accompanied by other acts of no less gravity, all of which moved in the main direction of threatening Iraq's sovereignty and security and attempting to place Iraq under Iranian hegemony. During 1979 and 1980 countless feverish statements, declarations and speeches issued almost daily from officials of the Iranian régime calling: for changes in the political and social system of Iraq; for the promotion of acts of disorder and terrorism in Iraq and the employment of inhabitants of Iranian origin actually to commit such acts; for citizens to boycott and oppose the national authority and to paralyse

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

governmental machinery; for the armed forces to rebel against authority, desert their barracks and evade national service; and openly for the assassination of political leaders in Iraq. I refer in particular to the statements made by the former Foreign Minister of the Iranian régime, Sadeq Ghotbzadeh, in Damascus on 27 April 1980, in which he announced an alleged plot against the life of the President of the Republic of Iraq.

What was even more serious, Iranian officials began to speak openly and publicly of using their armed forces to achieve their designs against Iraq. I made special reference to the speech by the President of the Republic of Iran, Abol Hasan Bani-Sadr on 11 April 1980, in which he said:

"When the Iranian army moves west no power on earth can stop its march to Baghdad."

No less serious was the announcement by Ghotbzadeh, the Foreign Minister, on 9 April 1980 that his Government had decided to overthrow the Iraqi Government, or his announcement the day before that Baghdad and Aden were Persian.

Iranian officials at the time considered the making of ever more threatening statements against the security and sovereignty of Iraq to be a basic means of promoting their influence within the new régime and climbing to ever higher positions in the Iranian power structure, on the supposition that he who proved to be the most extreme in that area would be closer to the Khomeini line of exporting the revolution and would thus be closer to his heart.

With the continuation of these political and propaganda campaigns and campaigns of subversion to undermine security and stability, the Iranian régime began to use the force of arms against Iraq to achieve its aggressive aims. In the period from February to September 1980 Iranian aircraft committed 249 violations of Iraqi air space. There were 244 instances of Iranian armed forces firing across

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

the border and on Iraqi border posts or subjecting them to attacks and artillery fire and obstructing navigation in Shatt al Arab, the vital artery of Iraq. There were also three instances of firing upon Iraqi civilian aircraft and seven instances of shelling Iraqi economic installations.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

In all these deliberate acts Iraq would give warning, call attention and engage in dialogue by diplomatic means in the hope that the Iranian régime would listen to the voice of reason and good sense, conform to the rules of international conduct and obey the dictates of international law. In 293 notifications by official memoranda dispatched to the Iranian authorities concerning these violations in the period from 5 March 1979 to 30 October 1980 the Iraqi Government drew attention to the risks involved in these acts and warned against their grave consequences for the relations between the two countries, but to no avail. The Iranian leaders continued to escalate their threats against Iraq and to compete with each other in discovering the best means to export their backward revolution to Iraq.

On 4 September 1980 the Iranian régime moved to a dangerous level in its plan of aggression against Iraq. Iranian armed forces used heavy 175-millimetre artillery to shell the towns of Khaneqin, Mendeli, Zirbatya and Naftkhaneh. Iranian artillery fired on these Iraqi towns from the Iraqi territories which it had refused to deliver back to Iraq as dictated by the 1975 Agreement and on which it had amassed military forces. The Iranian Government thereby deliberately threatened Iraq's sovereignty and security in two ways: on the one hand by a deliberate military occupation of Iraqi territory and on the other by a deliberate shelling of Iraqi towns by heavy artillery from that Iraqi territory.

Although Iraq, by a memorandum dated 7 September 1980, called Iran's attention to this conduct, which was in contravention of its international obligations, and requested it to remove its military encroachments on Iraqi territory, Iranian artillery fire continued unabated. Iraq was therefore obliged again to notify Iran by an official memorandum dated 8 September that it was compelled to exercise its right to legitimate self-defence under the Charter and international law by

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

removing the Iranian occupation forces should Iran fail to stop its military transgressions against Iraqi sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Rather than respond to the Iraqi representations the Iranian authorities continued their military attacks on Iraq. We were therefore obliged for the third time, on 11 September 1980, to deliver to Iran a detailed official memorandum in which we suggested that the Iranian leadership seek the view of its organs responsible for border affairs and agreements as to the validity of the Iraqi position based on the binding commitments undertaken by both countries under the 1975 Agreement. The memorandum further urged the Iranian Government to realize that to attack heavily populated cities with their civilian inhabitants, as it did when it shelled Khaneqin and Mendeli, could not be taken lightly; it was a grave matter which Iran should be careful to avoid if it did not wish the relations between the two countries to suffer serious deterioration. It is to be noted that on all occasions Iraq was careful to remind the Iranian Government of its international obligations, including the 1975 Agreement. It is also necessary to take note of the fact that as late as 11 September 1980 Iraq stressed to Iran, albeit for the last time, the need to abide by the provisions of the 1975 Agreement.

How did Iran respond? Iran did not reply to our diplomatic memoranda in kind but resorted instead to threats and denunciations and continued to use military force against Iraq's borders, cities, economic installations and essential facilities.

Having long suffered all this with patience and made countless efforts to resolve matters, the Iraqi Government, faced with clear evidence and with the failure of the Iranian Government to respond to this historic memorandum, became convinced that the Iranian Government's violations of the elements of the comprehensive settlement contained in the 1975 Agreement were deliberate in

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

character. Iraq therefore had no choice but to consider that Agreement and all subsequent agreements based thereon null and void, having regard to the fact that Iran had already nullified them by word and deed. Iraq's position was in accordance with the provisions of clause IV of that Agreement and article 4 of the Treaty on International Boundaries and Good-Neighbourliness, based on the Agreement.

By accusing Iraq of nullifying the 1975 Agreement, Iran wants this Assembly and ourselves to ignore its own violations of the Agreement, whether those relating to Iraq's territorial sovereignty or external and internal security or those relating to non-intervention in its internal affairs, while maintaining at the same time, without officially recognizing the Agreement, the privileges therein accorded Iran to delimit boundaries in Shatt al Arab on the basis of the Thalweg line. The Iraqi diplomatic and legal attempts to draw Iran's attention to the gravity of the acts of aggression and threats it was committing and warning it against the dire consequences of such acts on the relations between the two countries were responded to by Iran with more threats and the increased use of military force.

Iran continued to escalate the conflict. As from 19 September 1980 it intensified its heavy artillery fire and air attacks on heavily populated residential complexes and vital economic installations in Iraq as well as on Iraqi and foreign merchant shipping entering and leaving Shatt al Arab. Furthermore, the Iranian authorities announced the closure of the Strait of Hormuz to Iraqi navigation and declared a general mobilization, while amassing military forces in huge numbers along the borders and embarking upon a large-scale military operation openly using regular forces.

Effective from 18 September 1980 the Iranian armed forces issued four military communiqués on their activities. In the third communiqué, issued on 19 September 1980, Iran stated that it used its air force in its military operations. In the fourth communiqué, issued on 19 September 1980,

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

the Iranian authorities boasted that the fields of Naftkhaneh, an important Iraqi oil area, had been set on fire.

The military operations undertaken by Iraq with effect from 7 September 1980 to expel the Iranian forces which were occupying its territory and shelling its border cities from that selfsame occupied Iraqi territory, as well as the military operations undertaken on 22 September 1980 to face the Iranian troops amassed on Iraqi borders with the object of effecting a deep incursion into Iraqi territory in order to attain their aggressive and expansionist objectives against Iraq, were purely defensive in character. In September 1980 Iraq had two options and no other: either to submit to the Iranian aggression aimed at the occupation of Iraq and its conversion into an Iranian province or to exercise legitimate self-defence.

All of these attitudes adopted and actions taken by Iran had happened before 22 September 1980 and constitute a flagrant violation of a number of principles and rules of international law governing friendly relations among States as codified in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, which the General Assembly approved by consensus in its resolution 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970, chief among which are the principle of good-neighbourly relations, the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs of States, the principle of sovereign equality of States and the principle that States shall fulfil their international obligation in good faith.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Moreover, the net result of the actions of the Iranian Government - which was the first to use military force against Iraq, with effect from 4 September 1980, and even before that date - fall within the concept of direct armed aggression as laid down by the definition of aggression which the General Assembly approved by consensus in its resolution 3314 (XXIX), of 14 December 1974.

On the other hand, the measures taken by the Iraqi Government since 4 September 1980 to counter the Iranian aggression are consistent with the right of legitimate self-defence because they meet the conditions of necessity and reasonableness established by international law for the legitimate exercise of this right.

Iran, whose President spoke before the Assembly a few days ago, wants the Assembly and the Security Council to forget all these acts of aggression and actions contrary to international law and the nature of relations between States in modern times, and to believe instead its allegation that Iraq committed aggression against it.

Iran claims that Iraq has not resorted to political means to resolve the conflict and that it has waged war against Iran with a view to overthrowing the Iranian régime. Let us ask ourselves this. Did not all the efforts made by Iraq from February 1979 to September 1980, the latest of which being our memorandum of 11 September 1980, constitute political and diplomatic processes for resolving problems? Is it not Iraq that welcomed the establishment of a Republic in Iran, invited its Prime Minister to visit Iraq, sent congratulatory messages to its leadership and dispatched 293 notifications in diplomatic memorandums cautioning Iran against threats to Iraq's sovereignty and security? Is it not Iran that has heaped abuse on Iraq, threatened its security and stability insistently sought to change its political and social system, considered Khomeini to be Iraq's guardian,

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

used military force to violate Iraq's borders and threatened to invade its capital and erase it from the map of the region?

Which of the two parties has rejected dialogue and the mediation of friends to resolve the problems between the two countries? In a speech he made in April 1980 Iran's then President, Bani-Sadr, boasted to his audience that President Saddam Hussein had on three occasions sought to send mediators to resolve the problems with Iran and that he, Bani-Sadr, had refused to talk to them. Any fair-minded person must ask himself this: was Iraq alone in being unable to resolve its problems with Iran by diplomatic means at that time, or was the entire world at a loss as to how to deal with that anomalous, aggressor régime, which has no respect for international law or established custom in State relations, and is thus unable to this day to resolve its problems with that régime?

Let us go back to 1979 and 1980 and go over the daily events one by one, and ask the States of the region and those other States that have had problems with Iran which of them has been able to establish a constructive dialogue with the Iranian régime on the basis of international law, the rules of international conduct and mutual respect for sovereignty and interests. Has Kuwait, or Saudi Arabia, or Bahrain, or the Soviet Union, or the United States, or France or Britain? Which State, big or small, whether near Iran, far away from Iran or neighbouring Iran, was able at that time, or is able even today, to resolve its problems with Iran through dialogue, on the basis of international law and the rules of conduct in today's world? There are 1,001 proofs that the whole world has suffered and continues to suffer from deliberate Iranian violations of international law and agreements and breaches of contracts signed between Iran and the countries of the world, as well as from Iranian terrorist plots, Iranian audacities and Iranian rejection of dialogue. Perhaps former Secretary-

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

General Waldheim's notes on his visit to Tehran provide the best proof of what we have stated and of the way the Iranians have conducted their talks even with the representatives of our international Organization.*

The world has witnessed many conflicts, which had their origin in various causes, and it continues to witness many such conflicts. What should a Member State of the United Nations do when an armed conflict arises between it and another State? In this world to which we all belong there is an international authority concerned with security and stability in the world. That authority is the Security Council. On 28 September 1980, having met and considered the situation between Iraq and Iran, the Security Council adopted resolution 479 (1980), which called for the cessation of hostilities and the initiation of negotiations. Iraq, a responsible Member of the United Nations, which believes in the United Nations Charter and in the laws and rules governing relations among States, accepted that resolution immediately. Iran, however, which has refused to resolve the problems with Iraq by political means, through negotiations, and which believes in using means that contravene international law and custom with a view to threatening the sovereignty and security of Iraq, refused to accept Security Council resolution 479 (1980) and, instead, has insisted on continuing the war to this day.

Just as it refused to abide by the will of the international community and end the war in September 1980. So Iran has refused to resolve the conflict through other international organizations and bodies, such as the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Non-Aligned Movement, by seeking, as in the case of the United Nations, to impose conditions which are contrary to international law

* Mr. Mahbubani (Singapore), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

and to the concepts of the age, with a view to enabling Iran to attain all its expansionist aims based on the theory of exporting the revolution, which is the root cause of all the problems plaguing the region today.

Today we have a huge dossier of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions and of the decisions and appeals of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, all of which call for the settlement of the conflict between Iran and Iraq by peaceful means on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations, international law, the principles of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Islamic principles. Iran has rejected all these calls, while Iraq has accepted them all. If a country had truly been the victim of aggression, could it have rejected all those international efforts over a period of seven years and all those international appeals and calls, insisting all the time on war, slaughter and destruction? Is not this attitude, rather, one characteristic of a covetous aggressor harbouring aggressive, expansionist designs? Which of the two parties to the conflict has considered the war a gift of God and a suitable occasion for liquidating internal opponents, allowing the revolution to strike root and getting rid of the older generation and a newer one?

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

The declarations of Khomeini and all Iranian officials made since September 1980 until today have sung the praises of war and recounted its virtues and implications for the survival of the régime and the régime's ability to crush its opponents. Those declarations have also extolled the war's implications for the growth of Iran's influence in the region and at the international level. Could war be an imposed situation on a régime that glorifies war in that manner? Or, rather, is it not that that régime itself wanted this war and imposed it on Iraq and on the countries of the region, thus involving the international community as a whole in its effects? Who other than the aggressor Iran - which insists on exporting its backward revolution with its heinous crimes, which insists on bringing the countries of the region under its control and which insists on resorting to terroristic means in all countries of the world - bears the responsibility for this war and for the slaughter and destruction which have been going on for more than seven years?

The statements made by the leadership of the Iranian régime seven years ago and the statements they hysterically keep repeating today are enough to enable us to determine the side which has initiated aggression and war and which is unable to survive without war, to say nothing of its responsibility for the continuation of the war, despite all the well-intentioned efforts that were made and continue to be made to end it. By concentrating on a three-week period of conflict between two neighbouring countries, after which the Security Council intervened, Iran tries, through lies, to present a topsy-turvy view of things. It wants us to forget all the acts of aggression and subversion and all the violations of international law which it committed against Iraq and all the countries of the region before, during and after that period. It wants the world to forget the death, slaughter and destruction which has continued for seven years because of its insistence on war,

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

its refusal to abide by international law and its rejection of the jurisdiction of the international organization over the conflict, as well as its insistence on its own methods and concepts to resolve this conflict by force, terrorism and blackmail.

I have called to mind what happened in 1979 and 1980 before the outbreak of the conflict between Iraq and Iran and I have cited the aggressive acts of Iran against my country and its threats to the sovereignty and security of Iraq. You, Mr. President, together with all the Members of the international Organization, know what is going on in the region now and what Iran does and says against the other States. You no doubt have heard of the missiles which Iran has launched against a small, peaceful country like Kuwait, and you know of the continuous threats to Kuwaiti shipping. You know of the impudent threats Iran has directed against Saudi Arabia and of its aggression against Saudi vessels and airspace, as well as of Iran's calls to overthrow the Saudi Arabian régime. You know the facts of Iranian efforts to intervene in the internal affairs of all the countries of the region, without exception. You also know that there is in Iran an alternate Government for many of the legitimate régimes in our region. You know of Iran's role in terrorism in Arab States of North Africa, which have been obliged to close Iranian embassies to avoid subversive and seditious acts carried out and financed by those embassies. You certainly also know of the facts of the acts of terrorism committed by Iranian agents even in non-Islamic States, such as in European countries. You know of the hostage game used by the Iranian régime as a means of political blackmail and the acquisition of arms to enable it to continue war and aggression against my country and others in the region.

All these acts of aggression which are being committed by Iran against the countries of the region nine years after the establishment of its anomalous régime

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

fall within the meaning of armed aggression under the definition of aggression approved by the General Assembly, to which I have already referred. If Iraq has borne more Iranian aggression than the other countries of the region it is only because there are 1,180 kilometres of common boundaries between Iraq and Iran and because our cities are only a few kilometres from those borders and the capital of our country is only 120 kilometres away from them.

This is the Iranian régime whose representatives come to this forum to shed crocodile tears before members so as to make members believe that they are the victims of aggression. No one, however, has asked the representatives of the Iranian régime about their definition of aggression. The Iranian régime conceives aggression in terms different from those accepted by the other States of the world. According to the Iranian régime, it is aggression for my country to defend itself against Iran's attempts to invade my country. In the view of the rulers of Tehran, it is aggression not to allow them to intervene in our internal affairs, and it is also aggression not to allow them to violate the rules of international law and the rules of conduct among States whenever they desire to do so. Aggression, in the eyes of the rulers of Tehran, consists in not allowing them to impose their hegemony on the countries of the region. That is the concept of aggression of the rulers in Tehran.

The anomalous and criminal Iranian régime, which wallows in the bloodbaths it has triggered in its country, which has driven children over minefields, which has sent hundreds of thousands of human beings to their deaths by its insistence on war for more than seven years, which treats international law and the rules of conduct among States with contempt, which has slaughtered prisoners of war and subjected them to unspeakable atrocities, which has failed to build good relations with any other State of the world apart from opportunistic and business relations with a few

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

countries, which poses a threat to international security and stability, which lays down mines in international waters in the Gulf and threatens free navigation and which commits crimes in the region and in many areas of the world - such a régime has no right to set out conditions to the international Organization. Anyone who wishes to satisfy that régime and bargains with it at the expense of the principles of international law and the rules for the settlement of disputes between States is not rendering any service to peace, justice and the supremacy of law in the world. Such a person could be either miscalculating or seeking cheap gains at the expense of respect for the Charter and international law and respect for this Organization, as well as at our expense, we, the peoples of the region, which are being subjected to Iranian aggression, terrorism and blackmail.

I should like, therefore, to make it quite clear that Iraq, which has struggled and striven with courage and ability against the Iranian aggression, and which has protected its sovereignty, security and the life of its citizens against the barbaric waves of invasion waged by Iran year after year, has stood as an invincible barrier to protect the region and the world from Iran's evil. Any sensible person can well imagine what great dangers would threaten the region and the world should that barrier, God forbid, give way.

Iraq will never allow more concessions to that murderous monster with its insatiable appetite for aggression, expansion and blackmail.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

The Iranian régime has rejected the resolutions of the Security Council one after the other, from resolution 479 (1980), adopted in September 1980, up to resolution 588 (1986), adopted in October 1986. Each time it has attacked the Security Council, blackmailed it and said: "I do not like this resolution. If you want me to accept a resolution from the Council, you should include in it such and such".

When we come to the Security Council to deal with the situation and discuss the question of adopting another resolution, we find certain parties behind the scenes in the Security Council saying: "Well, let us include something of what Iran wants; perhaps this other resolution will be acceptable to it". And the second resolution includes what Iran wants. But Iran then rejects the second resolution, just as it rejected the first, stating that it has not been given enough. The attempt is repeated a third, fourth and fifth time. Iran rejects all these attempts and continues the war, the blackmail and the game of deception.

We have witnessed such scenes on all the occasions on which the conflict has been discussed, and we have heard the repeated Iranian claims and demands. On all those occasions the Security Council has made concessions with the object of achieving peace. Peace, however, has not been achieved; the war has continued. After the adoption of each resolution of the Security Council, the Iranian régime has undertaken a new campaign to invade Iraq, to reinforce its political blackmail with a military act it has tried to impose on the ground. If, God forbid, the Iranian régime had been successful in only one of those invasions, which we have opposed and foiled, that would have been enough for Iran to establish its hegemony over the entire Gulf area and to extend its power even further, thereby overturning all balances and confronting the world with a dangerous situation.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Now there exists a binding resolution, adopted by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter - resolution 598 (1987). It is the strongest resolution ever adopted concerning the conflict, and it is also among the strongest resolutions adopted by the Security Council in its history. It was adopted unanimously by the 15 members of the Security Council, and is unambiguously clear; its meaning needs no interpretation. The first step in implementing it is the observance of a comprehensive cease-fire, with withdrawal to internationally-recognized borders; the second is the establishment of supervision over that process; the third is the release and repatriation of prisoners-of-war. Thus the various steps follow each other in sequence. This is what Security Council resolution 598 (1987) says, not the delegation of Iraq.

Now we see the representatives of Iran attacking the Security Council, as they did seven years ago, and placing conditions on it. They have rejected this balanced resolution, and they want the Security Council to interpret its own resolutions in the manner they, the representatives of Iran, desire. They want the Council to read the resolution in Persian!

What we call for is respect by the Security Council for its own resolution and its strong rejection of the attempts at blackmail and deception. This is not just an Iraqi demand; it is a demand in harmony with the resolution and its true meaning. We regret that some of those who voted for the resolution are acquiescing in the attempted acts of blackmail and deception by Iran although they participated in its formulation and voted for it.

We hope that there will be an end to those attempts and that the text of the resolution, which was adopted unanimously by members of the Council, will be observed. We also call on the Council to move forward unhesitatingly, without succumbing to any kind of manoeuvre or blackmail, within the context of

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

resolution 598 (1987), namely, use of the means provided by the Charter for the purpose of establishing comprehensive and durable peace.

I should like on this occasion to state again that we welcome resolution 598 (1987) and are prepared to co-operate with the Secretary-General and the Security Council to implement it faithfully and honestly and as it stands. We shall strongly reject any attempt to review the resolution or the arrangement of its provisions.

Finally, I should like to point out that if one is searching for more evidence on the contempt of the Iranian régime for international law and its non-adherence to its obligations under the Charter, then the statement of the President of that régime, made on Tuesday last made from this rostrum, provides the best possible such evidence. It was full of insults and abusive language against the Security Council and its permanent and non-permanent members over more than seven years, numbering more than 40 Member States from all continents.

The President of the Iranian régime, speaking from the rostrum of the United Nations, did not say that his country adheres to the Charter of the United Nations and international law. He delivered a lecture to the Assembly on the concepts of his régime and his concept of international relations. He did not commit himself to respect the rules of our age, developed over the 40 years that have passed since the establishment of the United Nations.

That statement, full of falsifications and lies and contradicted by the daily actions of the Iranian régime over the last nine years, clears any remaining doubts to the true position of that aggressive and expansionist régime. The statement puts an end to all the utterances, which have no basis in reality, that have been made in certain circles concerning a probable change in Iran's position on the resolutions of this Organization and the will of the international community.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

The President of the Iranian régime in fact declared war on the international community and the system of international relations as we know it in this Hall, filled as it is, with the representatives of the peoples of the world. He has revealed all the cards which the Iranian régime, and those who keep it company, have tried to cover. It remains for the international community - and the Security Council in particular - to declare itself, to affirm its credibility and to maintain before the world respect for the Charter of the United Nations, the hope of all peoples, on which they rely to face aggression decisively and achieve a just peace.

Mr. CAPUTO (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My first words are words of congratulation to you, Sir, on your unanimous election to the Presidency of the General Assembly. The delegation of Argentina is pleased to have supported the election of the Bureau. Let me assure you that we will co-operate with you in your efforts so that the forty-second session of the General Assembly may contribute to the solution of the problems facing mankind.

At the same time I wish to acknowledge the wisdom with which my distinguished colleague Mr. Humayun Rasheed Chowdhury fulfilled his duties.

I wish also to express our congratulations to Ambassador Joseph Verner Reed in his new duties as Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs.

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

From this rostrum, we often warn about the serious crises that affect our planet and we call attention to the misunderstandings and conflicts that threaten the harmony of mankind.

I believe that in 1987 we must begin recognizing the progress towards peace that has taken place in the world. One fact suffices to explain my statement, which is also the reason for my hope - the recent historic understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union concerning the dismantling of short- and medium-range missiles in Europe. It is the first time since the development of nuclear weapons that an effective commitment to disarmament has been initiated. The fact that common sense has prevailed in the relationship between the major Powers is, I believe, the event of the greatest political importance to affect the planet in recent decades.

All members of the international community have an important role to play in this regard. Nuclear disarmament is undoubtedly a priority task, which cannot be delayed. With that conviction, the leaders of Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, Tanzania and Argentina are actively pursuing the initiative for peace and disarmament known as the Group of Six, which since its inception has postulated the adoption of decisions that might halt and reverse the nuclear arms race.

In the multilateral sphere, we feel encouraged by the progress evidenced in the disarmament conference towards achieving a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. We hope to see that convention materialize in the near future, on a non-discriminatory basis.

There is thus evidence in the world of a greater willingness to have recourse to negotiation as the proper way of approaching the solution of conflicts. Such an attitude must obviously be encouraged by all means - among these, our Organization, the United Nations, provides an ideal framework for the development of negotiations

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

and understandings. In that sense, my Government wishes to stress the tireless activity of our Secretary-General, whose efforts to make the United Nations the most valuable element for peace available to us are widely recognized and appreciated. His work is a source of legitimate pride for his country - so dear to us Argentines - and for our regional group, from which he was chosen.

In its participation in the Security Council Argentina is inspired by its desire to make a concrete and effective contribution to the strengthening of the United Nations. Through our votes, and our participation in general, in the Security Council we have in view the consolidation of the system set forth in the Charter, convinced as we are that small and medium-sized countries may contribute significantly to the maintenance of international peace and security.

In that light, we have considered various international conflicts. Some of them, such as the war between Iran and Iraq and the questions of southern Africa and the Middle East, are obvious and exert daily pressure on the international conscience through their manifestations of destruction and death. Others, such as terrorism and drug trafficking, constitute a more subtle and less orthodox, but none the less dangerous, form of violence.

As regards the armed conflict between Iraq and Iran, we have achieved, with the agreement reached among the 15 members of the Security Council, which led to the adoption of resolution 598 (1987), an instrument that allows us to act, to mediate and to promote conditions would allow both countries to safeguard their vital interests, preserve their national honour and dignity, and, above all, regain peace. But we are seriously concerned by the events that have taken place since the adoption of Security Council resolution 598 (1987). That is why, in the view of the Argentine Government, immediate compliance with a cease-fire is necessary as

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

the primary and indispensable condition for achieving the objectives set forth in resolution 598 (1987).

The main challenge is, indeed, to achieve peace, but it also seems appropriate to state that we face another challenge - that of demonstrating the effectiveness of our Organization and, in particular, of its Security Council. Accordingly, my Government believes that, without ever putting aside the exercise of political restraint, the Security Council should - if circumstances so require - intensify the search for machinery that might ensure the effective implementation of resolution 598 (1987).

Also among the many promising signs this year is the fact that the two Koreas are analysing proposals for reducing armaments and troops and are considering the possibility of signing a non-aggression pact. We must likewise call attention to the meeting of the German leaders as another element favouring the reduction of tension.

Among these encouraging events, the Latin American countries would, obviously, also wish to emphasize the development of the situation in Central America. It would be hard to enumerate all the meetings, contacts, proposals and negotiations carried out by the Foreign Ministers of the Contadora Group and the Support Group. Today, we can say that nothing seems to have been in vain, that no effort has been useless. But for that to be so, if peace again becomes possible it will undoubtedly be due to the political will of the five Central American countries whose Presidents, resolutely confronting the regional crisis, signed the Guatemala agreement on 7 August last with a view to working out fundamental solutions with regard to security, the consolidation of institutions, and social and economic development.

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

The Argentine Government continues to be firmly committed to its support of a lasting peace in Central America and has given evidence of that will in a practical way through its participation in the mechanism for the verification and follow-up of the Guatemala agreements drawn up at Caracas on 22 August.

There is therefore cause for rejoicing that peace in Central America appears possible, but we must also be aware that although the progress achieved is substantial, the situation remains fragile. No political will, no diplomatic skill, can ensure peace without self-determination, non-interference, pluralistic democracy and economic development. And we are all well aware how difficult it is to bring about these conditions. It is therefore essential that the entire international community co-operate in order to create the basic conditions for peace in Central America. If we rejoice at peace, if we search for it and preach it, let us all share the responsibility for its attainment.

The situation in the Middle East continues to be unstable and dangerous. We consider it imperative to continue to explore all feasible formulas for obtaining a just, honourable and equitable peace. We are convinced that this will become possible only if the solution includes recognition, at the same time, of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to live in their own territory - with the authorities and forms of government they freely choose - and the rights of all States of the region - obviously including Israel - to live within internationally recognized boundaries. In that context, the convening of an international peace conference under the auspices of the United Nations, with the participation and approval of all parties, would represent a definite step forward.

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

With regard to the critical scene in the Middle East we continue to follow with particular concern the situation in Lebanon, and we feel it is necessary to step up efforts to ensure that Lebanon may recover its full territorial sovereignty and exercise its inalienable right to live free of all foreign interference.

The growing deterioration of the situation in southern Africa and the problems of that region have a common cause in South Africa's persistent refusal to abide by the decisions of the United Nations. The continuation of the apartheid régime constitutes one of the worst and most urgent of today's problems. Argentina reiterates its solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa and its rejection of the Pretoria régime, whose inflexibility endangers international peace and security.

In addition, the Government of South Africa continues to occupy illegally the Territory of Namibia. It is imperative that progress be made towards the self-determination and independence of the Namibian people. To that end, the Organization must fully assume its direct responsibility over the Territory, adopting the measures necessary for that purpose. In this connection, as in the question of apartheid, my country supports the adoption of mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter, since we view that as the most appropriate and effective means to establish justice and the principles of the Charter in southern Africa.

Tense situations between States are often aggravated by acts of international terrorism. The General Assembly has unanimously condemned such criminal acts. We undertake to lend our support to the search for measures that would enable us to make co-operation in this area even more effective.

Argentina also wishes to reaffirm in the General Assembly its support for the legitimate and just aspiration of the Republic of Bolivia to recover a direct

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

outlet to the Pacific Ocean. We have followed with interest and attention the talks that took place at Montevideo and we hope that the spirit in which they were convened may be renewed in the search for a solution through negotiation and dialogue.

The identification of our foreign policy with the principles and purposes of the United Nations is concretely evidenced in those subjects in which we are directly involved. Thus, with regard to the question of the Malvinas Islands, the Argentine Government is firmly committed to the search of a peaceful and lasting settlement of the sovereignty dispute and related problems that at present exist between my country and the United Kingdom. In this context we have accepted General Assembly resolution 41/40, which requests both Governments to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the problems pending between both countries, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. It is worth recalling that that resolution received overwhelming support, which included close friends of the United Kingdom. That wide support confirms the genuine interest of the international community in finding a solution to the question of the Malvinas Islands.

Unfortunately, that feeling of the international community has not been shared by the British Government, which has repeatedly rejected the idea of global negotiations without exclusions that may allow us to resolve the dispute between the two countries.

The Argentine Republic, while reaffirming its sovereign rights over the Malvinas, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding sea, also repeats its permanent willingness for dialogue, its decision to respect the interests and life-style of the inhabitants of the Malvinas, guaranteeing their

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

well-being and prosperity, and its firm commitment to peace. In that sense my Government expresses its permanent willingness to find mechanisms that may ensure peace in that region without altering in any manner its titles and claims over the islands.

The Argentine Government expresses once more its gratitude for the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions, in the question of the Malvinas. My Government appreciates his efforts and is convinced that the Organization has an important role to play in the process of settling the dispute over the Islands.

Turning to another area, my delegation is duty-bound to express its gratitude to the outstanding and noble task of the World Commission for the Environment, presided over by the Prime Minister of Norway.

The relative reduction in world tension will enable us to devote greater efforts and resources to environmental conservation and to ensure a harmonious and sustained development. From that perspective, for example, the Malvinas region, which today is an area of tension, might, through appropriate solutions, become a region for co-operation and détente that would generate progress and development, with a priority concept of environmental conservation. Once the Argentine territorial claim has been answered, the South Atlantic might become a formidable experiment for co-operation and progress with an inestimable effect on the economies of the Malvinas and Patagonia.

Today Latin America is confronting a triple challenge.

In the first place, there is a challenge to recover and strengthen the democratic political system in places where it has not hitherto existed or where it had been allowed to lapse. The 1980s signalled the recovery of the founding ideals and values of our region. Our destiny is once more in the hands of our peoples.

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

Nothing could be more encouraging for universal peace, because a democratic Latin America is a guarantee of stability and common sense for all the international community.

In this new stage, in itself fragile because of the traces left by authoritarianism in Latin America, we are now confronted with a second challenge, the challenge of the threat of war in Central America, the consequences of which would undoubtedly affect the entire region. Contadora has shown that Latin America is capable of facing this second challenge, even at times when all hope seemed lost.

Our region also faces a third challenge, that of resolving the crisis caused by the external debt and the distortion of the international economic and financial system. Our peoples and Governments have also shown their abilities and decisiveness vis-à-vis this challenge, which casts the darkest shadows over our future.

The consequences of this crises were defined with common sense and resolve in the Cartagena consensus, in which, with unprecedented courage, we initiated structural adjustment programmes that meant and continue to mean great sacrifices for our peoples.

At the same time, we understand that we are facing a re-organization of international political and economic relations and, in spite of the narrow perspectives of the present day, we have made significant progress towards shaping a common regional space. This is evident, for example, in the creation of the so-called Rio Group which, at the forthcoming meeting of the eight Presidents to be held in Mexico, will take one more step towards the integration of Latin America.

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

Consolidation of political systems, a concrete contribution to peace, compliance with the demands of an exorbitant and unfair debt, far-reaching economic restructuring, substantial progress towards integration - these, in short, are some of our achievements in response to that triple challenge. Nobody could reasonably expect so much; nobody could reasonably demand more of us.

However, despite all this, our future is still dark. The present economic situation cannot continue without the chances of deep social crises, which would seriously affect all the progress that we have made. Latin America cannot and should not continue to subsidize the creditor countries as a net exporter of capital. Latin America cannot continue to be the victim of trade wars between the industrialized countries, which have caused an unprecedented fall in the prices of its traditional products, while markets are closed or lost because of the unfair competition created by subsidies. Common sense prevents us waiting passively for an end to that situation.

A few figures suffice to show the magnitude of the Latin American economic problem. In the last five years alone the main countries of the region have produced a net transfer of capital to the developed world of about \$150 billion, which represents an annual reduction of approximately 5 per cent in the investment capacity of our countries, whose investment levels are already below those needed for sustained growth.

Those figures and that situation are applicable to all the other countries of Latin America, too, and we are sure that our Latin American brothers feel the same. We Argentines have no doubt that the main responsibility for change and growth in our country lies with the Argentine people themselves. Like all our Latin American brothers, we do not beg for help or shift on responsibility on the

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

other shoulders. Having said this, we must affirm that we have no doubt either how limited is the viability of our countries, however hard we try to achieve our own reforms, however much we reduce our concessions to legitimate social demands, however firmly we reject any demagogic temptation, as long as the present international situation persists. In present international conditions resulting from the debt and the restrictions on trade it will be very difficult to achieve the goal of strengthening democracy and securing an acceptable level of development.

The majority of the industrialized countries, if not all, often show their solidarity when an authoritarian régime afflicts our nations; similarly, they rejoice when we Latin Americans return to democracy. It is high time for us to state clearly that we Latin Americans hope that we shall not again in the future need that solidarity in our misfortunes, not having found solidarity in our reconstruction. In that case it would be, as President Alfonsín has so often said, a post-mortem solidarity.

Rightly, since we are responsible for our own future, and are determined never again to need that post-mortem solidarity, we believe that it is not possible to deal with situations which are no longer traditional and conventional with the traditional and conventional models and instruments. This is true of the debt. It is fair to acknowledge that in several developed countries there is a growing understanding of the need for a new, unconventional approach to a new problem. The United States Senate recently passed a Bill in which, analysing the question of the external debt, it proposed the creation of an international authority to develop new methods so that creditors and debtors might find a solution to this problem on which to a great extent the present and future of Latin America now depend.

(Mr. Caputo, Argentina)

The viability of democracy, its continuity and its strength depend above all on the hope of the people, the conviction that it is democracy that makes possible the struggle for a better future. It must be made clear to the Assembly that in Latin America the persistence of the unjust situation created by the debt and discriminatory trade practices is destroying the hope of the peoples.

Mr. KUSUMAATMADJA (Indonesia): Allow me first, on behalf of the Indonesian delegation, to extend our sincere congratulations to Mr. Peter Florin on his election as President at the forty-second session of the General Assembly. His elevation to that high office is a tribute to his personal qualities and record of great distinction in the service of his Government and of the international community. I am fully confident that under his stewardship we shall achieve substantive progress in our work.

To his distinguished predecessor, Mr. Humayun Rasheed Choudhury, I wish to convey our deep gratitude for, and appreciation of, the exemplary manner in which he presided over our deliberations during the last session.

The past year has been marked by several significant developments affecting the course of international relations. During the forty-first session the Assembly took a momentous decision to strengthen and revitalize the functioning of the United Nations. Its implications went beyond the confines of improving the Organization's administrative efficiency and financial viability and provided a critical boost to its capacity to face the multiple challenges confronting the international community. It has resulted in renewed confidence and recognition of the irreplaceable role and value of the United Nations as the unique multilateral framework for dealing with the global problems of our time.

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

The ability of the United Nations to rally the community of nations in common purpose to seek solutions to a diversity of critical issues has been manifest at various forums during the past year.

Last June some 140 nations gathered in Vienna for the International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking. The Declaration and Comprehensive Multidisciplinary Outline adopted at that Conference were clear manifestations of the ability of nations to forgo rhetoric and polemics in favour of jointly facing a common threat - not only a threat to the moral and social foundations of all societies, but indeed a potent threat to the youth who represent the future of all countries.

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

Meeting against the somber background of a global economy in the throes of persistent crisis, the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), convened in Geneva this summer, was able to overcome the paralysing differences and scepticism that had plagued previous sessions and achieved by consensus the Final Act of the Conference. In addressing squarely the key issues in the fields of trade, money, finance and development, the agreements reached may well presage a resurgence of momentum in the North-South dialogue and signal a reversal of the current malaise in international co-operation for development.

The recently concluded Conference on Disarmament and Development was yet another landmark in the process of jointly addressing two of the most urgent challenges facing the world today. For the first time at the intergovernmental level the close and multidimensional link between disarmament and development was explicitly acknowledged and the Final Document of the Conference committed participating Governments to making this relationship an effective and productive one.

We believe that, above all, the results of these conferences have contributed to arresting the erosion of multilateralism and to strengthening the commitment of Governments to the larger common interests and priority concerns of the international community.

While these are all encouraging developments, they cannot and should not divert our collective view from the dismal realities and dangerous anomalies that still condition the present international situation. Today, more than ever before, we have become aware of the dangers posed by an unrestrained arms race in the nuclear era, which, apart from its potent threat of mutual destruction, is now also acknowledged to be a serious impediment to the pursuit of optimal development. The world economy remains mired in prolonged crisis, international economic relations

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

are in acute imbalance, and economic development is bogged down in sharply reduced growth or stagnation. At the same time, the persistence of tensions and conflicts in many regions continue to take a heavy toll in both human and material resources of nations. The struggle for self-determination and true independence, justice and racial equality, economic progress and social emancipation must still contend with outmoded structures and new forms of neo-colonialist domination, pressures, interference and intervention.

If we are to move progressively towards a more viable world order of common security and common prosperity, there can be no alternative to fostering the renewed recognition of the value and indispensability of multilateral co-operation.

This is particularly relevant in the fields of disarmament and international security. I have earlier referred to the recently concluded Conference on Disarmament and Development. Indonesia welcomes the results that were achieved through the consensus of all participating States. Although it obviously fell short of our expectations, the Final Document of the Conference in our view provides us with a sufficiently broad framework for our future action and continuing efforts in these two interrelated fields upon which the building of a more peaceful, secure and prosperous world is so vitally dependent. In focusing global attention on the negative and far-reaching implications of current military expenditures, especially by the major Power blocs, for the world economy and the present international system and by highlighting the pervasive non-military threats to security, the Conference succeeded in establishing a compelling economic case against the arms race. It also underlined the imperative need to redirect resources released through disarmament to the improvement of the socio-economic conditions of the developing countries, especially. It is to be regretted that the Conference could not yet agree to provide for an international financial mechanism

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

to facilitate such a reallocation of resources. None the less, Indonesia expects that on the basis of the Action Programme that was adopted, this and other follow-up actions will be pursued in the context of an enhanced, interrelated perspective within the United Nations and its appropriate organs and agencies.

We are also greatly encouraged by the progress that is being made in the disarmament negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. We welcome their agreement in principle to conclude a treaty eliminating all intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear missiles - a treaty which, however limited in scope, would for the first time involve the actual dismantling of specific categories of nuclear weapons. Such an accord may, it is to be hoped, lead to further agreements on the larger issues of strategic and space armaments.

More importantly, it is to be hoped that this initial but significant achievement may bring about a new atmosphere and give a fresh impetus to the multilateral disarmament negotiations now in progress in Geneva. Bilateral agreements between the super-Powers only, while providing the necessary catalyst towards general disarmament, do not meet the goal of eliminating all nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction under effective international control. Although primary responsibility indeed rests with those who possess a monopoly of destructive power, all States have a vital stake in disarmament and therefore have the right and the duty to contribute to this process. If concrete progress is to be made in genuine arms limitation and disarmament, then multilateral negotiations under the aegis of the United Nations should be the rule rather than the exception. Accordingly, the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva should be allowed to perform its rightful function as the single multilateral negotiating forum in the field of disarmament. In this context, we should like in particular to see the

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

Conference on Disarmament complete as soon as possible the negotiations on a chemical-weapons convention and continue to deal with such questions as a comprehensive test ban and the prevention of an arms race in outer space on a high-priority basis.

Our collective efforts to strengthen international co-operation and to meet the challenges of the future can hardly succeed while unresolved conflicts continue to rage in many regions of the world. It is of the utmost importance to bring to an early end the strife and turmoil which have their source in the continued violation of the fundamental rights of nations and peoples as envisaged in the Charter. This is painfully self-evident in the region of southern Africa, where institutionalized racism and the remaining vestiges of colonialism continue to affront our shared sense of justice and morality.

Despite world-wide censure and condemnation, the racist Pretoria régime has intensified its campaign of brute terror against the oppressed majority and persists in its illegal occupation of Namibia. Its lawless and predatory nature is further reflected in its incessant acts of aggression, political destabilization and economic strangulation against its neighbours, particularly the front-line States, thus posing a constant threat to regional and international peace and security.

Apartheid is at the root of the deepening crisis in southern Africa and must be eradicated in its totality. It is high time for those who pay lip service to the dismantling of that inhuman system but who continue to lend credence and support to Pretoria to cease such duplicitous behaviour and join the international community in working towards the objective of a free, non-racial and democratic society in South Africa.

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

Likewise, the liberation of Namibia is a sine qua non for the re-establishment of peace and stability region-wide. It is utterly unacceptable that after almost 10 years since the adoption of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence South Africa continues to cling to irrelevant pretexts such as the presence of Cuban troops in Angola to block its implementation. Indonesia has long been convinced that Pretoria will not voluntarily co-operate in the realization of the genuine independence of Namibia and that the only alternative is to compel it to comply with United Nations decisions.

The Security Council can no longer justify any further procrastination in imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. For if there is one Government against which Articles 39 and 40 of the United Nations Charter should appropriately be applied it is surely the renegade régime in Pretoria.

Time and again the search for a just and durable peace in the Middle East has been thwarted by Israel's brazen acts of expansionist aggression against its neighbours, its reign of terror and repression in the occupied Arab territories and its illegal policies and practices directed towards the goal of ultimate annexation of Arab lands and the permanent denial of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and independent statehood. Let there be no illusions among us that it is precisely in pursuance of those sinister designs that Israel is bent upon sabotaging any prospect of the convening of the international conference on peace in the Middle East. There is also no doubt that Israel's intransigence could hardly be sustained without the virtual carte blanche extended to it by its powerful friends and supporters.

My Government remains convinced that it is only through the proposed international peace conference that a viable negotiating framework can be established within which all the dimensions of the Arab-Israeli conflict and its

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

core aspect of Palestinian self-determination can be comprehensively addressed. It would also provide an acceptable forum where all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, could participate on an equal footing.

Given the ever present danger of escalating violence and widening conflict, there should be no further delay in preparing for the conference. We fully concur with the Secretary-General that questions of procedure should not present insurmountable obstacles and that our priority concern should continue to be directed towards what the conference would achieve in terms of the objective of just and lasting peace in accordance with the aspirations of the peoples of the region.

Recent initiatives undertaken by the Security Council offer renewed hope of a mutually acceptable negotiated settlement of the agonizing conflict between Iran and Iraq, which has lasted far too long and has inflicted such grievous loss of human life and material destruction on both sides. The protracted hostilities now threaten to expand into wider conflagration, including the deepening involvement of extraregional Powers, which we cannot but view with serious concern. It is Indonesia's fervent hope that the Secretary-General's current efforts, mandated by Security Council resolution 598 (1987), will succeed in bringing an end to war and paving the way towards a comprehensive, just and honourable peace.

In the subregion of South-East Asia the unresolved conflict situation in Kampuchea still constitutes the one major obstacle blocking the path towards stable peace, regional harmony and common prosperity. Despite continuing hopes for some movement in the direction of a just and comprehensive settlement through dialogue and negotiation, the profound and legitimate aspirations of the Kampuchean people to an end to foreign intervention and the presence of foreign forces on its soil,

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

and to self-determination and national reconciliation still remain unfulfilled. My Government is acutely aware of the complications and dangers of the prolonged impasse in resolving this tragic conflict, which cannot but be contrary to the interests of all the parties concerned. Thus, in July of this year Indonesia, as interlocutor for the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), arrived at an understanding with Viet Nam on the holding of an informal meeting, without pre-conditions and with no political labels, of all political factions of the Kampuchean people, on an equal footing, in which at a later stage Viet Nam and other countries concerned would be invited to participate.

We sincerely believe that this two-stage informal get-together would be a useful device in breaking the deadlock and preparing for actual negotiations towards a settlement of the Kampuchean problem in all its complex ramifications. We regret to note that this understanding has subsequently evoked differing interpretations among some of the parties directly concerned. Nevertheless, Indonesia, together with the other States members of ASEAN, stands ready to engage Viet Nam in the continued search for a political solution that would lead to the restoration of a genuinely independent, neutral and non-aligned Kampuchea, while at the same time assuring the legitimate interest of all countries in the region in living in peace with one another free from extraregional pressures and interference.

On the situation in Afghanistan, we have taken note with keen interest of the progress made and the obstacles that remain in the efforts aimed at finding a viable settlement. A negotiated solution based on the withdrawal of foreign forces and the restoration of the independence, sovereignty and non-aligned status of Afghanistan would not only bring peace and national reconciliation to the valiant Afghan people but also contribute to greater harmony and stability in the relationships among the States in the region and beyond.

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

Recent events in New Caledonia have shown that a process of decolonization which ignores or suppresses the innate rights of the indigenous people cannot yield a just or durable outcome. The holding of a referendum under such conditions serves only to exacerbate the divisions and strife in the Territory.

Self-determination and the peaceful transition to an independent New Caledonia can come about only if it is fully in accordance with the fundamental rights and interests of the indigenous Kanak people, while at the same time guaranteeing the rights and interests of all inhabitants of the Territory's multi-ethnic and multiracial society.

With so many persistent conflicts defying peaceful resolution, it is with particular satisfaction that Indonesia welcomes the conclusion of the agreement between the Central American States to establish a stable and lasting peace in accordance with the principles of sovereignty, common security, non-interference, self-determination, democracy and development. The accord represents a clear reaffirmation that dialogue and negotiations among the regional States themselves constitute the most effective means of resolving regional problems. It is now more essential than ever for all the parties involved, including countries external to the subregion, to sustain the momentum of the peace process and make possible the emergence of a regional order truly responsive to the basic interests and aspirations of the peoples of Central America.

In the economic sphere, the international agenda this year has been dominated by the convening of the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). That Conference assumed crucial importance because it was expected not only to address the key issues central to the health of the world economy but also to revive the stalemated dialogue between the developed North and the developing South and reactivate multilateral co-operation for development.

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

The Conference was held against the dismal backdrop of a world economy caught in serious imbalances and dislocations. As summarized in UNCTAD.VIII's agreed assessment of global economic trends, compared with the preceding two decades the world economy in the 1980s has been characterized by a slowdown in growth of demand and output despite generally lower rates of inflation. Many developing countries are experiencing serious difficulties in adapting to structural changes under the impact of such acute reversals as mounting external debt burdens, high real interest rates, increased protectionism and commodity prices depressed to their lowest levels in 50 years. In short, the present decade is witnessing a generally insecure economic environment in which millions of people still lack the basic conditions for a decent life.

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

It is a matter of considerable satisfaction to Indonesia that after long and often strenuous debate UNCTAD VII could in the end unanimously agree on a set of policy measures covering the four key interrelated areas of resources for development, commodities, international trade and the problems of the least developed countries. Obviously, these policy measures still fall far short of the expectations of the Group of 77 as expressed in the Havana Declaration. Indeed, some of these prescribed policies amount to a simple reiteration of earlier unimplemented policy measures and are thus wholly inadequate to meet the aggravated situation of today. Nevertheless, judged against the background of the persistent crisis enveloping much of the developing world and the stalemate in the North-South dialogue, the consensus achieved represents a step in the right direction.

One development which was the highlight of the Conference, and which is of particular interest to my delegation, was the decision by the USSR to sign the Common Fund Agreement, thus opening up the very real likelihood of an early entry into force of the agreement. We trust that the follow-up action for the speedy operation of the Fund will also be promptly undertaken. But the major overall conclusion that can be drawn is that UNCTAD has emerged stronger from the process, thereby rebuffing the efforts by some to marginalize its role.

While quite understandably preoccupied with the more immediate threats to our development efforts, we should not lose sight of the longer-term challenges confronting us. The multiple crises which are currently besetting the world can no longer be viewed or addressed in their sectoral compartmentalization. As the Secretary-General aptly points out in his report on the work of the Organization, the symbiosis of development, environment and population is beginning to be better appreciated. In facing this challenge we welcome the timely decision of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to submit to

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

this session of the General Assembly two major reports of great relevance, namely the Environmental Perspective to the Year 2000 and Beyond, and the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, entitled "Our Common Future". It is indeed crucial for us to ensure accelerated growth and development in order to meet our present needs without compromising the well-being of our future generations. This is essentially what we understand to be the meaning of sustainable development. We agree with the World Commission that poverty is a major cause and effect of global environmental problems; and that it would be futile to attempt to deal with environmental problems without a broader perspective covering the underlying world poverty and international inequality. It is also undeniable that sustainable development would be further enhanced by an international atmosphere of peace, security and co-operation free from the presence and the threat of war, especially nuclear war, and the waste of intellectual and natural resources on armaments.

Turning to the world social situation, we must remain vigilant so as to ensure that the substantial progress already achieved in various fields will not fall victim to the adverse trends in the global economy.

In Indonesia and the other countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the implementation of programmes such as that of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) on the strategy of child survival and development, which is supported at the highest levels of Government, has led to immeasurable improvements in the quality of life of our peoples. Central to this success is the importance of widespread popular participation and guidance, as recently manifested by the adoption of an agenda for action by parliamentarians from the ASEAN region in support of this strategy. If such direction can be sustained our goal of health for all by the year 2000 can indeed become a reality. In Indonesia, social

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

development programmes continue to enjoy the strong personal support of President Soeharto and have resulted in dramatic advances, particularly in such areas as the immunization of children. Despite the severe constraints of economic adjustment, social development has also been greatly accelerated both by the institution of integrated health and social services and by the increased attention being focused on improving the status of women.

I have already alluded to the results of the International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking. The progress achieved in that forum should now be sustained with decisive action at the national, regional and international level. Of critical importance in this regard is the speedy finalization of the new draft convention against illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, as a necessary complement to existing international instruments.

Indonesia is also encouraged by the progress that has been achieved in the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority and for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. The registration of India as the first pioneer investor is a significant augury for the implementation of the provisions of the Convention as regards the sea-bed régime and resolution II of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. Indonesia urges all States which have not done so to ratify the Convention to ensure its early entry into force.

It is quite apparent that the economic and social issues of our time have become increasingly multidimensional in character and closely interrelated. We therefore concur with the Secretary-General's observation in his annual report that "in dealing with this web of global problems, the United Nations system will need to be more fully integrated, and better able to follow priorities established for the system as a whole". (A/42/1, p. 14)

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

In this connection, my delegation has noted with interest his proposal to strengthen the role of the Economic and Social Council in order to make it more consonant with the original intent of the Charter. We are confident that in conducting the in-depth study of the United Nations intergovernmental structure in the economic and social fields the Council's Special Commission will give this proposal the serious consideration that it deserves.

At the same time it should always be borne in mind that all efforts to strengthen the role, improve the functioning and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the United Nations and its organs will remain marginal unless they are matched by the consistent support, including financial support, of all Member States. Therefore, in order to reach an effective solution to the current crisis confronting the Organization it is necessary to re-emphasize at this time the imperative need for all Member States to fulfil their financial obligations under the Charter.

In a world of increasing interdependence of nations and interrelationship of issues, international co-operation is no longer an option, it is a necessity. Equally, recognition of the fundamental rights and interests of all nations and peoples, apart from being a moral imperative, is an essential prerequisite for lasting peace. The eradication of the poverty and deprivation which afflict vast areas of the world can no longer be regarded as a long-term goal; it is of urgent relevance to national and international security. If the pursuit of these objectives is to achieve tangible results it is to the revitalization of the multilateral institutions that we must turn.

(Mr. Kusumaatmadja, Indonesia)

While our Organization is obviously not without deficiencies, our hopes for a new world order must lie not in the rejection but in the rejuvenation of the United Nations. Utilizing the system effectively is as important as changing it. Together we should exert continuous efforts to strengthen the United Nations as the principal collective instrument through which Members can resolve the fundamental global issues confronting humanity.

Mr. LENIHAN (Ireland): I should like to express my congratulations to Mr. Peter Florin on his election as President of the forty-second session of the General Assembly. I am sure that our work will benefit greatly from his Presidency. I should like also to avail myself of this opportunity to thank his predecessor for his able leadership of the forty-first session.

This forty-second session of the General Assembly convenes at a very important juncture in world affairs. For the first time for many years there is the prospect of significant arms control. Agreement between the two super-Powers is now under way. The agreement in principle that was announced last week is very welcome as an important first contribution to what we hope will be a continuing disarmament process. We were reminded very recently at the Conference held here on disarmament and development of the extent to which the existence of excessive armaments across the whole spectrum is a burden on the international community as a whole. It is a burden which must be reduced. We are encouraged by the readiness of the super-Powers to begin the process of disarmament, which we believe will serve as a step towards a more general easing of international tensions.

We cannot, however, lose sight of the many elements of instability which continue to mar the international scene. The agenda for this session is composed of as long a list of conflicts unresolved and disputes unsettled as any of its predecessors. In addition to regional conflicts we are faced with a lack of respect for human rights; the emergence, or in some cases re-emergence, of famine conditions; and ever increasing expenditure on armaments including in particular expenditure by those nations which can least afford it. These remain the sad realities for far too many of the world's inhabitants.

How well equipped is this Organization to tackle this particular agenda? We are all aware of the criticisms which are made of the United Nations and its

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

affiliated bodies. It is said that the United Nations is selective in the topics with which it chooses to deal, that it is partial in its criticisms and that it has been wasteful of its resources. Of course it is an imperfect institution operating in a very imperfect world. Friends of the United Nations, among which my Government would wish to be regarded, must admit that there has been and remains an element of truth in those claims. We are just as conscious of the flaws in this Organization as any, but we are dedicated to remedying those flaws.

At the same time it is also essential to emphasize the genuine achievements of the Organization. How can one ignore the contribution of the United Nations to the process of decolonization; its part in the protection and promotion of human rights throughout the world; its work and that of the specialized agencies within its framework for development and for the eradication of disease and hunger; its efforts to promote the goal of disarmament, including in particular the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty; and the part which its peace-making and peace-keeping machinery has played in resolving or sometimes defusing conflicts which could have escalated much further?

The value of the mechanisms offered by the United Nations to Member States as an alternative to the threat or use of force should not be underestimated. In this regard the major Powers, which have been given very special rights under the Charter, have a particular responsibility. If they take the lead in co-operating to make the United Nations systems work more effectively and live up to the hopes of its founders they can be confident that they will have the support of the great majority of the Members of the Organization.

There are grounds, especially in recent times, for cautious optimism. In particular, developments in the past few weeks encourage my delegation to the view that the United Nations will continue to occupy the central place in the conduct of world affairs assigned to it by its Charter.

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

First, I would refer to the Security Council. The recent initiative taken by the Council, with the support of all its members, in the long-running conflict between Iran and Iraq has shown a willingness on the part of the members of that body to discharge the responsibilities vested in them by the Charter. The unity of purpose manifested on that occasion offers the hope that those provisions of the Charter conceived as central to the functioning of the United Nations as a world Organization can be implemented for the effective maintenance of international peace and security.

Secondly, in a somewhat different order of ideas, the adoption by consensus at last year's session of a comprehensive resolution on the reform of administrative and budgetary procedures in the United Nations marked a significant stage in the Organization's development. It is important that the unity and spirit of compromise shown then should not be a transient phenomenon but should influence the ongoing implementation of these measures of reform. Those measures safeguard the essential functioning of the United Nations as an organization of sovereignly equal States committed to the purposes and principles of the Charter. The role played by the Secretary-General in promoting the updating and streamlining of the Organization has been a key factor in the progress made to date. It is essential that he be given the fullest possible support in managing the financial and human resources of the Organization.

While a beginning has been made in establishing a basis for sensible budget-making within the United Nations, the financial situation of the Organization remains precarious. All Member States have, in subscribing to the Charter, committed themselves to meet their mandatory financial obligations in

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

full. The payment of such contributions is therefore a legal requirement, binding on the Member States in the same manner as their other international obligations.

My Government attaches a central importance to the peace-keeping activities of the United Nations and is proud that Ireland has been able to contribute to most of the Organization's peace-keeping operations. Responsibility for the establishment of a peace-keeping force rests with the Security Council. It is therefore in the first instance to the members of the Council that troop contributors look for support in the discharge of the tasks which they have been mandated, and have agreed, to undertake. That support is essential if the mandate of an operation is to be implemented in full and if its financing is to be assured. In addition, a peace-keeping force can, of course, succeed in its tasks only if it enjoys the full co-operation of the parties to the conflict.

Judged against those criteria, the situation of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) gives cause for some disquiet. Over the past 14 months three members of the Irish contingent have lost their lives while on duty in south Lebanon. Other contingents there have also suffered casualties. It is unacceptable that co-operation continues to be withheld from the Force and that the mandate which has been renewed at regular intervals since it was first adopted in 1978 remains inoperable. My Government continues to call for the complete withdrawal from southern Lebanon of Israeli troops, the dismantling of the so-called security zone and an end to harassment of United Nations peace-keeping troops by irregular forces.*

* Mr. Saldivar (Paraguay), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

The Secretary-General, too, has repeatedly called for the necessary co-operation to be extended to UNIFIL so as to allow it to complete a mission which has been undertaken in the interests of peace and with the backing of the international community. My delegation strongly endorses that call and supports the Secretary-General in that particular matter. The Secretary-General has also pointed to the unsatisfactory financial position of the Force caused by the continued withholding of contributions due in respect of both the present and previous mandate periods. If troop contributors are to continue to undertake these onerous responsibilities, all concerned must decide to act in full conformity with the Security Council's mandate to the Force.

Since the founding of this Organization, East-West relations have been a central preoccupation of the international community. The capacity of the Security Council to discharge its primary responsibility for international peace and security is clearly influenced by the state of super-Power relations. This is a reality. Recent indications of positive developments in East-West relations are therefore of considerable interest to all Members of the United Nations. Ireland welcomes these indications and hopes that a secure foundation for a lasting dialogue will now be laid, in the belief that more secure and stable international relations can result from a process of comprehensive and realistic dialogue between the super-Powers.

We attach importance in particular to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) process as a significant aspect of East-West relations. This established framework for dealing with security and co-operation between East and West in Europe has brought notable improvements in the conditions of all of the people of Europe, East and West, as well as facilitating relations between the participating States. My Government hopes to see further developments in the process, leading to greater contacts between the peoples of Europe, more

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

sustained co-operation at the level of States, and more effective recognition of human rights, so that the impact of agreements reached can be felt by all Europeans. We hope to see a successful outcome in the course of this year, in the shape of a balanced and substantive final document as a follow-up to the meeting taking place at present in Vienna.

Successive sessions of the General Assembly have underlined the need for serious and sustained efforts to check the arms race. I have said already that we welcome the improved prospects of agreement for the first time between the United States and the Soviet Union to reduce the number of nuclear weapons on both sides. The agreement in principle to the global elimination of intermediate-range nuclear weapons is welcome in itself, but also as a step which will, we hope, lead to more general disarmament, and we must regard it as a first step in that direction. We hope, therefore, that it signals the beginning of a process conducive to the easing of international tensions more generally throughout the world. There is, I believe, a universal and deeply felt desire that these negotiations should continue with a view not only to preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth but also to bringing about a further reduction of nuclear weapons in all categories.

The conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty would be an obvious and practical step in inhibiting the further technical development of these weapons, thus helping to reduce reliance on these particular weapons by the nuclear-weapon States. A ban on testing, accompanied by the reduction in nuclear weapons that now appears imminent, would provide important and timely reassurance on the intentions of the nuclear-weapon States. Ireland is convinced that there are no technical obstacles in the way of such a ban, if the will exists.

The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development has only recently concluded its deliberations in these very halls and

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

we are happy that the participants agreed on a Final Document by consensus. The subjects of disarmament and development are at the very core of the concerns of this Organization. Ireland is persuaded that the need of all States for security can be met by progress in both disarmament and development. The international community should be alive to every opportunity to make use of resources freed by disarmament measures, undertaken for whatever reason, for the purposes of development.

Despite widespread condemnation by the United Nations and other international organizations and improved co-operation in implementing measures to deal with it, the serious threat posed by terrorism to human life and to international peace and security remains. Ambivalence with regard to terrorism and its perpetrators still persists. Along with our European partners, we have repeatedly and unambiguously condemned all acts of international terrorism, irrespective of the identities of those responsible, or their motivations. We must all ensure that the obligations we have assumed under international conventions are fulfilled; we must also pledge ourselves further to intensify existing bilateral and multilateral co-operation on practical anti-terrorism measures. Much of this can be carried out within the framework of the United Nations and its agencies, as exemplified by the work currently under way in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO). It behoves us all to do our utmost to see that terrorism ceases to be a threat to the orderly conduct of international relations.

An area of United Nations activity with which public opinion in my country has strongly identified is the work undertaken in the field of human rights. On the eve of the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we recall the great debt owed to the framers

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

of that document. Its assertion of inalienable rights to which every human being may lay claim represents a landmark in the struggle to secure freedom and justice for all. On the basis of that foundation, much valuable work has been done in the intervening years in the preparation of international instruments designed to expand and deepen the scope of the human rights canon.

Despite the existence of this impressive framework, violations of human rights, often on a serious scale, continue to occur. We call for a renewed commitment of effort on the part of all Member States so that each individual can effectively enjoy those rights to which he is formally entitled.

In his statement to the Assembly on 22 September the Foreign Minister of Denmark, speaking on behalf of the Twelve member States of the European Communities, addressed many of the regional conflicts with which we are confronted. I should like today to comment on the situation in those areas which, in the view of my delegation, give cause for particular concern.

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

First, the divisions and instabilities of the Middle East, on which I have already touched, remain a matter of consistent concern and high priority. We were greatly encouraged in the course of this year by the growing momentum towards the convening of an international conference, which we believe is the most timely and effective approach to bringing about a comprehensive and enduring peace in that area. We, in common with our European partners, have made clear our commitment to such an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations and our readiness to play an active role in assisting this process so far as we can. We urge all the parties concerned to renew and intensify their efforts to overcome those obstacles and difficulties which still stand in the way of the convening of a conference. We appreciate and support the Secretary-General's efforts to this end and with this purpose in mind.

We have followed with deepening concern the mounting toll of death and destruction as well as the growing threat to international peace and security posed by the conflict between Iraq and Iran. We appeal to the two belligerent countries to recognize the futility of continuing this war. We urge them to respond to the call of the Security Council for a cease-fire leading to a negotiated settlement. I would recall that we, the Members of this Organization, have conferred on the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. We support the efforts of the Secretary-General in the exercise of his good offices, with the aim of ensuring compliance with the Security Council resolution.

Elsewhere in that region, in Lebanon, religious and communal antagonisms continue. We are among those countries whose citizens are innocent victims of the hostage-taking and kidnapping, which has been a particularly deplorable characteristic of the continued violence in that country. We unreservedly condemn

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

this practice and appeal to all parties and forces in Lebanon to co-operate in securing the immediate release of all innocent victims. We urge all parties to show restraint so that reconciliation, national dialogue and reconstruction can commence. The cycle of violence must be broken as a necessary pre-condition for a peaceful solution based on respect for the sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

South Africa remains a source of serious concern to the whole international community. The events of the last year have brought no comfort to those who hope to see the apartheid system dismantled and the emergence in South Africa of a multiracial democracy in its stead. Massive repression continues unabated and censorship, in fact, has been greatly strengthened. Many thousands have suffered loss of freedom under the state of emergency, in addition to the iniquities that are inflicted daily on them by the apartheid system. The Government of South Africa continues to defy international opinion and has yet to demonstrate clearly that it is prepared to engage in genuine reform and to commence meaningful political dialogue with the authentic leaders of the majority community.

The steps which have been taken to maintain the apartheid system have had a malign influence elsewhere in the southern Africa region. Ireland has frequently condemned the continued activities of South Africa in seeking to destabilize its neighbours, whether through armed incursions into their territories by its security forces, support for paramilitary movements opposed to the Governments of its neighbours, or the application of economic pressure.

On Namibia, I call again on South Africa to desist from further obstructing progress towards Namibian independence in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). This resolution remains the basis for Namibian independence and the world community should continue to demand its implementation by South

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

Africa. The introduction of extraneous elements linking progress towards a Namibian settlement with developments elsewhere in the region is not acceptable.

The rapid withdrawal of Soviet troops, in accordance with an irrevocable timetable, remains the essential pre-condition if the long conflict in Afghanistan is to be brought to an end. A political solution must guarantee the Afghan people's right to self-determination, allow the return of the refugees and the re-establishment of Afghanistan's status as an independent and non-aligned country. We reaffirm our support for the efforts of the United Nations Secretary-General and the principles set out in successive United Nations resolutions.

We remain convinced that the basis for a just and lasting solution to the conflict in Kampuchea is contained in the Declaration of the International Conference on Kampuchea, which calls for the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops and the exercise by the Kampuchean people of their right to determine their own future. In the event of a withdrawal, effective steps should also be taken to prevent any armed group from seizing power by force or resorting to the threat of force to intimidate the Kampuchean people and thereby deprive them of their right to choose their own destiny. Kampuchea must be free both of foreign troops and of any prospect of a return to the appalling activities of the Khmer Rouge.

The agreement signed by the five Central American Presidents in Guatemala City in August has greatly enhanced the prospects of peace in that region and has given very real hope that the urgently needed improvements in the areas of human rights and social justice will be undertaken. We congratulate the Governments concerned on taking this important step towards achieving national reconciliation and the strengthening of democracy and on their renewed commitment to the objectives of the United Nations Charter and of the draft Contadora Act. We look forward to the full implementation of the agreement while being keenly aware of the extent of the

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

difficulties that have yet to be overcome. We urge the Governments involved to maintain their efforts and call on all other States in a position to do so to facilitate the peace process undertaken and now under way.

I have mentioned some of the regional conflicts which are the cause of particular concern. However, for millions of people, the immediate threat to their security and well-being is not a military or a political one. Their well-being is being continuously threatened by a lack of development. Many millions still lack the basic conditions for a decent life. Their condition is as much the concern of this Organization as is any other aspect of its purposes and principles.

The present insecure world economic environment - characterized by slow growth, sluggish trade and low commodity prices - provides a sombre background to our deliberations on global issues of development. The unfavourable economic environment affects us all. In my own country, the slow-down in world trade has contributed to high unemployment. A heavy debt-service burden has forced our Government to impose severe cut-backs on public expenditure. However, no country or group of countries has been as seriously and severely affected by the slow-down in world growth as have the least developed countries, particularly those of sub-Saharan Africa. In this regard I welcome the initiative which the Secretary-General has taken in establishing an advisory group to study and report on the balance-of-payments and debt crises as obstacles to the economic recovery of many African countries.

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

The interrelated issues of resources for development, commodities, international trade and the problems of the least-developed countries were considered at the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), in July. The discussions at the Conference showed welcome evidence of a readiness on the part of all countries to work together to improve the environment for accelerated and sustained development. The Final Act of the Conference reflects the broad understanding that was reached on the need for a number of policy approaches and concrete measures to address and deal with these problems.

The successful outcome of UNCTAD VII has also contributed to the restoration of confidence in our ability to tackle development questions within the framework of the United Nations. In an increasingly interdependent world, solutions to such problems can be found only through multilateral co-operation. The universal nature of the United Nations system confers a unique authority on the conclusions of conferences such as UNCTAD and complements the valuable practical work being carried out in developing countries by the United Nations Development Programme and by the specialized agencies. The indispensability of a global approach to development problems was further brought out in the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, published earlier this year. The challenge that faces the international community is to take the steps which we all agree are necessary in the interests of development and to make better use of the machinery of the United Nations to achieve our agreed objective.

The problem of Northern Ireland continues to be of major concern to the Irish Government. In successive years Irish Foreign Ministers have come to the General Assembly to describe the dimensions of the problem and to underline the urgency of finding a durable solution.

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

Since the meeting between the British and Irish Heads of Government in 1980, it has become an accepted principle that a solution to the Northern Ireland problem is to be found in the framework of Anglo-Irish co-operation. Out of that process emerged the Anglo-Irish Agreement between the British and Irish Governments, signed in November 1985 and registered here with the United Nations.

The Anglo-Irish Agreement represents both a commitment and a challenge for the British and Irish Governments. For our part, the Irish Government which came into office in March of this year is determined to use the mechanisms of the Agreement to improve the position of all the people living in Northern Ireland and especially the members of the Nationalist community. Within our overall programme for action we have established certain priority areas where we believe change is urgently required. These areas include the achievement of fair employment practices and reforms in the administration of justice.

As indeed the United Nations and its specialized agencies have recognized in many pronouncements, equal opportunity in employment is one of the hallmarks of an acceptable society. The socio-economic rights of individuals must rank equal in importance with their political and other rights. The employment profile of Northern Ireland undoubtedly points to a legacy of discrimination against one community. It is the common objective of the British and Irish Governments to ensure the elimination of that discrimination in all its forms. Some steps have been taken along the road but there is much further to travel. We regard the removal of discrimination in employment as both a moral and a political imperative in Northern Ireland and as a sine qua non of further progress in that area.

Public confidence in the administration of justice and good relations between the security forces and the community are other distinguishing marks of a normal society. When emergency measures are deemed necessary in order to protect the public from violence it is essential that the public be assured that the actions

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

of security forces are evenhanded and that the proceedings of the courts are impartial. In a divided society such as Northern Ireland, where a very large minority of the population has felt alienated from the institutions of government and especially from the forces of law and order and the system of justice, the importance of such public confidence is very acute. In Northern Ireland, therefore, it is necessary to consider what changes are required to remedy the damage done to public confidence in the past and to assure public confidence now and for the future. That is why, in the Anglo-Irish Agreement, of 15 November 1985, and in the communiqué which accompanied it, the British and Irish Governments agreed to seek measures which would give substantial expression to the aim of public confidence in the administration of justice and committed themselves explicitly to early progress in that area.

It is easy to be misled into thinking that the conflict in Northern Ireland centres upon irreconcilable religious or historical differences. In fact the challenge which lies at the heart of the problem is similar to many of the challenges posed by other areas of conflict throughout the world which are raised regularly in this Assembly. The need for peoples and nations freely to work out their own future, the accommodation of historical differences within such nations peacefully and by agreement and related human rights questions are basic to many of the tensions and much of the instability throughout the globe, no less than in Northern Ireland.

The role of the Irish Government under the Anglo-Irish Agreement offers support to Nationalists in Northern Ireland in ending that sense of exclusion under which they have lived and in finding solutions to the problems which beset both communities in that area. We also believe that the Irish Government's role reflects the recognition by the two Governments concerned and by the overwhelming

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

majority of the populations of Britain and Ireland that the Nationalist and Unionist communities both share a common future on the island of Ireland which must rest upon principles of inclusion and accommodation of both traditions.

In saying this, my Government recognizes that the Anglo-Irish Agreement has not gained full acceptance in Northern Ireland. We recognize the rights and the identity of the Unionist population as well. There must, however, be a realistic acceptance that the Agreement is there as part of the political landscape in Northern Ireland and has been achieved by the two sovereign Governments involved in that island. Only in such a climate of realism can meaningful debate take place about future political developments.

In successive years we have called for an end to the campaigns of violence in Northern Ireland. The past year has, unfortunately, seen a continuation of that futile violence which has brought such misery and suffering to the people of the area. The perpetrators of that violence are a tiny minority of the population of Northern Ireland who do not act on behalf of anybody but themselves. Indeed, their unremitting campaigns of violence and assassination can only add to the mistrust and mutual fear between Irish people of different traditions. Such actions do not bring closer but postpone the day when unity based on reconciliation can take place in Ireland, leading to the coming together, under agreed structures, of all the people of diverse traditions in our island.

We, as the Irish Government, will continue to work the mechanisms of the Anglo-Irish Agreement in conjunction with the British Government. We will remain open to contact with all those in Northern Ireland willing to pursue peaceful constructive approaches to the problems of the area. We will seek to make progress on the practical level of economic fairness, evenhanded treatment by the security forces and confidence in the administration of justice, all of which deeply affect the ordinary citizen in his or her everyday life. We realize that progress at the

(Mr. Lenihan, Ireland)

overall political level is indispensable to a durable settlement, by agreement, of the problems of our country as a whole.

Similarly, in the world at large regional problems of a similar kind can only be resolved by the exercise of positive political will on the part of the countries immediately involved.

Mr. FERNANDEZ ORDOÑEZ (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): May I first of all congratulate Mr. Florin on behalf of my delegation on having been elected to preside over the work of the current session of the Assembly. I am convinced that under his expert guidance, we shall be able to bring to a successful conclusion the important tasks before us.

I also wish to express our gratitude for the tireless and fruitful work done by his predecessor, Mr. Choudhury. I should also like on this occasion to reiterate our full support for the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, who last year was unanimously elected to a new term of office in a post full of challenges - challenges which he has faced and continues to face with courage and imagination.

There has been much talk in the past few years about the crisis of multilateralism. We Member States have collectively pondered the reasons and remedies for that phenomenon. In my opinion, the problem is not so much that the multilateral organizations are imperfect as that there is insufficient political will on the part of Member States to help them fulfill their aims.

In the case of our Organization, we are faced with the need to find within ourselves a capacity for renewed and shared determination to lend all our support to this collective project. We must go about this realistically, mindful of the changes that have taken place over the past 40 years - changes that call for greater sobriety and efficiency in the day-to-day running of the Organization. In this way, we will keep alive the spirit that attended the founding of the United Nations and the ideals of peace, justice and solidarity referred to at the last session of the General Assembly by His Majesty the King of Spain.

There is no point in inventing an imaginary, idyllic world. We must take as our starting-point the real world, where there are wars, death, starvation and

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

injustice and where freedom and peace still remain a mere hope. We must start from this reality and quite simply try to ensure that this world is inhabitable by the end of the twentieth century.

In order to achieve that aim, we must deal with three different sets of issues: those relating to security and disarmament; those having to do with the international economic system; and those concerned with the protection of human rights. I shall deal with each of these in turn.

The work of the Assembly is influenced every year by the general climate prevailing in international life, but also - in a very special way - by the state of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Spain is glad to see the improvement that has taken place in these relations and the positive character of the dialogue currently in progress.

We believe that détente requires the fostering of confidence among States. This will not come about in the absence of guarantees for the security of all of them. We, for our part, hold to the conviction that security in the world today can and should be achieved on the basis of, among other things, a balance of forces at the lowest possible level. We are convinced that it is possible to move towards a more secure world without this necessarily implying that it will be a more heavily armed world.

We are therefore pleased that the Geneva negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union have led to an agreement in principle on the elimination of intermediate-range nuclear systems. There is no historical precedent so far for agreements of this nature, which may well reinforce the positive trend opened up in East-West relations. Spain has from the outset sought to promote the achievement of these agreements and will support every effort to

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

secure further agreements which are both necessary and possible in such fields as strategic weapons, space defence and the banning of nuclear tests.

Despite its importance, the reduction of nuclear weapons will not by itself generate a satisfactory level of security. A treaty must be rapidly concluded to bring about the total eradication of chemical weapons. Moreover, Spain looks with concern upon the extraordinary accumulation of conventional forces and weapons on European territory - as well as their serious asymmetry. It is therefore urgent that negotiations be undertaken with a view to eliminating these disparities, ensuring conventional stability at lower levels and making large-scale offensives and surprise attacks impossible.

All these agreements must be accompanied by verification procedures to ensure compliance, thus increasing the confidence needed to strengthen détente.

As Europeans, we attach the greatest importance to the improvement of East-West relations. We shall therefore make every effort to ensure that the work of the current session of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) in Vienna contributes to the implementation of the commitments undertaken thus far in all fields and develops them further.

My Government has repeatedly stressed its determination to preserve Spain's status as a non-nuclear country. That intention has also been ratified by a decision taken in a national referendum and will be legally completed with Spain's imminent accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The sovereign decision by the Spanish people not to acquire nuclear weapons of its own and not to permit the nuclear weapons of third parties to be brought on its territory - or deployed or stockpiled there - is thus confirmed.

We hope that our accession to the NPT will help to strengthen politically the non-proliferation régime, both horizontally and vertically.

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

All the issues that face us in the field of security and disarmament must elicit a suitable response from this General Assembly, thus paving the way for the forthcoming third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In this context, we welcome the results achieved at the recent International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. Perhaps our greatest historical piece of folly - one for which we will be held accountable by future generations - is the scandalous squandering of resources on increasingly sophisticated weapons, when the threshold of total destruction was passed long ago and while immense areas of the planet are still sunk in hunger and misery.

The second point to which I have referred is the clarification and restructuring of economic relations. This is another of the great challenges facing the international community.

According to the latest United Nations world economic survey, a slowing down of the world economy has taken place for the second year in a row. Moreover, most of the developing countries have not experienced sustained growth and many of them are heading for stagnation in the medium term. Nor is the instability recorded in numerous markets for goods and services very encouraging. In real terms, commodity prices are at their lowest level for the past 50 years and there are no signs that improvement is about to take place.

Since interdependence is an inescapable reality, both developed and developing countries alike share a responsibility to work for the stability of the system as a whole and to seek pragmatic solutions. The developed countries can do this by adopting policies that favour economic growth and access to markets, and the developing countries by implementing appropriate adjustment policies that foster sustained non-inflationary growth.

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

In this context official development assistance also plays an important part. For the last few years Spain has been endeavouring to increase its contribution to the extent possible.

It is our hope that at this session the General Assembly will tackle economic issues with both determination and realism, seeking in the most intractable issues the lowest common denominator acceptable to all, as was the case last year following the promising special session on the economic situation in Africa, but without shying away from imaginative solutions or objectives, which are vital in the long run. The recent example of the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD VII), at which, after painstaking efforts by all delegations, it was possible to obtain moderately satisfactory results, should prompt us to hold even more strongly to that constructive spirit during the current session.

The problem of external debt continues to be one of the most pressing matters the developing countries have to face, particularly in the Latin American region. At the same time it also affects the functioning of the international financial system as a whole. I wish to stress here in the Assembly the doctrine that creditors and debtors have a shared responsibility to solve the debt problem.

So long as we are incapable of generating sustained growth for the developing countries and helping to co-ordinate the economic policies that will make it possible, so long as those countries are unable to increase their domestic savings and have to live in stagnation, there will be social and even moral limits to their adjustment policies, for it is not possible to follow indefinitely the example of Sisyphus, who pushed the rock up the mountain every morning only to see it roll back down in the afternoon and had to push it back up the next day. It is necessary to build up real hope with real measures, for this is a real problem involving not financial figures but the human beings behind them. Positive action

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

is required, such as more favourable rescheduling, trade liberalization, fair prices, increased resources made available to multilateral agencies and aid for development through an effective transfer of technologies and resources.

Spain supports such a policy and has advocated and will advocate in every forum a policy aimed at dialogue, such as was called for here by the Spanish Prime Minister, Felipe Gonzalez.

I now come to the third issue to which I referred earlier - the defence, promotion and protection of human rights. This is a field in which the United Nations has in the course of its existence tirelessly persevered in an attempt to establish new commitments and respond with determination to unavoidable challenges. The codification of those rights has been perfected and at the same time effective arrangements have been established for the monitoring of the obligations States have entered into in this field. All this has helped to bring to maturity a universal ethical conscience such that the community of nations cannot remain indifferent to the massive and systematic violation of those rights. In such cases there can be no question of resorting to the argument of national sovereignty and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States.

It is encouraging to note the progress that has been made in defining and developing legal norms, in particular in respect of the monitoring machinery that has been set up. There is, however, still much to be done in both fields, especially in the area of the effective monitoring of respect for human rights and concrete solidarity with those social sectors that continue to be subjected to indiscriminate repression or marginalization.

The recent entry into force of the Convention against Torture is an important step in this direction. Spain will ratify it as soon as the parliamentary procedures, which are already far advanced, are complete. It is intended that that ratification will be accompanied by the declarations provided for in articles 21

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain

and 22 of the Convention, since it is felt that to monitor compliance effectively requires recognition of the jurisdiction of the Committee of Experts set up for that purpose.

While addressing the social and humanitarian sphere, I wish to stress the capital importance of the recent Vienna Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking. No one can disregard the increasingly alarming magnitude of this problem, which has now reached worldwide proportions. Its extremely grave repercussions are not merely of a social and economic nature; they are also related to the notion of security, in view of the links of this phenomenon with others, such as arms trafficking or terrorism, in the impenetrable and powerful networks of international black money. We are convinced that only close international co-operation will make it possible for the illicit traffic in drugs to be combated and their consumption eradicated.

Terrorism is also taking on a worldwide dimension. It is a scourge that threatens us all and that we must all work together to eradicate. The United Nations, which has already promoted several conventions designed to combat terrorism in the legal sphere, has also taken a far-reaching step in political terms by adopting by consensus General Assembly resolution 40/61, which expresses unreservedly the most uncompromising condemnation of terrorism. This extremely encouraging development must not, however, remain as an isolated declaratory gesture. The consensus achieved must be maintained and broadened by devising recommendations and measures in the various sectorial areas.

The task of protecting human rights, which is a vital imperative at this point in history, takes on its maximum significance when those rights are institutionally breached. Racial discrimination, which is always odious and incompatible with the very notion of human dignity, appears in all its starkness in our time with the apartheid system instituted and perpetuated by the authorities of South Africa.

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

The international community must once again make it clear beyond all doubt that that system must be totally eradicated once and for all. In this context, we note with grave concern the continuing refusal of Pretoria to commence a genuine internal political dialogue with the representatives of the black majority.

Having analysed the major challenges facing the international community, I shall now go on, as have some of my colleagues, to discuss some of the regional problems with which the Organization has to deal.

If the maintaining of the apartheid system is the result of the purblind reactionary policy of the Pretoria Government, it must be admitted that in the last few months the grave state of tension that prevails in southern Africa has been deteriorating and that responsibility for the instability in the area also lies with the Republic of South Africa. Spain condemns the attempts to destabilize South Africa's neighbours by means of a policy of military and economic aggression.

Moreover, the situation in Namibia, characterized as it is by the maintaining of a colonial relationship and racial discrimination, has still not been channelled along the paths repeatedly called for by this Organization, through the application, without delay or excuse, of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and the concomitant independence of the Territory.

With regard to the Middle East, it is a positive sign to see the almost universal acceptance by the international community of the principle of convening an international conference. In the present circumstances this is the only formula likely to make it possible to achieve a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the conflict. Such a settlement should be based upon withdrawal by Israel from the occupied Arab territories, respect for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination, and the security of all the States in the region, including Israel, within internationally recognized frontiers. The conference, which must be open to participation by all the parties

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

involved and concerned in the conflict, will certainly have to be approached painstakingly and realistically. But it would not seem appropriate to delay convening it. Spain hopes that all the parties involved will make an effort to overcome the obstacles that still stand in the way of such a conference.

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

Meanwhile, Spain is following with growing concern the deterioration in the human rights situation in the territories occupied by Israel, and the increasing number of illegal settlements there. Such action and behaviour has a negative effect on the peace process in the region.

In Lebanon there are tragic recurrences of episodes of bloodshed that impede the necessary peaceful community life of a country which deserves a better fate and whose unity, independence and territorial integrity must be safeguarded. We are also concerned about the sufferings of the Palestinian refugees, aggravated as they are by the internal situation in the camps resulting from the attacks from outside to which they are subjected.

On the long and bloody war between Iran and Iraq, the Organization took an important step when the Security Council unanimously approved resolution 598 (1987). I reiterate our full support for the Secretary-General, who is continuing to make efforts to bring closer together the positions of the parties to the conflict. We believe that resolution 598 (1987) is balanced and realistic. We urge both parties to express without reservation of any kind their willingness to implement the decisions of the Council in their entirety.

We are concerned, moreover, at the recent escalation of the war and call for the immediate imposition of a cease-fire on the various fronts. We also condemn the intolerable attacks on free navigation in the waters of the Gulf.

The question of Cyprus continues to be a very dangerous source of tension in an area that is already deeply troubled. We continue to urge a compromise which will fully guarantee the unity, sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and enable the two communities on the island to live together in peace.

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

Spain regards the Maghreb as a region of priority interest and is endeavouring to make a comprehensive and active contribution to harmony and co-operation among all the countries in the area. For this reason, the persistence of the Western Sahara conflict continues to give cause for concern. Spain supports the Secretary-General's efforts to use his good offices to reach a negotiated settlement in accordance with United Nations resolutions. The outcome of such a settlement should be a referendum on self-determination, in accordance with the principles and modalities laid down both by this Organization and by the Organization of African Unity to make known the will of the Saharan people.

In Afghanistan, the indirect talks held under the auspices of the Secretary-General have still produced no agreement. The withdrawal of the Soviet troops and respect for the right to self-determination of the Afghan people are the essential elements of a lasting and peaceful solution of the problem. This is the way mapped out by the resolutions adopted, by an overwhelming majority, in the General Assembly year after year.

In Kampuchea we are confronted with a similar situation, for in this case, too, we believe that the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops is an essential prerequisite for that country to have the chance to choose in freedom the political system best suited to its interests.

The consolidation of the internal processes of democratization in certain countries in Asia and the Pacific area clearly has an influence beyond those countries and contributes significantly to the stability and security of the region.

We Spaniards feel fraternally bound to the peoples of Latin America, and share their aspirations to peace, freedom and justice as if they were our own. It is thus a source of deep satisfaction that, despite the persistence of difficulties,

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

democracy is becoming more firmly established, that encouraging steps are being taken towards the settlement of certain conflict situations and that dialogue and co-operation between the Latin American countries is being strengthened. All this highlights the constructive contribution of the Latin American peoples to the cause of peace.

As regards the crisis in Central America, we have always maintained that this harrowing conflict is a regional problem the deep-seated causes of which are to be found in the persistence of unjust economic and social structures. Consequently, the solution, which must be a peaceful and negotiated one, must likewise be regional. We still believe, too, that prospects for peace in the area are by no means enhanced by trying to place its problems in the context of the confrontation between the great Powers.

We have accordingly encouraged from the outset the activities of the Contadora Group, which has set in motion a process in which its members, together with those of the Support Group, have shown realism and a willingness to engage in dialogue. In the course of this process the Contadora Group and its Support Group have been successful in generating political will and providing a frame of reference for settling the conflict which has secured the support of all the Latin American countries, the member countries of the European Economic Community and the vast majority of the international community.

The recent signing of the extremely important Guatemala agreement all the Central American countries has made it clear that this effort has not been in vain. But the really decisive factor is that the Central American countries are willing to approach the solution of their problems in a spirit of solidarity, using the instruments of dialogue and negotiation.

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

The steps which have been taken since 7 August underscore the importance of the process under way, the firm political will of the Central American countries to carry it through and the need for them to be able to count on the encouragement and support of the international community. Spain sees this as a one-way journey, in which any external interference would be not only inadvisable but even rash, jeopardizing the establishment of a definitive peace in the area. For this reason, in reiterating the support of the Spanish Government for the Guatemala agreement we urge the Assembly to express in a clear and forceful way the support of the international community for this agreement.

The spirit in which the Central American Presidents have acted has also highlighted the profound desire for peace of the Latin American peoples and their reiterated commitment to negotiation and dialogue as the best way of providing lasting solutions to existing conflicts. We are sure that this same spirit will continue to inform the treatment of all disputes that exist or may arise between them.

I also wish to refer to the colonial situation of the Malvinas Islands, which remain a source of concern to the international community. This problem can be solved only through negotiations between the United Kingdom and the Republic of Argentina leading to the restoration of Argentina's territorial integrity. This need not entail disregarding the legitimate interests of the population of the islands. It is urgently necessary that such negotiations take place between the two Governments, and we urge them to begin there.

There is also a colonial question which continues to affect my country in a very direct way. The Spanish Government and people are still determined to find a definitive solution to the problem of Gibraltar that will enable the Rock to be restored to our national territory without damaging the interests of the

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

population. With this aim, we are determined to pursue the dialogue with the United Kingdom on the lines of the Brussels Declaration, by which both Governments decided to solve the problem in all its aspects, including the sovereignty aspect, by negotiation. This negotiation necessarily includes political and technical elements, and we are willing to make parallel progress in both fields, although always in the direction marked out years ago by the Assembly of completing the process of decolonization and restoring Spanish territorial integrity..

I began by referring to the alleged crisis of multilateralism and I shall end with it. One of the elements which in the last two years has been added to this phenomenon is the financial crisis which has overtaken our Organization. Following the passing by a consensus last year of resolution 41/213, on the basis of the report of the Group of 18, a process of administrative and financial reform of the United Nations has been started. It is our wish that the reform currently under way should lead on the one hand to greater rationalization and better use of the means and resources of the Organization and on the other to a strengthening of its work to achieve the purposes of the Charter and meet the needs of the international community in our time.

The reform is ultimately a task for all of us and we should all be engaged in it. No country can legitimately withhold its financial contributions, thus failing to meet its obligations under the Charter.

(Mr. Fernandez Ordoñez, Spain)

We trust, in short, that this year substantial progress will be made in the analysis of the internal situation of the United Nations, that accurate diagnoses will be carried out and that a start will be made on reaching agreement on specific revitalization measures. Only in that way will it be possible to strengthen the role of the Organization as an essential forum for discussion, harmonization and action in international relations, and its character as an irreplaceable multilateral instrument, with which Spain fully identifies and for the success of which it will spare no effort.

Fifty years ago an eminent Spaniard, Mr. Gregorio Marañón, said something which holds good today:

"We do not know where men will find their new path and their new faith, or where these will lead, but ... the interpretation of the overarching phenomenon of our time, which is the instinctive sense of panic of our species, suggests that the marvelous discovery which will transform future generations is, quite simply, peace".

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on representatives who wish to make statements in exercise of the right of reply.

I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to ten minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second intervention and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. ADJOM (Chad) (interpretation from French): The Chad delegation reserves its right to reply at the appropriate time to the substance of the false allegations made by the representative of Qaddafi. I shall therefore confine myself now to a few of the most glaring assertions of the Libyan delegation in its statement here this morning.

(Mr. Adoum, Chad)

First, I would remind the Libyan delegation that what it calls aggression on the southern flank of Libya is nothing but the struggle of a people to liberate its land which Libya plundered and contaminated during a barbarous occupation that lasted many years. Surely that struggle is legitimate.

Secondly, the French contingent is stationed in Ndjamena under the agreements on co-operation concluded between Chad, a sovereign State, and France, a friendly country. Furthermore, it is in conformity with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which gives States the natural right to self-defence.

Thirdly, did the Libyan representative weigh his words at all when he claimed and gratuitously said that Aouzou is Libyan? All the international instruments which define the frontiers between Chad and Libya and which were concluded between the United Kingdom, France and Italy - the former colonial Powers - make it absolutely clear that the statement by the Libyan representative is false. The representative of Qaddafi is certainly well aware of that fact when he violates history and law by saying here, before the whole world, that his country has no need of papers stemming from colonization to prove anything at all. We can see clearly here the truly perverse and perfidious nature of the Libyan régime. In these circumstances, what kind of co-operation with the Organization of African Unity (OAU) are they referring to when they refuse to solve the problem, and take no account of history, law and the cardinal principles of the OAU, of which Chad and Libya are members? The truth is very simple: Qaddafi has no argument to offer. He is just trying to impose himself on everyone by the force of arms and by lies.

Fourthly, to the allegation that Libya is helping the OAU to solve a so-called Chadian problem, I would simply reply that here again we see deception and diversion. For there is now only one problem - the problem between Chad and Libya.

(Mr. Adoum, Chad)

It is that problem which the OAU is tackling. It is that problem which was considered in Lusaka, where the representative of Tripoli tried to drive the Heads of State members of the Ad Hoc Committee crazy by his attitude, his tergiversatio and his lack of logic. Fortunately, these enlightened Heads of State thwarted the delaying tactics of the Libyan representative.

The meaningless statement made this morning by the representative of Libya provided the nations of the world with further proof, if any had been needed, of Libya's obvious bad faith and its rejection of any peaceful settlement of the war of aggression that the Qaddafi régime has been ruthlessly waging in Chad for more than a decade now. Hence, the statement that the war between Chad and Libya is over and that Libya has nothing to do in Chad is, again, the worst kind of bad faith and dishonesty. For the Libyan air force continues to violate Chadian airspace daily, with impunity, by repeated overflights in defiance of OAU decisions. The Libyan régime continues to recruit mercenaries and to mass troops in order to resume its land and air offensive against Chad.

That is why we say that the statement made by the representative of Libya this morning was puerile, extremely dishonest and a delaying tactic.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): When they listened this morning to the statement by the Permanent Representative of Libya, some members of the Assembly might have been tempted to think for a moment that there was a confrontation in Chad between France and Libya. And that is exactly what the Permanent Representative of that country wanted them to think. It is the kind of presentation of facts that we are accustomed to from him; it has no relation to reality.

The Ambassador of Chad has just eloquently described the countless ills from which his country is suffering because of the acts of aggression that Libya has been perpetrating for some years now. I would simply add this: There is no

(Mr. Blanc, France)

conflict between France and Libya; there is a conflict between Libya and Chad, a conflict which was started by Libya and of which Chad - an African, non-aligned country - is the victim. Chad - as it was fully entitled to do - succeeded in liberating almost all the northern provinces from Libyan occupation. It did so with Chadian armed forces alone. In providing assistance to Chad, France is only responding to the official request of the Government of that friendly country. It is within that framework that a purely defensive and deterrent military contingent has been stationed there.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

With regard to the issue about the Aouzou Strip, I can only repeat what was said by the French Foreign Minister last Wednesday from the rostrum of this Assembly:

"France, which brought Chad to independence and thus bequeathed to it its borders, considers this territory [the Aouzou Strip] to belong to Chad. It is ready ... to communicate the documents in its possession to bodies that so request." (A/42/PV.8, p. 27)

The representative of Libya is free to have a different opinion. It is for him to argue his case before the appropriate bodies within the framework of a legal settlement, and France for its part very much and very earnestly hopes for such a settlement.

Mr. FARTAS (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic): I shall not waste the Assembly's time in answering the fallacies, lies and justifications spoken a few minutes ago by the representative of Chad, because they are not deserving of a response.

As for what the representative of France said, we reserve our right to respond to him at an appropriate time, for I believe that our problem is with France.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.