



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/42/PV.19
5 October 1987

ENGLISH

Forty-second session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINETEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 30 September 1987, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic)
later: Mr. PETERS (St. Vincent & the Grenadines)
(Vice-President)

- General debate [9]: (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Al-Thani (Qatar)
Mr. Andersson (Sweden)
Mr. Koroma (Sierra Leone)
Mr. Dugersuren (Mongolia)
Mr. Abadia Arias (Panama)

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. AL-THANI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): In addressing this international forum, I take pleasure in congratulating you, Sir, in the name of the State of Qatar, on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its current session, which we are confident will be a successful one. Your election was a sign of appreciation of your vast experience and proved competence. We are sure that you will put all these qualities at the service of the Assembly's forty-second session.

I should like also to express appreciation and thanks to your predecessor for the ability and competence with which he conducted the last session's work.

Our highest commendation is also due to Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, Secretary-General of the United Nations, for his efforts and effective good offices in asserting the United Nations role in the preservation of international peace and security. In particular, we welcome his efforts in bringing conflicts to an end and eliminating the spectre of war. We commend his report to this session on the work of the Organization and affirm our support for its content.

We, the Members of the United Nations, owe the Organization our allegiance and support in view of its services for the welfare and development of the international community and its consistent efforts to ensure the preservation of international peace, security and stability. Each of us should therefore uphold the Organization's role, strictly observe its Charter and respect and carry out its resolutions and recommendations. It is from this perspective that we should all proceed in our co-operative relationships with other States, regionally and at the global level.

(Mr. Al-Thani, Qatar)

It is therefore with great regret that we note the non-compliance of some States Members of the Organization with the resolutions it adopts. We similarly regret the Organization's inability to require from these few States compliance with its resolutions. This state of affairs casts a pall of impotence over the Organization with regard to certain chronic international problems. It also adversely affects its credibility and the standing of its resolutions in the eyes of the world public.

This critical view does not, however, detract from our appreciation of the efforts deployed so tirelessly by the Organization and the Secretary-General in the cause of international peace, security and stability.

The Palestinian question remains the living example of disregard of United Nations resolutions in defiance of the political will of the world community. Ever since the displacement of the people of Palestine and the usurpation of their homeland, the Zionist racist entity has remained to this day unrivalled in its contemptuous disregard and arrogant defiance of United Nations resolutions. The actions of this racist entity are all contrary to international legality and to United Nations resolutions. Its behaviour is based on terrorism, hegemony and expansionism. In all this the hallmark of its actions has been utter disregard of international legality and deviation from humane and civilized conduct, relying on its military machine to inflict material and moral destruction.

(Mr. Al-Thani, Qatar)

The Palestinian question remains the core of the Middle East problem. All other conflicts and problems in the region are but by-products of that basic problem, which is, indeed, a problem for the whole world.

We are quite certain that this sensitive region will not know stability and tranquillity until a just and comprehensive solution is found to the Palestinian problem, a solution which would return the Palestinian people to their homeland and enable them to set up an independent State on their national soil under the leadership of their sole, legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization.

We urge the world community to help put an end to Israel's arrogance and its defiance of the norms of international law so that such a just and comprehensive solution may be achieved. Israel's settlements policy, the aim of which is to deprive the Palestinian people of their historical right to a homeland and obliterate their identity and culture by destroying their educational, cultural and social institutions, must be brought to an end.

The State of Qatar believes that the best means of reaching a just and permanent peace is to convene an international conference, to be attended by the permanent members of the Security Council and by the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization.

The Iran-Iraq war is a source of concern and anxiety to my country. It has now entered its eighth year and continues to result in an immense loss of life and resources in both countries. The persistence of that war has disrupted the peace and stability of the Gulf region and could disrupt world peace and stability as a result of threats to international shipping in the waters of the Gulf, the interruption of oil and gas supplies, the escalation of the so-called tanker war

(Mr. Al-Thani, Qatar)

and the presence in the waters of the Gulf of increasing numbers of naval units of several States.

The State of Qatar, together with the other member States of the Gulf Co-operation Council, is striving to find a way to put an end to the war through a negotiated settlement which would safeguard the legitimate rights of both parties, ensure that the Gulf region does not become the scene of international conflict and preclude the possibility of outside intervention, which has grave consequences for the peoples of the Gulf region.

We hope that both parties will exercise the utmost self-restraint and not interfere further with freedom of navigation. We urge our two neighbours, Iran and Iraq, to co-operate in implementing Security Council resolution 598 (1987), which expresses the common will of the international community in its endeavour to bring about a peaceful, just and comprehensive end to this war, conducive to tranquillity and peace in the region under the rule of international legality. Only such a solution can promote the best interests of the peoples of the region and of the world at large.

We commend Iraq for its positive stand regarding resolution 598 (1987) and welcome its co-operation with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in that respect. We hope that the Islamic Republic of Iran will act similarly.

The recent incident at the holy sanctuary of Mecca, the attacks on the embassies of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait in Tehran and the launching of a missile at Kuwaiti territory are ominous indicators of where the region may be heading. We express our regret and dismay at those incidents and demand that they not be repeated against any Arab State of the Gulf.

Lebanon, that brother country, has been living a tragedy since its soil was occupied by Israel five years ago. Its people are experiencing atrocious suffering

(Mr. Al-Thani, Qatar)

and part of its territory is still occupied. Imperative calls for withdrawal by the Security Council have, as usual, been ignored by the Zionist entity. We therefore emphasize the need for the international community to fulfil its duty by seeking the complete withdrawal of Israel from all Lebanese territory. We declare our firm support for the independence of Lebanon and the preservation of its territorial sovereignty.

My country expresses great satisfaction at the inscription on the agenda of a sub-item entitled "Convening, under the auspices of the United Nations, of an international conference to define terrorism and to differentiate it from the struggle of peoples for national liberation".

Terrorism is indeed a dangerous phenomenon that threatens the world community. We condemn terrorism and look forward to concerted international action to combat it. Agreement on a precise definition of terrorism will be an important step towards that goal. By contrast, national liberation movements seeking self-determination are legitimate under the United Nations Charter and should be supported by all.

The State of Qatar views with increasing concern what is taking place in Afghanistan, which continues to be a focus of tension in the region and with which we share a common heritage of Islamic religion and history. The presence of foreign troops on Afghan territory threatens the peace and security of neighbouring nations. My country looks forward to the speedy withdrawal of foreign troops in order to enable the people of Afghanistan freely to choose their political system. Years of civil war have proved that there is no military solution to the problem. What is needed is dialogue and, ultimately, the opportunity for the people of Afghanistan to set up the kind of Government they prefer.

(Mr. Al-Thani, Qatar)

The situation in southern Africa remains one of our concerns. We hope that suitable solutions will soon be found to bring to an end the suffering of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. This should be possible when and if the racist régime in Pretoria complies with the resolutions of the United Nations and ends its evil policies towards the neighbouring peoples of southern Africa. My country supports the courageous struggle of the national majority in South Africa against the ruling white racist minority. It is the duty of all Member States to mobilize world public opinion in support of this just humanitarian cause. We reaffirm our solidarity with the people of Namibia, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), in their struggle against the continued occupation and colonization of their homeland in defiance of relevant United Nations resolutions.

The world economic crisis still wreaks havoc in all States, especially the developing nations. The debt-servicing burden on many States of Africa, Asia and Latin America is increasing. The indebtedness of third-world nations has reached astronomical levels, estimated at hundreds of billions of dollars. The terms of world trade have deteriorated and the negative effects of the protectionist measures imposed by industrial nations have become more apparent. Prices of raw materials produced by developing nations continue to fall, while prices of the products of industrial nations are on the rise. The resulting inflation and economic stagnation call for a renewed and intensified North-South dialogue, aiming at the establishment of a new economic order or, at the least, improvement and reform of the existing order.

Economic growth is the only path likely to enable the developing nations to settle their foreign debts and avert financial ruin. In order to further the process of growth and development, developed nations should encourage the transfer

(Mr. Al-Thani, Qatar)

of technology to developing nations, increase their imports from those nations and genuinely reduce the interest rates that burden the developing nations. They should even consider the total or partial cancellation of the debts of those developing nations. We consider it appropriate that loans by international financial institutions to developing nations be increased and the markets of developed nations be opened to the products of developing nations within the context of more stable and realistic trade arrangements.

Industrialized countries should curb the arms race and allocate a considerable part of their present military expenditure to development assistance to developing countries.

Further, the developing nations in turn should adopt economic policies aimed at restricting consumption and increasing investment and job opportunities for their work forces.

Mr. ANDERSSON (Sweden): Allow me first, Mr. President, to congratulate you on your election to preside over the forty-second session of the General Assembly. You can count on the full support of my delegation in carrying out your important task.

Is there some flaw in the design of the human species?

Is there any possibility for us to change before it is too late?

These questions were raised in a speech by the much beloved Swedish writer of children's books, Astrid Lindgren. The title of her address was: "Violence, never!"

Astrid Lindgren answered the questions herself by pointing to the children. It must begin with them, she said.

Children who encounter repression and violence themselves use violence when they grow up. Children who are received with love and respect themselves acquire a loving attitude to the world around them.

Children do not make a distinction between black and white, yellow and brown. To children, other children are simply children, regardless of their origin, their language or the colour of their skin.

My country, Sweden, used to be an ethnically homogeneous society. During the last few decades it has been transformed into a multinational and multiracial country. Certain suburbs of the nation's capital count more than a hundred nationalities, representing all parts of the world.

Adults like ourselves should learn from children. We should avoid letting racial prejudices create antagonism between human beings. We must launch an attack against the evils of racism, wherever they may occur.

Racism is senseless. It jumps to conclusions regarding the merit and characteristics of human beings on the basis of such superficial matters as the colour of their skin or hair.

(Mr. Andersson, Sweden)

Racism is pitiable. It often acts insidiously, fawningly and treacherously. Racism is cowardly. It hides behind false phrases and spreads its poison in the dark.

Racism is egoistic. It denies and counteracts solidarity and co-operation. It pits man against man.

Racism is cruel. It constantly commits horrid crimes and acts of war and violence.

Developments in South Africa give cause for deep concern. The régime's hardening attitude since the May elections is ill-considered and tragic. The brutal outrages against the opponents of apartheid, trade union leaders and their organizations, and the escalated destabilization policy against neighbouring countries have seriously impaired prospects of a peaceful solution.

The determination of the minority régime to uphold the apartheid system must be met by the international community with increased pressure and firmer demands for change. This is necessary if we want to contribute towards breaking the violence and making way for a peaceful dismantling of the apartheid system. This must be brought about now. Otherwise, it will be too late.

The abolition of apartheid is the concern of the entire international community. A special responsibility rests with the permanent members of the Security Council.

It is disappointing that the Security Council has not yet been able to decide on effective, mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Pending such sanctions, Sweden and the other Nordic countries have extended their previous unilateral measures and introduced a general ban on trade with South Africa and Namibia. We hope that these measures will lead to other countries' following suit, thereby increasing pressure on the South African Government.

(Mr. Andersson, Sweden)

South Africa's occupation of Namibia continues. We support the Secretary-General's efforts to break the deadlock. A solution must be based on Security Council resolution 435 (1978), without irrelevant conditions.

The countries of southern Africa have been hit very hard by the South African policy of destabilization. Increased bilateral and international development co-operation efforts are imperative in order to give them support and to reduce their dependence on South Africa. Assistance to southern Africa constitutes a very important part of Sweden's bilateral development aid. In the last five years about \$1.5 billion has been allocated to the region.

Mobilizing and co-ordinating such efforts should be an important task of the United Nations. Assistance to the victims of apartheid policy and humanitarian aid to the liberation movements should also be increased.

Increased support for the front-line States would also create a more favourable start for the entire region - including South Africa - the day apartheid is abolished.

The war between Iran and Iraq has caused immense human suffering and enormous material losses.

Recent developments in the Gulf imply great risks of escalation and widening of the conflict. All the parties concerned must, in this explosive situation, exercise the utmost restraint. The Swedish Government welcomed the adoption of Security Council resolution 598 (1987). The resolution provides a good basis for a solution to the conflict and must be complied with. It is also a matter of the authority of the Security Council. The Secretary-General has my Government's whole-hearted support in his renewed efforts.

In the Middle East, Israel's long occupation of Arab territories constitutes a dangerous threat to both Arabs and Israelis. Agreement on an international peace conference under the auspices of the United Nations would bring to the region hope

(Mr. Andersson, Sweden)

of peace and of an end to the occupation. Sweden supports the efforts to bring about such a conference.

The foundations for a settlement are laid down in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Israel must leave the territories that were occupied in 1967. The Arab parties must recognize Israel's right to exist within secure borders. Furthermore, the Palestinian people must be allowed to exercise their right to self-determination and the right to establish a State of their own.

(Mr. Andersson, Sweden)

It is important that the Palestinians be represented in negotiations by those in whom they have confidence. In our view the Palestine Liberation Organization enjoys such confidence.

In violation of international law, the Soviet Union continues its war in Afghanistan, now in its eighth year. The Soviet invasion forces must be withdrawn. The Afghan people themselves must be allowed to decide their own form of government and their future. That is imperative for success in the efforts to settle the conflict and to enable the millions of Afghan refugees to return to their homes. The efforts of the Secretary-General to that end has the Swedish Government's strong support.

To resolve the conflict in Kampuchea, it is equally crucial that the Vietnamese troops be withdrawn and that the Kampuchean people be allowed to decide their own future. The Swedish Government has noted with interest the recent contacts concerning the country's future. We hope that this development signifies the beginning of a real dialogue.

We welcome the agreement that has been concluded between the Governments of Sri Lanka and India on a return to peaceful relations between the ethnic communities in Sri Lanka. There are now better prospects that this distressing conflict can be resolved in a peaceful way.

It is our hope that the increased activity shown by the two Korean States in their endeavours to resume their dialogue will be successful.

The agreement reached in August between the five Central American countries is an important step towards peace and co-operation in a region that has long been troubled by conflicts. These have their roots in social and economic injustices. They have been aggravated by foreign intervention, such as United States support - in violation of international law - for those who are waging war against Nicaragua's lawful Government.

(Mr. Andersson, Sweden)

We welcome the fact that the Government of Nicaragua, through recent positive measures, is clearly demonstrating its will to implement the peace plan, in spite of the aggression directed against that country. The agreement expresses the aspirations of the Central American countries to shape their own future in accordance with their own wishes. Implementation requires the support of the entire international community. Everyone, in and outside the region, must be guided by the fundamental principles of the agreement: respect for international law and democracy. One condition for success is that assistance to the irregular forces cease. The Contadora countries and their Support Group, as well as the Organization of American States and the United Nations, have an important role to play in the continued peace efforts. As the President of Costa Rica, Mr. Arias, put it recently in Washington, "We have to give peace a chance".

Through its peace-keeping operations, the United Nations has in several cases been able to assist the parties to regional conflicts in cooling off the situation, thereby facilitating the search for a peaceful solution. Sweden's long-standing, active support for these operations is illustrated by our decision last year to put a logistic unit at the disposal of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL).

Our positive attitude towards participation in peace-keeping operations remains. That applies also to the United Nations Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). We regret that, above all, the unreasonable method of financing has forced us to withdraw our battalion from Cyprus. It is increasingly intolerable for such a United Nations operation to be financed that extensively by the troop-contributing countries. Sweden will continue to participate with police and headquarters personnel in the United Nations peace-keeping operation in Cyprus in the future also. The efforts of the Secretary-General to bring the parties together have our undiminished support.

(Mr. Andersson, Sweden)

Violence and oppression must be combated. That is the only way to create the necessary conditions for a lasting peace for future generations.

One of the main purposes of the United Nations is to protect and promote human rights. With the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as its foundation, an impressive structure of norms has emerged. International conventions on the protection of human rights have been adopted. Most recently a convention against torture entered into force. It is important that States accede to these conventions. All States must respect human rights and fundamental freedoms.

There is every reason to stress the significance of the struggle against international terrorism, with its destructive violence. Co-operation within the United Nations and other international forums is of immense importance. It is our hope that the General Assembly during this session will reach agreement on increased co-operation in this field.

The narcotic-drugs problem has acquired world-wide proportions. At the International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking held in Vienna last summer the participating States pledged to undertake forceful international measures to counteract drug abuse. In order to fulfil that undertaking, it is essential that the United Nations obtain the necessary resources to play a central role.

The importance of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) was highlighted at its meeting this summer. The Final Document shows an awareness of the interdependence of countries and the close relationship between different growth-promoting measures. The outcome of the conference was positive. It is now the responsibility of all Governments to fulfil the intentions of the Final Document in a constructive spirit.

(Mr. Andersson, Sweden)

Two threats of annihilation hover over mankind: nuclear war and global degradation of the environment. The first can be unleashed at any moment; the second would take longer. If we do not have the ability to remove these threats, human civilization is in danger.

Two years ago our hopes of progress in the disarmament field were strengthened. At that time the leaders of the two super-Powers made their historic declaration: nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

The Swedish Government welcomes the agreement in principle between the United States and the Soviet Union on the elimination of intermediate-range nuclear weapons. But it would be a serious set-back if these disarmament measures were to result in an arms build-up in other fields. It is essential that progress be achieved as soon as possible also in the current negotiations on strategic nuclear weapons and space weapons.

A comprehensive nuclear-weapons-test ban is becoming increasingly important. A test-ban agreement would render more difficult the development of new and ever-more-advanced types of nuclear weapons. It would also reduce the risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Such an agreement would be a definite sign of the will of the nuclear-weapon States to break the vicious circle of the arms race.

In the shadow of the nuclear-weapon threat, there are other weapons of mass destruction also. Some are more than a threat. At this very moment people are suffering from the horrible effects of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Andersson, Sweden)

We now have before us an opportunity to save future generations from those weapons. With continued progress at the negotiating table of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, a convention banning chemical weapons could become a reality in the near future.

Nor must we tire in our endeavours to reduce conventional arms at both the global and the regional level. Within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe there seem to be good prospects for reaching agreement on further developing the confidence- and security-building measures agreed upon at the Stockholm Conference last year. There also seem to be good prospects for initiating negotiations on conventional disarmament in Europe within that framework.

The Swedish Government actively supports the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Nordic area and a corridor free of battlefield nuclear weapons in Central Europe.

Increased attention should be paid also to the naval arms race. It is high time that negotiations were initiated on confidence-building measures and disarmament in this field too. An appropriate first step could be a multilateral agreement on the prevention of incidents at sea to supplement existing bilateral agreements.

The world must choose development instead of the arms race. The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development was a success for multilateral diplomacy. It is our hope that those who did not take part in the Conference will participate in the continued process.

(Mr. Andersson, Sweden)

We are responsible for the world we leave to future generations. The World Commission on Environment and Development, under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister of Norway, Gro Harlem Brundtland, has shown convincingly how important it is to bring about sustainable development. If that development concept is applied, we can save our environment and safeguard our natural resources. If we do not manage to do this, economic and social progress will be impossible, and in the long run the survival of mankind will be jeopardized.

The current agenda of the General Assembly contains items concerning draft resolutions from the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the report of the World Commission and on the action-oriented environmental perspective. We sincerely hope these will be adopted this autumn. If they are, a process could be initiated in which the decision-making bodies of the United Nations could revise policies, programmes, budgets and activities with the aim of promoting sustainable development. Similarly, all Governments should review their own national policies. That process has already been initiated in Sweden. Far-sighted management of natural resources and preservation of the environment will, furthermore, be established as one of the five objectives for Swedish international development co-operation.

As proposed by the Brundtland Commission, a second global conference on the human environment should be considered. Its aim could be to review developments since the first United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, to evaluate and assess the hazards posed by environmental problems and to agree on a programme of action to ensure sustainable development.

If there is wide support for that proposal, a new conference could take place in 1992, that is to say 20 years after the first Conference. Sweden is prepared again to act as host, if that is the general wish.

(Mr. Andersson, Sweden)

The United Nations is going through a critical period of self-examination and change. To overcome the difficulties, commitment and patient work are required of all Member States. A good foundation for reform work was laid last year by the General Assembly, on the basis of the report of the Group of 18. The aim of the reform process cannot be budget cuts as such; the overall aim must be to attain a world Organization that is well equipped to perform its functions.

The purpose of the altered budget procedure we have agreed on is to make it possible for the programme budget to be adopted with the greatest possible support from Member States. In that way, the preconditions can be created to secure the necessary support for the activities of the United Nations.

If the reform process is to be successfully completed, it is of utmost importance that all Member States should fulfil their financial obligations under the United Nations Charter. That applies not least to the Organization's largest contributor. Otherwise, the consequences could be devastating.

There is reason to recall the ideas on a more even scale of assessments put forward by Sweden's late Prime Minister, Olof Palme, at the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. That would be one way of making the world Organization less vulnerable. As things stand now, the scale of assessments agreed on has ceased to function. If this unsatisfactory state of affairs continues, we shall inevitably have to consider a revision of the scale of assessments.

The future agenda of the United Nations will have an orientation that is partly different from the one it has today. We are increasingly faced with issues and problems of global importance. Such challenges cannot possibly be met through national or regional measures only. For the Swedish Government, the conclusion is obvious: it is through more efficient and purposeful co-operation within the framework of the United Nations and the United Nations system that we can

(Mr. Andersson, Sweden)

effectively tackle these types of issues. This applies to the threat posed by nuclear weapons, environmental degradation, and North-South injustices. It applies to serious diseases such as AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome), to the increasing drug abuse, and to refugee problems.

The United Nations system must be capable of adapting to these realities, but it is not changes in the purposes and principles of the United Nations set forth in its Charter that are required. The rules of international law embodied in the Charter must be unconditionally upheld. What is needed is to review and reconsider the structure and work methods of the United Nations system. The world Organization must be capable of effectively meeting the requirements of the 1990s and beyond. This applies not least to the economic and social sector.

But it is not just a question of being prepared for tomorrow. We must also make better use of the machinery the United Nations offers today.

Co-operation within the United Nations symbolizes hope for a life without fear, a life in peace and dignity for all people. It is our compelling duty to keep that hope alive.

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): On behalf of the Sierra Leone delegation I should like, Sir, to extend warm congratulations to you on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at its forty-second session. Your unanimous election to that high office is in recognition of your distinguished record as a statesman and your long experience in diplomacy. I wish to assure you of my delegation's fullest co-operation in the discharge of your awesome duties.

May I also avail myself of this opportunity to pay tribute to your predecessor for the admirable manner in which he conducted the deliberations of the forty-first session.

I take this opportunity to express my delegation's appreciation to the Secretary-General for the lucid and comprehensive report he has presented on the work of the Organization since the last session. We are deeply heartened that the Organization is gradually becoming the object of a "greater commonality of views" among its Members, scarcely a year after its very existence was in jeopardy.

The renewed interest in multilateralism this development represents calls for deep reflection, since it entails complex processes at work, requiring skilled management on the part of the Secretary-General and the Secretariat. My Government is encouraged that the Secretary-General has risen sufficiently to this challenge by fearlessly pointing out flaws in the structure of the Organization and repudiating inappropriate conduct by Members, regardless of their size or influence.

In this regard we note with approval the critical view he has cast on the current structure of the Economic and Social Council and the reforms he has proposed, especially the call to upgrade representation in that Council at the ministerial level, as well as the need to establish a small planning staff for development which could consider integrated approaches to development-related problems, taking account of the capacity of the system as a whole.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

The Secretary-General's efforts represent only one facet of what we require to ensure the viability and efficiency of our Organization. But firm commitment to the provisions of the Charter is the other, and perhaps the most crucial, element in ensuring our Organization's effectiveness. It is therefore a matter of great regret to us that Member States have often undermined the credibility of the United Nations for purely short-term political objectives, or sometimes through wilful neglect.

The relevance of the United Nations as an instrument for the peaceful existence and orderly development of every nation no longer requires justification. Suffice it to say here that history is replete with instances of even weaker nations denying peace and orderly progress to greater nations in an unmanaged international environment. Thus it would be a serious mistake for any Member State to view its commitment to the United Nations as an altruistic gesture subject to its whims, rather than as a sacred duty dictated by an enlightened perception of its self-interest.

Since the previous session, developments in the security, economic and social conditions in many parts of the world have given us more cause for despair than hope.

As we observe the progress of negotiations towards the reaching of a historic agreement on disarmament between the super-Powers, our excitement is tempered by the knowledge that extensive testing of weapons capability is simultaneously taking place, and enormous resources are being devoted to the perfection of other means of mutual destruction. Therefore, as we acknowledge this remarkable disarmament effort between the super-Powers, we expect that the entire international community will perceive the true significance of this event as a major step in the urgent pursuit of more global and comprehensive arms control and disarmament agreements

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

and as part of a greater security enterprise whose success also requires the peaceful resolution of regional and internal conflicts as well as the achievement of acceptable economic and social conditions in all nations.

We believe that it would be naive for anyone to assume that islands of peace and security could be created and sustained in a world awash in tension and fed by racial prejudice, religious intolerance, economic injustice and, above all, hegemonistic aspirations. That is why we have been tireless in calling on all nations to be resolute and uncompromising in demanding majority rule in South Africa and self-determination in Namibia. We have also constantly advocated that equal resolution be applied in the search for just settlements of the disputes in the Middle East, Kampuchea, Central America, Afghanistan, the Western Sahara and Chad.

The Secretary-General has warned that a human tragedy of overwhelming proportions is imminent in South Africa unless, of course, timely action is taken to prevent it. The delegation of Sierra Leone has had occasion in this Assembly and elsewhere to offer its views on the kind of actions it considers appropriate for the international community to adopt to stave off this impending tragedy. We have no wish whatsoever to repeat those views here except, of course, to remind those who continue to oppose the imposition of comprehensive sanctions against the racist South African régime that they are endangering the very interests that they seek to protect by undermining the only viable instrument of gentle pressure against South Africa and making the violent destruction of that régime inevitable.

In the absence of the apartheid régime's readiness to negotiate a democratic and peaceful transition to majority rule in South Africa, and because of the reliance by that régime on the use of naked force against the majority black population to perpetuate its illegal existence, it becomes absolutely absurd for

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

anyone to claim to be on the side of freedom and justice in South Africa and at the same time to repudiate the use of effective pressure against South Africa either in the form of sanctions or in the threat or use of military coercion.

While we detest, as a matter of principle, the use of force for the achievement of political objectives as much as any other State Member of this Organization, we would not hide behind that principle to camouflage the abandonment of our sacred duty under the Charter to help eliminate from the face of the earth the barbarism, immorality and conflict all of which apartheid so visibly embodies.

Very few of us need reminding that any system such as apartheid, which continues to subsist on a daily diet of imprisonment, torture and murder of black children as young as seven years of age, the indiscriminate massacre of dispossessed, defenceless and innocent members of its community, as well as citizens of neighbouring States, offers very few options for redress. This becomes a classic case of what the late President Kennedy referred to, with characteristic eloquence and perceptiveness, when he said: "Those who make peaceful evolution impossible make violent revolution inevitable."

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

That is the assessment of the situation in South Africa which those who directly carry its burden have now reached, as expressed by the African National Congress (ANC) leader, Mr. Oliver Tambo, who said:

"Nobody should demand of us that we seek change by non-violent means when we are denied all constitutional possibilities to redress the grievances of the majority."

We believe that the international community has the chance to avert the human tragedy in South Africa if it heeds the advice of the Secretary-General and takes timely action, for if by neglect or by cynicism we allow the tragedy to occur, the consequences may turn out not to be as bearable to some of us as we might have assumed.

There is ample evidence that apartheid is crumbling. Both the spiritual and the intellectual underpinnings of apartheid suffered severe assault recently when the White Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa, the body that formulated the theological justification for that system, declared that scriptural rationales for enforced racial separation were an error that should now be rejected. Also recently, the University of Stellenbosch, the erstwhile intellectual powerhouse of apartheid, became a centre of opposition to that system.

Let us realize that these events did not occur by accident or in a vacuum, but as a result of the intense and consistent political, economic and military pressures which the international community has exerted on South Africa in recent years.

It is therefore logical that we keep up the pressures that brought these changes about, not only to achieve the eventual dismantling of apartheid but also to accelerate the process for the independence of Namibia. In this context we recognize and commend, among other things, the efforts that have brought about massive disinvestment in South Africa, the activities of trade unions and church

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

organizations, in and outside of South Africa, the resolution of the freedom fighters, as well as the fortitude of the front-line States in southern Africa.

The war between Iran and Iraq represents a tragedy of enormous proportions which the international community should do everything to end. The role of the United Nations in the pursuit of this objective is crucial, and we endorse the long-standing preoccupation of the Secretary-General with efforts to find a lasting solution to the conflict, culminating in his recent visit to Iran and Iraq.

We believe that Member States of this Organization can, in their individual capacities, make significant contributions to the peace process by helping to create the general climate of trust and urgency without which the current cloud of suspicion which pervades the atmosphere cannot be dissipated, and without which there will be a prolongation of hostilities. We note with interest and satisfaction the unanimous adoption of Security Council resolution 598 (1987) and appeal to the Secretary-General and all Members of this Organization to help create the conditions suitable for the implementation of that resolution.

The revival of the idea of an international peace conference on the Middle East, and the current wide international support which that idea enjoys, is of great interest to my delegation. We have followed closely the progress of the Secretary-General's efforts to mobilize a consensus on the procedural aspects of the conference among the parties concerned, and we observe with deep disappointment that it has not yet been possible to obtain the agreement of some of the parties to the idea of convening an international conference.

Our confidence in the resilience of the Secretary-General and in the goodwill of Members of this Organization encourages us, however, to hope that the existing obstacles will be overcome before long. At the same time we expect that the enormous suffering which the Palestinian people endure because of Israel's brutal activities in the occupied territories will continue to incense the conscience of

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

Members of this institution and elicit sufficient resistance to Israel's designs to perpetuate its occupation.

We see a total absence of moral strength and logic in a policy which seeks to preserve the rights of one people to a homeland and security by assaulting the same rights and the security of another people. What we have noted, as a result of this policy, is greater suffering and insecurity in the region and a greater threat to the stability of the international system as a whole. It is therefore in the interest of every member of the international community to work sincerely for the speedy resolution of the Middle East conflict; failure to do so would simply raise the cost for all and leave everyone much worse off.

Many in this Hall will recall that not so many years ago Viet Nam was fighting to defend principles which it held dearly, and for which it received the sympathy and support of many nations. Today, however, it continues to deny the people of Kampuchea what Viet Nam itself claimed to have fought for so vigorously during those years. The paradox of yesterday's victim and tomorrow's oppressor always furnishes constant amazement.

Last year, my delegation welcomed the eight-point peace plan put forward by the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea to resolve the situation in that country. We expected the practical approach offered by that plan to secure a positive response from Viet Nam, if only as a measure of indicating the latter's peaceful intentions. At this stage we believe that Viet Nam has only two options: to demonstrate a genuine intention to withdraw its forces from Kampuchea and allow the people of that country to set up their own form of government, or to continue to prove unfaithful to its Charter obligations and to incense the international community.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

The Korean peninsular has remained an area of constant tension since the end of hostilities three decades ago. We believe that for the establishment of a durable peace in the region, both North and South Korea, whose membership of this Organization is a logical step, should implement proposals for the revival of high-level talks between them. Those talks should continue to be direct and devoid of extraneous issues which undermine trust and confidence.

Recent developments in Central America, culminating in the signing of the Guatemala Agreement, the Arias Plan, have rightly aroused considerable optimism about the chances of durable peace in the region.

We trust that all peace-loving nations will contribute sincerely towards the realization of our collective wish for the peace and prosperity of the Central American peoples.

Although some progress towards a resolution of the Afghanistan situation seems to have occurred, notably the reported agreement on the monitoring of foreign troop withdrawal, the failure of the contending parties to agree on a date for the withdrawal of foreign troops continues to cause many delegations some anxiety.

While not wishing to minimize the significance of the perceptible narrowing down of the difference in the various positions over the date for troop withdrawal achieved at the recent proximity talks in Geneva under the supervision of the special United Nations representative, Mr. Diego Cordovez, we submit that so far there exists no cause for celebration; the danger that the Afghanistan situation poses to international peace and security remains as potent today as it has ever been.*

* Mr. Peters (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

The continuing stalemate in Western Sahara is causing tremendous human suffering and economic devastation in the occupied territory, and countries in the region, particularly Algeria, are having to cope with huge refugee problems. The valuable assistance offered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in mitigating those refugee problems is highly commendable.

While Sierra Leone continues to recognize the legitimate right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination, we appeal to all the parties concerned to co-operate with the Secretary-General in his effort to bring about the implementation of all relevant resolutions adopted by the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations, with specific regard to General Assembly resolution 40/50.

The various reports on the status of the world economy are again unanimous this year in expressing pessimism about prospects for the economic well-being of the world, both in the short and medium terms. Each year, for over half a decade now, we have had to listen in this Assembly to gloomy forecasts for the world economy, and at the end of every session we have left here assuring ourselves that we have done enough to dispel the gloom after adopting resolutions and promising to act.

The progress we seem to achieve each time never proves to be adequate, as we not only continue to have the same set of problems but their magnitude has even tended to multiply. This has been happening particularly in the case of the development crisis, of which the debt problem is an integral part, under which most of the developing countries have been labouring for almost a decade now.

The various manifestations of this crisis and its impact on the peoples of the developing world have for many years been a subject of extensive analyses and recommendations by academics, policy makers and development experts both in the United Nations and elsewhere.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

The general climate of slow or negative growth that currently prevails in the affected countries is causing further deterioration in the conditions of life which have already reached record lows. Efforts to reverse this trend, especially in Africa, have encountered severe countervailing forces in the international environment, notably contracting capital flows, currency instability, falling commodity prices, rising protectionism and agricultural subsidies in industrial countries, and above all a crushing debt burden.

For example, it has been established that borrowing countries now transfer huge net capital to creditor countries in the industrialized world: \$107 billion from 1983 to 1986 and an estimated \$27 billion in 1987 for the major borrowing countries alone; African countries have lost over \$19 billion so far this year in falling commodity prices; the effect of the European agricultural subsidies is said to be equivalent to a 124 per cent tariff on wheat and a 226 per cent tariff on sugar; and the third world's total external debt increased from \$729 billion in 1981 to over a trillion dollars this year.

In the face of these paralysing obstacles, pleas for understanding to the rest of the international community often elicit paternalistic responses at best, and derision at worst. Where an offer of assistance has been given, it has often been conditional on the implementation of economic policies that paid little attention to structural differentiations in the developing countries.

Thus the rigid enforcement of structural adjustment policies which always insist on import restriction and unregulated internal economic liberalization - wholesale removal of subsidies, massive devaluations, auctioning off of public enterprises - has merely accelerated the decimation of the structural foundations of the target economies, spawning grotesque social and political problems in the process.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

It is most refreshing to note the recent signs of a rethink regarding structural adjustment policies in their original cast - "structural adjustment with growth", which is the new version embodying this evolution in thought, explicitly acknowledges, among other things, the necessity not only for greater external assistance to those developing countries undertaking adjustment but also for the protection of vulnerable groups in society during the adjustment process.

Consolidation of the commitment by the industrialized countries which this development portends will definitely enhance the effectiveness of developing countries' efforts as they grapple with their economic problems.

In this regard we note with deep appreciation the impressive actions already taken by the Secretary-General, international financial and development institutions, as well as individual Governments and non-governmental organizations, to facilitate the successful implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery.

However, we renew our call for a fresh approach to the debt problem which is currently of very urgent concern. Sierra Leone acknowledges the value of multi-year reschedulings, longer maturities on new loans and capitalization of interest but, as we have already pointed out, total third-world obligations, instead of being reduced, have increased to a record level in 1987 under these policies. What we need are policies that actually reduce the debt burden. Such policies would require the active intervention of Governments in creditor countries as well as international financial and development institutions.

We have an enduring vision that because of its inherent dynamism the international system requires a new economic and political order that distributes, fairly, responsibilities and benefits to all nations, and not an order that can be artfully manipulated to "benefit a few greatly, some not at all, and dramatically increase the cost for all."

Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Permit me, on behalf of the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic and on my own behalf most warmly to congratulate Mr. Peter Florin on his election to the high post of President of the General Assembly of the United Nations at its forty-second session. This great honour conferred on him by the international community is a recognition of his rich experience as a diplomat and also a tribute to the prominent role of the German Democratic Republic in world politics and in the cause of strengthening universal peace and security. We are confident that under his skilful leadership this session of the General Assembly will achieve fresh success and concrete results in its work.

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

At the same time I should like to express our gratitude to your predecessor, the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh, Mr. Choudhury, for his skilful conduct of the proceedings of the previous session of the General Assembly.

Our delegation would like to take this opportunity once again to wish the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, good health and every success in his tireless work.

The general debate at this session of the United Nations General Assembly naturally mirrors the complex world situation and the most urgent problems of our time. Deep anxieties over the destiny of mankind are juxtaposed with guarded hopes for a turn for the better in international relations.

A confrontational approach arising from the policy of duress, neoglobalism and the settling of old scores still dominates the statements by representatives of the leading Western Power and some of its closest allies. In this way history is deliberately distorted and truth is unscrupulously trampled under foot.

On the other hand, it is clear that a constructive and responsible approach, a spirit of dialogue and negotiation, which takes into account the realities of the nuclear age is steadily gaining ground. Such an encouraging change is the result of the tireless efforts of the socialist countries, the non-aligned nations, and all other peace-loving forces that advocate a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world.

Today these forces can only feel satisfaction and optimism at the recent agreement in principle reached between the Soviet Union and the United States on the elimination of their medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles. The realization of such an agreement will constitute an important break in the vicious circle of the arms race and a first step towards genuine nuclear disarmament. An important supplement to this is the Soviet-American agreement on the establishment of centres for the reduction of the risks of nuclear war.

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

The joint Soviet-American statement of 18 September 1987 gives us hope that the two sides will make further efforts to work out a treaty on the reduction of strategic weapons in the spirit of the talks at Reykjavik while preserving the anti-ballistic missile Treaty. Similarly, there is a prospect of full-scale and step-by-step negotiations on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic hopes that all these changes will pave the way for realization of the Soviet programme on the step-by-step elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000. Such a hope is strengthened by the tangible progress being made at the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

In our view, progress in these directions will give real impetus to the efforts for the implementation of the proposals put forward by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty for a substantial reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments from the Atlantic to the Urals. The carrying out of the initiatives advanced by the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia and other European States for the establishment in the centre and other parts of Europe of corridors and zones free from nuclear, chemical and other weapons, and free also from the concentration of armed forces, has now become a matter of immediate, urgent and practical significance as a first step towards the attainment of this goal.

The article by Comrade Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "Reality and safeguards for a secure world", contains a comprehensive programme of measures for the elimination of the danger of war and for the establishment of a reliable system of international security through the collective efforts of all States under the auspices of the United Nations. To our mind, this document further elaborates and develops,

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

in the new circumstances, the ideas and objectives of the historical Decree of Peace proclaimed on the day following the victory of the October Socialist Revolution, the seventieth anniversary of which is observed this year by progressive people everywhere. This major event of the twentieth century ushered in an era of freedom, independence and social progress of peoples. It has made peace and peaceful co-existence a State policy. Further testimony to this is the military doctrine of socialism proclaimed by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty. The process of restructuring and the acceleration of socialist construction currently under way in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries strengthens the material foundations of universal peace and security.

The Mongolian People's Republic holds the view that the implementation of practical disarmament measures will pave the way for the creation of a crucial component of a comprehensive system of international security, namely, in the military and political fields. Another element of such a component is the removal of hotbeds of tension and conflict.

My Government is in favour of enhancing the emerging positive trends towards convening an international conference on the Middle East, and of an immediate and just settlement of the situation on the basis of ensuring the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, the full withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, and an effective guarantee of the national independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon and other States of the region. We believe that united action by Arab countries and cohesion in the ranks of the Palestinian resistance movement are of crucial importance in the attainment of this goal.

The policy of national reconciliation and the constructive international action set in motion by the Governments of Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Nicaragua have created favourable conditions for a political settlement of the situations

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

caused by the intrigues of imperialist forces and their regional accomplices against these countries. The right of the peoples of these countries to develop along the path they have chosen must be respected by all. Good will and realism should be matched by a positive response and must not be exploited for selfish and imperialistic ends.

The Mongolian People's Republic has consistently supported the constructive efforts exerted by the countries of Indochina, the Contadora and Lima groups, and the Sandinista Government, and by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and his representatives to bring about a political settlement of the situation in these hotspots. My Government also supports the steps taken by the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, in pursuance of the Security Council resolution on the cease-fire between Iran and Iraq. Mongolia associates itself with the appeal for an immediate end to this fratricidal war.

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

The Mongolian delegation has, on more than one occasion, stated from this rostrum that the collusion of imperialist and racist forces is the main cause of the aggravation of the situation in southern Africa. The Mongolian People's Republic condemns their subversive acts against Angola, Mozambique and other front-line States and supports the struggle of African countries and of the Organization of African Unity for the strengthening of peace, independence in the continent, and social progress.

My delegation is in favour of the immediate granting of independence to the people of Namibia and of the eradication of the apartheid régime in South Africa. We resolutely reject attempts to link the solution of the question of Namibia with the withdrawal from Angola of the Cuban internationalist servicemen.

Mongolia favours the strengthening of the independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and the immediate removal of the foreign military presence in its territory.

Disarmament measures and an improvement in the international situation in different parts of the world create favourable conditions for the solution of the problems of economic and social development. That truth has been abundantly proved by the outcome of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held recently under the auspices of the United Nations.

The possibility of ensuring the economic and social security of States on a global scale depends, in our view, on transforming their economic interdependence into genuinely equal and mutually beneficial co-operation among all countries in the interest of solving the cardinal problems of human progress. The Berlin declaration of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, of 29 May 1987, envisages ways and means of solving these problems, in particular the most pressing issues:

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

the overcoming of the underdevelopment of developing countries and the establishment of a new international economic order. Within the context of advancing those objectives, Mongolia takes a favourable view of the results of the extraordinary ministerial conference of non-aligned countries on South-South co-operation.

Proposing that concerted efforts be made towards the creation of the foundations of a comprehensive system of international security, the socialist countries urge the world community to work for a common response to the challenges of the nuclear age. There is no alternative to collective and equal security for all and to peaceful coexistence on the basis of respect for the right of peoples to choose their own way of life and for the right to peaceful and constructive work.

We do this in the spirit of the United Nations Charter and in the awareness of the need for the development and practical implementation of its provisions under new conditions. We are also drawing on the experience accumulated so far in international relations. The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the Harare declarations of the non-aligned countries are important assets in this regard. We believe that those documents, among others, can serve as important basic sources for working out a concept and the content of a comprehensive system of security.

The report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, set up by the United Nations General Assembly in 1982 and headed by the late Olof Palme, deserves greater attention. That report, entitled "Common security - a programme for disarmament", draws the conclusions that the well-worn path of military competition is a blind alley and that, in the nuclear age, nations cannot achieve security at each other's expense and must begin to organize their security policies in co-operation with each other.

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

In its foreign policy, the Mongolian People's Republic proceeds from the assumption that the strengthening of trust, mutual understanding and co-operation in the Asia-Pacific region has become extremely significant and important for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security. The vast network of economic, scientific and technical potential of the Soviet Union, the United States, Japan, China, India, Australia and the so-called newly industrialized States provides a unique material basis for the development of multifaceted co-operation for the benefit of all, in the interests of strengthening peace and security in the region.

The Soviet Union in its 1986 Vladivostok initiative and in the replies by Mikhail Gorbachov to the questions of the Indonesian newspaper Merdeka in July 1987, put forward wide-ranging proposals for building regional international relations precisely along those lines. Those proposals are designed to remove hotbeds of tension and conflict by peaceful means, to reduce the intensity of political and military confrontation in different parts of the region and to develop mutually beneficial co-operation on an equal footing.

Stressing the broad practical significance of the Soviet initiatives, our leader, Comrade Batmunkh, has pointed out that the realization of those initiatives undoubtedly would not only promote the strengthening of the security of the States of the region and the achievement of the universal aspirations for a nuclear-weapon-free world, but would also reduce tension, mistrust and the danger of the outbreak of new conflicts and would make sea and air communication routes in vast areas of the Pacific and Indian Oceans safer.

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

Peaceful proposals by the socialist countries and other countries are of particular urgency in the light of the deteriorating situation in the Asia-Pacific region. Militarist and revenge-seeking circles are seeking to turn the region into a new breeding-ground for confrontation with socialist countries and other peace-loving States. Here, the United States first-strike nuclear and missile weapons are being built up increasingly on land, sea and under water and a dangerous partnership is taking shape in plans for the militarization of outer space. Attempts are being stepped up to destabilize the situation in progressive and peace-loving States, as is interference in their internal affairs.

On the other hand, we have observed many events, many trends, which would indicate that ideas of improving the situation and expanding peaceful co-operation in the region are making headway.

The realization of the agreement, in principle, on the elimination of Soviet-American medium- and shorter-range missiles on a global double zero basis, will have an exceedingly favourable impact on the situation in the region.

There has been further noticeable improvement in the relations between the USSR and the People's Republic of China in the political, economic and other spheres and this is of great significance for an improvement of the international situation.

Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos have added new impetus to their efforts to improve relations with the People's Republic of China and with the countries members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations and for turning South-East Asia into a zone of peace, stability and co-operation.

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea has put forward a number of new initiatives designed to eliminate tension on the Korean peninsula and in the Far East and to create the conditions necessary for the peaceful reunification of Korea. We consider particularly timely its proposal for a stage-by-stage reduction of armed forces of the North and South along with the simultaneous withdrawal of American troops and weapons from South Korea. My delegation associates itself with the view that only a reunified Korea could become a Member of the United Nations.

The entry into force of the Rarotonga Treaty, which consolidates the process of converting the South Pacific into a nuclear-weapon-free zone, is a significant event in the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons in the Asia-Pacific region. The Mongolian People's Republic calls upon the United States, the United Kingdom and France to follow the example of the Soviet Union and China, which have signed the relevant Additional Protocols to the Treaty. My Government supports the struggle of the countries of the region to put an end to nuclear tests in the Pacific.

The movement to turn South-East Asia and the Indian Ocean into a nuclear-weapon-free zone and a zone of peace has been intensified. Our country supports the efforts made by India, Indonesia and other States to that end.

The Soviet-Indian Declaration of Principles for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Non-Violent World represents a major political step in the promotion of new political thinking. Broader application of the spirit of that Declaration in the relations between States of the region would be of great significance for the cause of strengthening international security.

The Mongolian People's Republic is endeavouring to promote confidence and mutual understanding and the development of good-neighbourly relations among countries of the Asia-Pacific region and actively supports all constructive

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

initiatives to that end. Mongolia, in its turn, is taking concrete steps to promote its idea of establishing international machinery designed to rule out effectively the use of force in the relations between the States of Asia and the Pacific.

The withdrawal by mutual consent in April-June this year of a substantial part of the limited contingent of Soviet troops temporarily stationed in Mongolia at the request of my Government serves to strengthen the atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding in the region.

A number of important international meetings of State and public representatives of countries of the region have been held recently in my country on the problems of strengthening peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region. Our relations with the countries of the region have been considerably expanded and the level of political dialogue with many of them has been raised. My Government will continue to make efforts to promote the strengthening of mutual understanding, good-neighbourly relations and co-operation among the countries of the region.

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic believes that the role of the United Nations has increased as never before as an instrument for the maintenance of international peace and as a centre for harmonizing the efforts of States with a view to finding appropriate solutions to universal problems. It reiterated once again its consistent support for the activities of the United Nations during the memorable visit of the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, to my country in May this year.*

* The President returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic attaches great significance to the broad range of ideas and concrete proposals contained in the article I have mentioned by Mr. Mikhail Gorbachov on enhancing the role of the United Nations in strengthening world peace and in establishing the foundations of a comprehensive system of international security.

In the opinion of my delegation, the proposal of the United Nations Secretary-General on the establishment in this Organization of a multilateral centre on the reduction of the risks of war and his ideas concerning regional centres for the promotion of peace and disarmament are timely.

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic shares his view that outer space should remain free of weapons. We maintain that while developing international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space it is imperative to pay particular attention to the strengthening of international instruments prohibiting the use of space for military purposes, especially the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies.

The Mongolian People's Republic considers that the time is ripe for our Organization to deal with matters relating to the prevention of an extremely dangerous potential type of terrorism, namely, nuclear terrorism, by adventurist elements.

The adoption at this session of the General Assembly of the declaration on the enhancement of the effectiveness of the principle of non-use of force in international relations would constitute a practical contribution by the United Nations to the reinforcement of the concept of equal security for all. It would also promote the practical implementation of the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and of the Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace, previously adopted by the United Nations.

(Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia)

My delegation hopes that this session of the General Assembly will mark an important milestone towards the achievement of the goals of enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations in implementing the provisions of its Charter. For its part my delegation will do its utmost to promote the success of the work of the session.

In conclusion I should like to announce that the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, as a token of its consistent support for United Nations activities, has decided to make a voluntary contribution of \$US 20,000 during 1987 and 1988, bearing in mind the financial difficulties the United Nations is at present experiencing. Certainly, the sum is very modest; nevertheless I hope the motives behind the gesture will be clear to all who are conscious of the need to lend every support to our Organization.

Mr. ABADIA ARIAS (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): At the beginning of this statement, Sir, I would have wished to say at length how pleased the Republic of Panama is at the choice of a person as deserving as you to preside over the forty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly. I would have wished as well to express special appreciation to your predecessor for the admirable work which he accomplished, and to refer in addition to the tireless and constant dedication of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, to the cause of peace and the strengthening of the Organization.

Similarly, following a tradition that dates back many years, I would have liked to begin this statement with a detailed list of the main world problems, followed by an explanation of the Panamanian position on them, but I find myself obliged to shorten those elements of my statement as much as possible, because on this occasion I speak on behalf of a people threatened and wounded, a nation humiliated and under attack.

The tenth anniversary of the signing of the Panama Canal Treaties by my country and the United States of America occurred on 7 September. That event in 1977 was unanimously welcomed by the international community, in particular the countries of the American continent, which saw in those documents agreement on a date by which colonialism on Panamanian soil would be ended and all vestiges of colonialism would be eradicated from American lands.

Unfortunately, the tenth anniversary of those Treaties was not a celebration for us Panamanians, who marked that date by expressing our indignation at the profound disillusionment of seeing that the will and resolve of that time had been distorted and the agreement replaced by a plan of aggression already set under way, carefully conceived, meticulously organized and obstinately pursued, to turn our dream of independence and sovereignty into a grotesque and pitiful farce.

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

Last year the President of the Republic of Panama denounced in this Hall the fact that the most reactionary sectors of the United States of America, with the servile support of the extreme right of the Panamanian opposition, had mounted a campaign to discredit leading figures in the Panamanian Government in order to undermine our efforts in the Contadora Group to bring peace to Central America and silence our demand that the violations of the Torrijos-Carter Treaties be corrected.

During the past year, we have seen that campaign strengthened with all sorts of unfounded accusations, especially against those authorities that have been struggling most resolutely for peace in Central America and opposing with determination United States attempts to restore and preserve a colonial pattern in the areas bordering the Canal and reduce the Panamanian Government to the status of a submissive colony.

With Panama unable to obtain or exercise the right of reply in the face of the entire network of communications media that had been manipulated, the slander increased in seriousness, quantity, frequency and potential harm, because the moral aggression that forms the first part of the plan of domination was necessary to prepare United States public opinion so that it would condone any act against Panama, any injustice, any attack and any violation of the Charter of the United Nations and that of the Organization of American States (OAS). Since attainment of that goal requires a profound knowledge of the democratic sensibilities of the people of the United States, and a great familiarity with the most effective means of deceit to turn slander into widely accepted truth, there was a systematic replacement of the staff of the United States diplomatic mission in Panama and an increase in administrative and technical staff. An attempt was made to build satellite broadcasting installations, in violation of the Vienna Convention of 1961.

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

A team was organized to host and guide official staff, politicians and correspondents so as to manipulate whatever opinions they might form on Panama. A whole parade of alleged violations of human rights and alleged weaknesses in democratic institutions was staged. Indeed, the entire United States diplomatic mission seemed to have been turned into a factory for slander and lies, with its own distribution and dissemination machinery. The complaints that we have lodged about this at the highest levels of the United States Administration have remained unanswered.

The other Governments of the world, which have access to sources of information that no one manipulates or falsifies, are governed by their own principles and act in accordance with their own interests, know that these are not the facts, and they must have already begun to wonder why the United States of America is acting in this way with regard to Panama. Later, they will begin to see the answers to this question, because I must now go on to the second part of the plan: economic aggression.

In the past 10 years we have had increasing success in the plan of the revolutionary Government of Panama to create a great financial centre, taking advantage of the very special advantages that my country can offer, and this has become a new source of wealth and work for the people of Panama. As the number of foreign banks with branches in Panama increased, and as funds deposited in those branches grew to billions of dollars, the pressure put on Panama by the United States Government to reform its bank legislation also increased. They demanded changes that might make the banks consider it more appropriate and lucrative to transfer their operations to another country, which would thus put an end to the flourishing of these activities, which represent 9,000 permanent jobs.

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

When it was seen that the campaign of slander against Panama was not affecting the financial centre and that Panama was only agreeing to those specific changes that could facilitate joint efforts against the illicit drug traffic, the financial centre became one of the targets of the plan of aggression. All the seditious actions of the past three and a half months have had as their principal arena the heart of the banking area of Panama City, and news articles with photographs of people setting fire to automobiles or bags of garbage, with the name of a foreign bank in the background, had the effect that the slander of the mass media had not achieved.

Just three months ago, Panama denounced before the Organization of American States and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries a resolution adopted by the United States Senate which violates internationally recognized principles accepted as fundamental to the peaceful coexistence of nations. In its brazen arrogance, the resolution even cited legal norms and formulas that should be applied to remove from their posts those Panamanian officials whom the plan of aggression had singled out as pawns to be cleared off the infamous chess-board that had been set up.

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

Last week, while Heads of State or Government and representatives of various nations were expressing their support for the cause of peace in Central America in this Organization and reiterating their support for the principles of the United Nations Charter, the United States Senate, with total disdain for international legal norms, adopted a resolution imposing conditions on economic assistance, military aid and arms exports to Panama, as well as on imports of Panamanian sugar to the United States of America, unless, within 45 days, a transition Government were established in Panama in compliance with the will of United States senators.

By one of those ironies in which history abounds, the oppressor often commits a blunder that favours the oppressed, and the last days of that time period coincide with the national holiday of Panama. The deadline is on the eve of the date when Panamanians commemorate Panama's Proclamation of Independence from the Spanish Empire. On that day we shall be reaffirming that Proclamation of Independence with the firmest possible resolve.

As if the violation of the principles of self-determination of peoples and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States were not enough, the recent Senate resolution violates specific norms adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. I should like briefly to cite a few of them.

Article 32 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States establishes that

"No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights." (resolution 3281 (XXIX))

General Assembly resolution 36/103 on the inadmissibility of intervention in the internal affairs of States clearly affirms

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

"The duty of a State, in the conduct of its international relations in the economic, social, technical and trade fields, to refrain from measures which would constitute interference or intervention in the internal or external affairs of another State, thus preventing it from determining freely its political, economic and social development; this includes, inter alia, the duty of a State not to use its external economic assistance programme or adopt any multilateral or unilateral economic reprisal or blockade ... as instruments of political pressure or coercion against another State, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations." (resolution 36/103, Sec. II, para. (k))

In resolution 41/165, adopted just last year, the General Assembly

"Reaffirms that developed countries should refrain from threatening or applying trade restrictions, blockades, embargoes and other economic sanctions, incompatible with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and in violation of undertakings contracted, multilaterally and bilaterally, against developing countries as a form of political and economic coercion that affects their economic, political and social development." (resolution 41/165, para. 3)

I should like to affirm before this Assembly that however overwhelming and formidable the might of a nation may be, it shall never have the power to alter the significance of these norms, nor to evade the moral condemnation of other nations for having violated them.

That brings me to the third phase of the aggression that has already begun to emerge and that I now denounce, on behalf of the Government of Panama, before all the other Governments of the States Members of this Organization.

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

At about noon on Wednesday, 23 September, this very month, while the Ambassador of the United States of America was hosting a luncheon at his official residence with his councillor and with many figures of the opposition recognized as the main local leaders of that attempt to overthrow the Panamanian Government which I have been denouncing, over 100 soldiers of the United States armed forces stationed in the defence zones in the area bordering the Canal, whose sole purpose is the defence of the inter-oceanic waterway, arrived in two buses at the United States Embassy building and parked there, in violation of the procedures established in the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and its related agreements on the displacement and transport of those foreign troops.

At the same time, a Black Hawk UH 60 helicopter, bearing registration plates M-23985, from the Howard military air base near the Canal landed some 10 kilometres from the northern air strip of the Rio Hato airport, where there are military installations belonging to the Panamanian defence forces, without using established air corridors and in violation of Panamanian air space. Its pilot refused to respond to demands from the control tower that he identify himself and indicate the purpose of the flight, and the aircraft took off when a Panamanian land patrol approached it.

I must explain that if I am mentioning these details even though it is unusual to do so in United Nations statements on such occasions, it is because one of the main strengths of the Republic of Panama is the support for the cause of national liberation of my people that the repudiation of similar acts of aggression arouses in other nations.

The Panama Canal Treaties, which tomorrow will formally have been in force for eight years, very intentionally took into consideration the fact that the patriotic sensibilities of the Panamanian people had been deeply wounded for many years by the United States military presence in the colonial enclave they maintained there

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

for 75 years - years of humiliation and outrage by foreign soldiers who often behaved like victorious occupation troops.

For that reason, the Treaties included provisions that even prohibit the wearing of foreign military uniforms outside specifically established areas of defence, except in the case of official occasions. I must, with great indignation and sadness, emphasize here that a luncheon given by the head of a diplomatic mission and his deputy for the leaders of a movement aimed at overthrowing the Government of the country where they are accredited is not an official occasion. What occurred constitutes, it must be said, a premeditated and calculated provocation with the intention of creating a situation conducive to some act of violence that would justify to United States public opinion the aggression that forms the third stage of the plan.

As was to be expected, there has already been a nationwide reaction which can be seen in many declarations by trade union and student organizations, reviving language that had not been heard in my country since the days that followed the act of aggression committed by United States troops against the Panamanian civilian population that caused 21 deaths and left over 500 people wounded.

Why such outrage? Why is a country as large and powerful as the United States pitting itself against a nation which has rendered it great services and against a people which has always shown it friendship?

One day soon, Government leaders will understand that it is not possible for this atrocious game of inventing slander and fabricating lies to continue without endangering their own democratic institutions. That is why we must now explain why a sinister coalition of forces is acting against the independence and sovereignty of Panama, as well as against the Government which, in an unequal contest, is now defending the country's status as an independent and sovereign State.

(Mr. Abadía Arias, Panama)

For almost five years now the Governments of Colombia, Mexico, Venezuela and Panama have been acting together to promote agreement on a peaceful negotiated solution in Central America. Time and again, with similar recourse or by other means, as the case may be, foreign interference has succeeded in thwarting the initiative that emerged in 1983 and that first gathered together the countries of the Contadora Group and then the countries of the Support Group, with the approval of all nations in general and, in particular, with the sincere and resolute support of the nations comprising the European Economic Community and the Non-Aligned Movement.

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

We have had to pay a high price for our perseverance and insistence on achieving a Latin American solution to this Latin American problem. As we overcame the obstacles one by one, obstacles created or fostered to a large extent by sectors of the United States Government, and as prospects of peace began to emerge more clearly, pressures mounted on the Panamanian Government to leave the Contadora Group and to withdraw its support for the cause of peace in the region.

When the position of the four countries of the Contadora Group was aligned with the position of Argentina, Brazil, Peru and Uruguay, a military member of the United States National Security Council personally demanded of General Manuel Antonio Noriega that Panama withdraw from the Contadora Group. When he was told that the demand was an affront to the dignity of our people and nation a plan was hatched to subjugate Panama. Three months later there began a wide-ranging replacement of United States diplomatic staff, followed by an increase in the number of administrative and technical staff and increases in the number of troops stationed along the Canal, in disregard of the ban on such increases contained in the treaties in force between the two countries.

The reactionary forces in the United States Government that conspired to destroy Panama's independence found it crucial to replace the Panamanian Government with a compliant Government that would blindly follow its orders.

At the forty-first session, in Panama's statement, the President of Panama, Eric Arturo Delvalle, denounced a plot to evade implementation of the Canal Treaties, under which the Canal is to be turned over to full Panamanian control within 12 years and the United States military presence in our territory is to end at the same time.

That statement and the further denunciations of many violations committed by the United States lent a new dimension to the plan of aggression already set in

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

motion with the manipulation of some United States communications media and some local and foreign news agencies to bring about acceptance of the slanders invented for use as the main weapon in the dirty war declared against those who defend my country's independence and sovereignty.

The United Nations was a beautiful and promising result of the sacrifices made by mankind in the struggle against fascist barbarism. Its most powerful members paid with countless human lives and incalculable destruction to learn the tragic lesson I am now recalling. Half a century is not long enough for people to forget.

In its structure, in its methods, in the way its combined forces operate, in its organization, and in its tactics, the movement threatening my country bears a terrifying resemblance to the fascist movements that laid waste and subjugated Europe.

Despite those resemblances, the United States Senate has chosen in support of that movement to play the sinister card of interventionist action and economic aggression, thus presenting a grave danger to all the nations of the Americas and a tangible threat to world peace. If the United States Government used all its might to impose on Panama a minority Government which submitted to its desire for domination, no nation in the world would be able to feel that its independence and sovereignty were secure or that a similar attempt could not be made at its own borders.

If the Panamanian people had not rejected the seditious outbreak that, with the support, aid and instigation of certain sectors of the United States Government, tried to overthrow the Panamanian Government and replace it with a provisional Government obedient to the orders of the United States Embassy in Panama, I should not be here now making this denunciation.

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

Since the beginning of the decade, a few years after the new Canal Treaties came into effect, Panama has been sounded out unofficially, and has received various other representations, about the possibility of an agreement extending authorization of military installations on Panamanian territory beyond the year 2000.

Prominent members and representatives of the United States military establishment have said, with an insistence that is significant, that the problem of the military presence, which will end in 12 years with the coming into effect of the 1977 Panama Canal Treaties, requires that the United States Government make decisions and take actions that must be begun at the latest in 1989 - that is, within 15 months.

Under the agreement reached in 1977, the United States armed forces are to be gradually reduced in number, and at the same time the role of protecting the Canal is to be transferred in an orderly, gradual way to the defence forces of Panama. Despite that, in the past five years United States forces have grown significantly, instead of decreasing, and increased participation by the Panamanians in those functions has been systematically forgotten and delayed.

For some years now, with growing frequency and at the highest level, as time goes by, civilian and military officials of the United States have been saying that the approach of the date set for the final implementation of the Canal Treaties and the end of the United States military presence in Panama is a problem demanding immediate attention.

The Panamanian Government has had only one answer to the soundings and veiled proposals that have reached it; that answer has always been that Panama demands that the Treaties be complied with to the letter. This sheds a revealing light on the fact that the minority political forces comprising the movement opposing the

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

Panamanian Government have always been in favor of the United States keeping military bases in Panama beyond the year 2000.

Shortly before the organized attack against the constitutional Government of Panama there were discussions in the United States Congress and reports on the financial cost of leaving the existing installations in Panama and the repercussions of doing so on United States strategic interests. Recent State Department documents have gone to unbelievable extremes of brazenness in recommending measures for the structuring of a new Government in Panama to defend those strategic interests. Outstanding among the excesses in this plot against my country, and a grim threat, is the fact that the United States Senate is trying to impose in Panama a provisional Government that, according to repeated public statements by the main leaders of this treason, would have as its President the very man who was overthrown in 1941 for his attempts to make Panama an ally of Hitler's Germany. That makes clear another motive of the plan against Panama, and once again demonstrates how dangerous it is for the other nations of the American continent and the ideals of this Organization.

Aware of the terrible price now being paid for the independence of its foreign policy, Panama reiterates its unswerving commitment to the principles of the Non-Aligned Movement, and it hopes to see in the near future the establishment of a new international economic order.

(Mr. Abadía Arias, Panama)

At one with those who promote the new trend of the unity of the Latin American countries, Panama believes that the strengthening of that unity requires, as an immediate task, the achievement of peace in Central America and the fraternal comprehension and generosity that will give Bolivia access to the sea. Such demonstrations of maturity and solidarity will make the Latin American peoples better able to fight for the cause of Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas, South Sandwich and South Georgias Islands, for the full attainment of self-determination by Puerto Rico, for a political solution to the foreign-debt problem and for the eradication of the drug traffic as a service rendered to other nations where this scourge increases the moral breakdown of major sectors of the population. It will therefore also be better able to form an invincible front against slander organized as a tool of war against the independence of our nations.

As a country where all forms of racial discrimination disappeared over half a century before slavery was abolished in the United States, Panama condemns the odious divisions of society in South Africa and once again expresses its firm solidarity with the people of Namibia. We reiterate our support for the aspirations of Spain in connection with Gibraltar and urge that peace be achieved between Iran and Iraq and that peace be brought to Lebanon. We reaffirm also our support for any action that can lead to peace between Arabs and Israelis, on the basis of the right of the State of Israel to exist within secure boundaries, as is established in a United Nations resolution. Panama once again affirms its people's solidarity with the Sahraoui people. It shares the aspirations of Cyprus, Afghanistan and Kampuchea to be free of any foreign military presence, and expresses its hope of soon seeing the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea represented in the General Assembly as Members of the

(Mr. Abadia Arias, Panama)

Organization. The proposals for a ministerial meeting to deal with the unification of the Korean peninsula should be agreed to without delay.

Despite the moral aggression that it is suffering and the danger of military aggression that it is confronting, Panama will continue to fight for a Latin American solution to the crisis of Central America and will continue to demand the implementation of the 1977 Panama Canal Treaty, with the Canal under full Panamanian control as of 31 December 1999, under the agreed terms and with the United States military presence ended on that date.

The Republic of Panama has full grounds for invoking the principles of this Organization and for making use of all the legitimate means that the norms of international law place at its disposal; and it is beginning to do so by openly stating that those principles and those norms have been violated by the United States, first through prolonged, severe moral aggression against the Panamanian Government and then through calculated, base economic aggression.

I affirm also that those principles and those norms are in danger of being converted into a dead letter by the use of force against the independence of my country. Because of the magnitude of that danger, we Panamanians must continue to fight for national liberation, regardless of the harsh times that lie ahead and the extraordinary sacrifices required to defend the Panamanian nation against the aggressors. We shall never be subjugated.

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

I would 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. ZEPOS (Greece): In his reply to the statement made yesterday by the Foreign Minister of Greece, the Permanent Representative of Turkey appeared to be continuing a habit of referring to events of the past which he carefully selects, in an attempt to give his own arbitrary interpretation and to divert the General Assembly's attention from the very core of the problem of Cyprus - that is, the continuing presence of the Turkish military forces occupying part of the territory of the Republic. The Turkish Permanent Representative, in his comments, took one or two events in isolation from the longer and overall dramatic developments of the recent history of Greece and of Cyprus and attempted - rather awkwardly, if I may say so - to invoke the name of Archbishop Makarios, who devoted the latter part of his life to defending the independence of Cyprus against Turkish expansionism.

This is not the moment to draw the Assembly's attention to issues falling within the precinct of analysis of history. I shall confine myself to recalling that the coup of 15 July 1974 against the leader of a sovereign and independent State was an act of high treason which gave Turkey the pretext and the long-awaited opportunity to unleash its invasion forces on Cyprus.

Speaking on the question of Cyprus, the Foreign Minister of my country stressed, in a clear and exhaustive manner, that there can be no solution unless there is a total withdrawal of Turkish troops from the island. His statement needs no elaboration. But, for those who persist in ignoring the core of the problem, I wish briefly to refer to some pertinent passages of relevant General Assembly resolutions.

In resolution 3395, adopted in 1975, the General Assembly, in paragraph 3

"Demands the withdrawal without further delay of all foreign armed forces and foreign military presence and personnel from the Republic of Cyprus and the cessation of all foreign interference in its affairs". (resolution 3395 (XXX), para. 3)

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

In resolution 33/15, adopted in 1978, the General Assembly, in the sixth preambular paragraph, deplores

"the continued presence of foreign armed forces and foreign military personnel on the territory of the Republic of Cyprus and the fact that part of its territory is still occupied by foreign forces". (resolution 33/15, sixth preambular paragraph)

In paragraph 3 of the same resolution, the General Assembly

"Demands the immediate withdrawal of all foreign armed forces and foreign military presence from the Republic of Cyprus". (resolution 33/15, para. 3)

In resolution 34/30, adopted in 1979, the General Assembly, in the ninth preambular paragraph, deplores

"the continued presence of foreign armed forces and foreign military personnel on the territory of the Republic of Cyprus and the fact that part of its territory is still occupied by foreign forces". (resolution 34/30, ninth preambular paragraph)

In paragraph 5 of the same resolution, the General Assembly

"Demands the immediate withdrawal of all foreign armed forces and foreign military presence from the Republic of Cyprus". (resolution 34/30, para. 5)

In resolution 37/253, adopted in 1983, the General Assembly, in paragraph 7

"Considers the withdrawal of all occupation forces from the Republic of Cyprus as an essential basis for a speedy and mutually acceptable solution of the problem of Cyprus" (resolution 37/253, para. 7)

and in paragraph 8

"Demands the immediate withdrawal of all occupation forces from the Republic of Cyprus". (resolution 37/253, para. 8)

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

Those passages speak for themselves and underline the importance of the theme my Minister presented yesterday.

I would add that Greece in no way rejects its obligations arising from the Treaty of Guarantee. That Treaty, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, provides no right whatsoever to unilateral military intervention. However, Turkey not only refuses to discuss the withdrawal of its armed forces from Cyprus but rejects discussion on a new expanded system of guarantees which would satisfy both Cypriot communities. It also refuses to apply elementary human rights and the three freedoms.

It is imperative to settle those three major issues if we are to ensure effectively the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of the Republic of Cyprus. Turkey should clarify its position on these three issues instead of making, through its Permanent Representative, unwarranted comments regarding our attitude vis-à-vis the Secretary-General. I very much regretted that.

I have no intention of following my Turkish colleague in making such comments. I wish only to refer factually to a statement made recently by the Prime Minister of Turkey, when he was speaking of the bad relations between his country and another neighbouring country. He stated that Turkey would "deal with this problem in the same manner as they dealt with Cyprus", and that "after the operation in Cyprus there was no trace left of Greek Cypriots or Greeks".

I regret that I have had to refer to those statements and make these comments. On the problem of Cyprus, as on other problems, we fully support respect for the principles and values of the Charter of the United Nations, and we defend the right of every sovereign State, including the Republic of Cyprus, to demand respect for those principles and values as regards itself by any recourse it may wish to have to any forum.

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): I will begin my reply to the statement of Ambassador Turkmen of Turkey by quoting from the speech of the late President of the Republic of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, when he made a dramatic appeal to this Organization for help against the Turkish onslaught on his people and his small country. Truly, as Ambassador Turkmen said, Makarios denounced and condemned the coup staged by the Greek junta, which was aimed at his assassination. This was evidence, I believe, of his independence of mind and of the fact that he always upheld principles and democratic ideals.

Lest the representative of Turkey forget, however, this is how Makarios described the Turkish aggression which immediately followed the coup, with all its force and brutality:

"As a result of the Turkish invasion, Cyprus, a flourishing and happy island, has been turned into a place of ruins, tears and death. ... The world has witnessed the ruthless showering of napalm bombs on undefended towns and villages, indiscriminately killing the civilian population in a fury of destruction. Even hospitals, churches and priceless ancient monuments were attacked and turned into ashes. Murder in cold blood, raping, looting and plunder were the daily practice ... To find parallel examples of invasion with similar acts of brutality and destruction one has to go back to the fifth century A.D., to the time of Attila, whose name has been aptly given to this invading operation by the aggressor itself. Festivities and demonstrations were organized in Turkey to mark and celebrate the victory of the Turkish forces against Cyprus and decorations and medals have been distributed to the Chiefs of the Air Force and the Navy for their victory against a small and defenceless island. Victory it is indeed! But a victory against the international legal order, against the United Nations and its Charter and against every norm of decency in a civilized society." (A/PV.2251, p. 7)

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

Somehow, Ambassador Turkmen conveniently - to use his own phrase - avoided mentioning that part of Markarios' speech.

We heard again the ludicrous argument that the invasion of Cyprus was carried out in accordance with the Treaty of Guarantee, which allegedly gives Turkey the right to use force and intervene militarily in Cyprus. The action referred to in that Treaty cannot be anything but peaceful action taken jointly with the other Guarantors; for the use of force in international relations is expressly prohibited in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter, and any treaty contrary to that provision of the Charter is null and void. The Turkish invasion was an act of aggression and a violation of the Charter and every norm of international law. The coup was just a pretext. To attempt in a United Nations era to justify the invasion of Cyprus under the provisions of the Treaty of Guarantee is to be oblivious of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, specifically of Article 2, paragraph 4, and Article 103.

Ambassador Turkmen, in trying to justify the imposition by the Turkish occupation troops of apartheid-like segregation by force of the Greek Cypriots from the Turkish Cypriots, alleges that an exchange of population took place. On this, Ankara bases its own definition of bizonal federation. Yes, we have agreed to a federal solution of the problem of Cyprus. But, alas, when we hear of so-called exchanges of population and of the creation within a single State of two areas that would be inhabited by citizens solely - I repeat solely - on the basis of ethnic origin, we totally reject the segregationist, partitionist arrangement, for it is contrary to every human rights convention and is what we called earlier a form of apartheid. We believe in freedom of movement, freedom of settlement and freedom of ownership of land for all our citizens, whether Greek Cypriots or Turkish Cypriots.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

The problem of Cyprus that we are faced with is an act of aggression by Turkey against Cyprus, a Member of the United Nations. This body and the Security Council have adopted a series of resolutions and decisions, but Turkey contemptuously disregards them. The issue, therefore, is one of compelling Turkey to implement the mandatory Security Council resolutions Turkey is a Member of the United Nations. It has undertaken a solemn obligation under Article 25 of the United Nations Charter to respect and enforce the Council's decisions.

As underlined by my colleague from Greece, all the relevant United Nations resolutions call unflinchingly and consistently for the withdrawal of the Turkish troops. Yet Turkey has not withdrawn a single soldier. On the contrary, it has increased the number of its troops and modernized their weaponry. In his report to the Security Council (S/18880) of 29 May 1987, the Secretary-General is absolutely clear on that point.

Turkey has also imported thousands of settlers into Cyprus in an attempt to "Turkify" the occupied areas and eventually annex them to Turkey.

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

Turkey, condemned by the international community for the invasion of my country, considers us "intransigent" for bringing the issue before the United Nations for debate. But dozens of world issues are discussed here. Is it intransigence to discuss Namibia or the question of southern Africa, or the Middle East problem or Palestine, or Central America?

Cyprus has a duty to this Organization, under whose resolutions the negotiating process commenced, to report back and to brief its Members on the developments regarding the problem and the lack of progress - and this because of Turkish intransigence, despite Ambassador Turkmen's reference to a single document in the overall efforts of the Secretary-General, under his mission of good offices, a mission we support.

The false Turkish accusations about the suffering of the Turkish Cypriot community have been made in the past, but since the Turkish invasion of 1974 the reasons and motives for making such statements have become more obvious, namely, to try to justify the continuation of the Turkish occupation of our country, contrary to solemn United Nations resolutions.

With respect to the reference to the so-called massacres in 1963, I would advise Ambassador Turkmen that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones, for the world does indeed remember.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to recall here, to mention just examples from this century, that 52 years ago, on 8 May 1935, the Venezuelan Carlos Aponte, together with the Cuban anti-imperialist fighter Antonio Guiteras, were murdered by Fulgencio Batista's henchmen, at Morrillo de Matanzas. Carlos Aponte had come from Nicaragua to fight for the real independence of Cuba, where, with the unforgettable Salvadoran patriot Farabundo Marti, he joined the leader of free men, Augusto Cesar Sandino, to repel imperialist intervention and free Nicaragua.

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

Our history is replete with examples of heroes such as Carlos Aponte and Farabundo Marti. Our peoples admire them and the examples they have set. Those who deny that, attempt to deny their legitimate aspirations.

Yesterday afternoon the representative of El Salvador called into question the support of my Government for the Esquipulas II agreements. He also referred to a supposed export of revolution by Cuba, as though revolutions were not the result of exploitation and poverty, injustice and oppression - in sum, domestic socio-economic factors - and teleguided or imposed against the will of the people.

He also complained of our support for the Salvadoran patriots, as though that were something novel or, worse yet, improper. Cuba supported and continues to support the agreements of the five Central American Presidents, just as it supported from the outset the initiatives of the Contadora Group. We have also supported every proposal submitted by the Farabundo Marti Front for National Liberation and the Democratic Revolutionary Front of El Salvador for negotiations leading to a settlement of the war imposed upon the Salvadoran people.

We want to achieve a true solution to the problems of that region that will guarantee peace for all peoples and will enable them freely to choose their future - the peace and the future for which Carlos Aponte, Farabundo Marti and Antonio Guiteras struggled and died, as well as all those who, like them, have filled our history with glory.

Mr. SILJANDER (United States of America): We regret the inaccurate statements made by the Foreign Minister of Panama. As a former member of the United States Congress, I can assure the Assembly that the United States Senate resolution adopted on 25 September, referred to by the Foreign Minister of Panama, was a sense of the Senate resolution and merely reflected the views of that body

(Mr. Siljander, United States)

alone. The sentiments expressed by the United States Senate were made in a spirit of support for the rights of the Panamanian people to exercise their basic democratic freedoms. They cannot be construed as interfering at all in the internal affairs of Panama.

With respect to the Foreign Minister's reference to the visit by members of the United States armed forces to the United States embassy in Panama, I should like to point out that 27 officer cadets of the United States Naval Air Force paid a courtesy call on the United States embassy in Panama City. The cadets carried no weapons and were in dress uniform.

Again, let me emphasize our astonishment and regret at the inaccuracies in the statements made by the representative of Panama.

Mr. HAKTANIR (Turkey): Yesterday the Permanent Representative of Turkey replied to the statement of the Foreign Minister of Greece. The two delegations speaking on behalf of Greece and the Greek Cypriots have chosen to reply to us today. One would have expected that this delay would have enabled them to come forward with reasoned arguments. But it seems that both delegations have decided to use this extra time to prepare statements full of stale, rebarbative and fallacious stereotypes.

The Greek Cypriots do not seem to realize that each time they speak in this manner and display their spite towards the Turkish Cypriots, they exacerbate distrust between the two peoples living on the island and rekindle, in the Turkish Cypriots, the memories of the ordeal that they suffered between 1963 and 1974, when they had to endure the monopoly of political and military power of the Greek Cypriots. They do not seem to understand that a coexistence and a new partnership in the island is possible only when the Turkish Cypriot people feel that its

(Mr. Haktanir, Turkey)

security is no longer threatened, that it has the possibility to participate effectively and on the basis of equality in a federal government and that it can enjoy equal political status. After many years of negotiations, the two sides have agreed on certain basic principles solemnly accepted on behalf of the Greek Cypriots by the late Archbishop Makarios and Mr. Kyprianou in 1977 and 1979.

(Mr. Haktanir, Turkey)

It is on the basis of these agreements that the Secretary-General, after nearly two years of intensive discussions with the two sides, has come forward with a draft framework agreement for a comprehensive solution. The Greek Cypriots, in the stand they take in their statements in the General Assembly, not only reject the proposals of the Secretary-General, but also renege on the commitments they made in 1977 and 1979. All this rhetoric has one obvious purpose: to evade any solution. Why? Because there is no one on the Greek Cypriot side who can assume the responsibility of a compromise.

As far as the Greek representative is concerned, I do not think he said anything that can alter the validity of the points that our Permanent Representative made yesterday. The representative of Greece did not fail to distort a statement by the Turkish Prime Minister. But even the art of supreme demagoguery that has flourished in Athens cannot conceal the facts.

The Cyprus tragedy is the product of Greece's policy. If Greece had not toyed with the ambition to expand its sovereignty to the island, if it had not intrigued, not only against the Turkish Cypriots but against the Greek Cypriots as well, if it had counselled restraint to the Greek Cypriots instead of encouraging and supporting their instincts of domination, if it had remained faithful to its Treaty obligations, if it had remembered its own historical experiences in which its ambitions produced only humiliation and frustration, Cyprus could have continued to live with the Constitution adopted in 1960.

Now Greece wants Turkey to reverse a situation which was created by Greece's blunders and to abandon the Turkish Cypriots to the mercy of Greece and the Greek Cypriots. This we will not do. We shall continue to support the Secretary-General's mission of good offices and a negotiated process which deals with all the dimensions of the Cyprus problem and not just with the favourite subjects of the Greeks and the Greek Cypriots.

Mr. RITTER (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the United States has expressed his surprise that Panama is denouncing before the General Assembly of the United Nations violations of the Treaties that we have signed with the United States and what is, under the terms of the United Nations Charter, intervention in its internal affairs.

The Treaty between Panama and the United States which establishes an end to the latter's military presence at the end of the century also very clearly establishes that United States troops are in my country's territory, for the exclusive purpose of defending the Panama Canal. The mobilization of troops outside the defence areas constitutes a violation of the Treaties and, in addition, an unnecessary provocation of the sensibilities of the people of Panama, which for 75 years has borne the presence of troops in all its streets and provinces.

On the pretext of defending the rights of the people of Panama, the United States Senate - and in the statement of the Foreign Minister of Panama it was mentioned that it was the United States Senate - adopted a resolution which indicates that in 45 days there has to be a provisional Government in Panama.

If that is not intervention in the internal affairs of another State, then nothing is.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call now on representatives who wish to speak a second time in exercise of the right of reply. Such statements are limited to five minutes.

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): I want to thank the representative of Turkey for his advice, a sort of fatherly advice. I would reciprocate by advising him and his country to heed the solemn calls in the relevant Security Council resolutions

(Mr. Moushoutas, Cyprus)

and withdraw Turkish troops from the Republic of Cyprus forthwith. It is indeed time to be a true Member of this Organization by demonstrating in practice respect for the provisions of its Charter.

Cyprus belongs to the Cypriots - Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, who are a precious and inseparable part of our people. If we are left alone, we have no doubt that we shall live together amicably and peacefully, as before.

Mr. ZEPOS (Greece): A few moments ago I was conscious of the fact that I was perhaps abusing your indulgence, Mr. President, and that of the members of the General Assembly by having to recall the content of some very pertinent passages of previous General Assembly resolutions concerning Cyprus in which it was clearly emphasized that the crux of the problem was the withdrawal of foreign occupying forces from that sovereign State.

I was certainly addressing myself to the representative of Turkey, confining myself to that reminder and not at all wishing to engage in polemics of a historical nature, which we could do elsewhere. I am sorry that he thought it the right moment to formulate advice to a nation which is proud of its history, its culture and its attachment to democratic principles and freedom.

The meeting rose of 6.10 p.m.