



## General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/41/PV.11

26 September 1986

ENGLISH

Forty-first session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 25 September 1986, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh)  
later: Mr. OSMAN (Somalia)  
(Vice-President)  
later: Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus)  
(Vice-President)

- General debate [9] (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Aziz (Iraq)  
Mr. Dizdarevic (Yugoslavia)  
Mr. Mwangale (Kenya)  
Mr. Al-Sabah (Kuwait)  
Mr. Malmierca Peoli (Cuba)  
Mr. Chissano (Mozambique)  
Mr. Filali (Morocco)

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. AZIZ (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): It gives me pleasure to convey to you, Sir, my most sincere congratulations on your election as President of this session of the General Assembly. We find your election even more gratifying since you represent a country with which my country has enjoyed a long history of friendly relations and common interests. I am convinced that your ability and your long experience will guarantee that this session will be successful and that positive results will be reached. I should also like to express our appreciation for the efforts made by your predecessor, Ambassador de Piniés.

This session is being held at a time marked by complex international relations caused by mounting international tension, an escalation in the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, increasing interference in the internal affairs of States, the use of aggression and force and the threat of such use, in various forms and ways. Finally, it is also due to the grave deterioration of the international economy, which afflicts us all.

One of the most important objectives of this Organization is the preservation of peace - the peace that ensures sovereignty, security and the dignity of all peoples. It is no mere chance, therefore, that the Charter of the United Nations has placed on us the collective responsibility of safeguarding this noble human objective.

The responsibility of preserving peace obliges us to make further efforts to alleviate tension between the super-Powers in order to provide the stability necessary for the development of international relations. It is our duty therefore to urge the two super-Powers to come together and work for the establishment of

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

international détente, without which no solid foundation for international peace and security can be established. There is no doubt that disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, continues to be an important factor in achieving the stability that must be achieved in international relations because of the great material and human potential that it will release to the development process. We should not forget, in this regard, to refer with appreciation to the positive initiatives of the Soviet Union in the field of disarmament. We hope the United States will meet those initiatives with a positive response.

Our collective responsibility in the achievement of peace dictates that we should also resolve the problems confronting some regions by peaceful means and through negotiations based on the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. That is why we call for a peaceful solution to the problems of Cyprus, Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Central America on the basis of respect for sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs and the territorial integrity of all States concerned. This will enable the peoples of those States to strengthen their unity and face up to the challenges of reconstruction and development.

We must also live up to our responsibilities in confronting all forms of foreign domination and in liberating the peoples of southern Africa from the yoke of the oppressive policies of apartheid and racial discrimination imposed by the Pretoria régime, which persists in flagrantly violating the human principles of equality among all men by its continued occupation of Namibia and its perpetration of acts of aggression against the front-line States.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

In accordance with the principles laid down in the United Nations Charter, Iraq strongly supports the Namibian people in their struggle for independence under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole legitimate representative, and stands by the black people of South Africa in their legitimate struggle for equality, liberty and dignity. We also support the imposition of sanctions upon the apartheid régime, which would be consonant with the principles of the Charter.

Our region, and my country in particular, being continually subjected to aggression, are among the areas in the world most greatly in need of peace, stability and the implementation of the principles upon which this Organization was founded.

The Palestine people, homeless now for decades, is being subjected in exile to repeated military raids and acts of genocide which aim to erase its national identity. The Palestinians are being subjected to all kinds of pressures and manoeuvres in an attempt to distort the facts and impose solutions of submission and surrender upon it and upon the Arab nation.

Zionism and Israel have been perpetrating these violations and inhuman practices in complete disregard of humanitarian principles and of the United Nations Charter and its resolutions. Practices such as these have reduced the Arab region to a state of continuing crisis, and the region is thus in urgent need of peace, security and stability. Zionist terrorism and Israeli violations have not been limited to the Palestinians of the diaspora, but have also affected those living under Israeli occupation and facing the Zionist policies of violation of human rights, racial discrimination, deportation, displacement, confiscation of property, the establishment of Zionist settlements on Arab lands and all kinds of measures which aim to distort and erase the identity and cultural heritage of the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Peace and stability in the Middle East cannot be achieved without the Palestinian people exercising its inalienable national right to return to its homeland, determine its own destiny and establish its own State in accordance with its own independent will. Iraq supports most vigorously the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, in its just struggle for the achievement of the legitimate aspirations of the Arab people of Palestine.

Thus the Israeli and Zionist acts of aggression against the Arab nation have become an obvious reality; but Israel no longer stands alone in perpetrating such acts in the area, for over the past seven years it has had an ally that shares with it the same objectives and methods of terrorism, aggression and distortion of facts, which aim to dominate the Arab region, destroy its unity and tear it apart into sectarian and racist mini-States at war with one another, depriving it of its historic opportunity for reconstruction and progress.

This similarity is clearly demonstrated by what is happening today in Lebanon, where the Tel Aviv and Teheran régimes are spreading disorder, anarchy, killing and destruction. It is only in such a political climate that these two anomalous régimes and their agents can spread their influence in this misery-stricken country. We therefore stand firmly by the Lebanese people in its struggle for peace, stability and national unity, its struggle to end the Zionist occupation of its territory and to outside interference in its internal affairs.

At the other end of the region, the Iranian régime is pursuing the same objectives as those of the Zionist régime, by similar methods. Iran is trying to impose its racist hegemony through distortion of facts, aggression, expansion, and war. It was with this aim that the Iranian rulers launched their wide-scale aggression against Iraq on 4 September 1980, and have continued it ever since.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

The Iranian armed aggression against Iraq has entered its seventh year, and although the facts of this aggression have been placed, on more than one occasion, before this Organization, I find it necessary to remind the Assembly of them not for the sake of repetition, but because what is happening today is in actual fact a repetition in itself of the events that took place around this time in 1980. Indeed, what is happening now explains what happened then.

During 1979, the year in which the present régime took over power in Iran, Iraq's interests were, as they have always been, very much linked to the preservation of security and stability in the area and to the maintenance of the most amicable relations possible with its neighbours and with the world at large. Iraq had no interest whatsoever in stirring up troubles with its neighbours or with any other country.

The Khomeini régime, on the other hand, adopted a policy which it has enshrined in its new constitution, by which it assigned itself sectarian religious jurisdiction over the affairs of all Muslims. The régime began exporting this policy by military force and found in Iraq its first target.

The policy of exporting revolution, which represents the cornerstone of the Iranian régime, is a fact that the Iranian Government does not deny. Indeed, the Iranian rulers see in their policy their prime objective to which they have geared all Iran's potential and resources, and in pursuit of which they have employed agents not only in the Islamic world but in the world at large. In pursuing this course, Iran has adopted the ill-famed opportunistic doctrine: "The end justifies the means".

Proceeding from this aggressive policy, which is alien to the spirit of an age that had long ago rid itself of nazism and fascism, the Iranian régime began a persistent campaign of aggression against Iraq throughout 1979 and the first nine months of 1980, a campaign that led to the outbreak of war between two neighbouring

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

countries that had succeeded for years in establishing good neighbourly relations between them.

The Khomeini régime assigned to itself the overthrow of Iraq's socio-political system as a basic task which it considered to be a divine duty and an unquestionable right. The Iranian régime attempted to spread acts of terrorism and subversion inside Iraq by employing Iranian nationals to carry out such acts and by inciting civil disobedience in Iraq with a view to paralysing the Government and its apparatus. The rulers of Iran openly called for the assassination of high government officials in Iraq and actually sent out Iranian agents to carry out that task. The Iranian régime invited the puppet Barzani clique back into Iran and began providing it with the assistance and the means to carry out subversive operations against Iraq. Since that contravened the 1975 Agreement requiring Iran to refrain from supporting the said clique, it amounted to a brazen declaration that Iran was no longer prepared to abide by the said Agreement. These acts and measures were accompanied by innumerable, almost daily, Iranian public statements threatening aggression against Iraq, and against its sovereignty and security, and promising the overthrow of its legitimate Government.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Furthermore, Iranian officials vied, with each other in the pursuit of this course, as they still do today. It has always been the case that the noisier and more blatantly belligerent an Iranian official is in supporting the Iranian régime's policy of aggression the better chance he stands of securing the approval and support of Khomeini.

Along with this, there was during 1979 and 1980 a series of military violations of the Iraqi border. Over the period from February 1979 to September 1980, Iranian military aircraft committed 249 violations of Iraqi airspace. Acts such as cross-border firing and attacks against Iraqi border posts, artillery shelling, obstruction of navigation in the Shatt-el-Arab River, Iraq's vital artery, and bombardment of civilian centres, totalled 244 over the period from June 1979 to September 1980. Iraqi civilian aircraft were fired on three times during the period from August 1980 to September 1980. Iraqi economic plants and oil installations were shelled seven times over the period from January to September 1980.

Throughout the time when these deliberate acts were being committed, Iraq tried to communicate with the Iranian rulers through diplomatic channels and warn them against continuing the course of aggression that they had adopted in the hope that they might listen to reason and comply with the principles of international law, so much so that the official notes sent by the Iraqi Government about Iranian violations numbered 293, all of which were of no avail.

On 4 September 1980 the situation witnessed a grave development when the Iranian armed forces used heavy 175 millimetre artillery in shelling the Iraqi towns of Khanaqin, Mendili, Zurbatiya and Naft-Khaneh. The shelling was done from Iraqi territories which were to have been returned to Iraq in accordance with the 1975 Agreement. Having refused to hand back those territories, the Iranian régime began massing troops on them instead, thus wilfully threatening the sovereignty and

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

security of Iraq on two counts: first, by the wilful military occupation of its territories; and secondly, by wilfully shelling Iraqi towns with heavy artillery from those same occupied Iraqi territories.

Notwithstanding the fact that on 7 September 1980, Iraq drew Iran's attention to this conduct which was contrary to Iran's international obligations and asked the Iranian Government to desist from its military encroachments upon Iraqi territory, Iranian shelling continued unabated. Iraq was then left with no other alternative but to exercise its right to legitimate self-defence under the Charter and international law and remove the Iranian occupiers. Thus Iraq was careful to communicate with the Iranian Government on 8 and 11 September 1980, trying on each of these occasions to draw the Iranian Government's attention to the necessity of adhering to its international obligation, including the Agreement of 1975.

In the light of such clear evidence about Iran's attitude, and having waited for six whole days following the delivery of its note of 11 September 1980, the Iraqi Government was left with no doubt about the Iranian Government's deliberate violation of the 1975 Agreement and of the elements of the comprehensive settlement embodied therein. Iran had unilaterally abrogated that Agreement in order to extricate itself from its obligations, relating to the demarcation of the border and non-interference in Iraq's internal affairs, and so that it could continue its military operations against Iraqi towns and installations, with a view to achieving Khomeini's overriding objective of overthrowing the legitimate Government in Iraq and turning our country into an Iranian province. Hence, Iraq, having seen Iran abrogate the 1975 Agreement by word and deed, was left with no other choice but to consider that agreement as null and void in accordance with its fourth paragraph and with article 4 of the Treaty on International Frontiers and Good-Neighbourliness, which was based on it.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Iraq's diplomatic and legal initiative of 11 September 1980 fell on deaf ears in Iran. In fact Iranian leaders called it a conspiracy organized by the Shah. Their response was further Iranian use of military force and even graver threats to the safety and security of Iraq.

The Iranian Government continued to escalate the military conflict and, with effect from 19 September 1980, began intensifying its heavy artillery shelling and air bombardment of residential areas and vital economic installations in Iraq, as well as Iraqi and foreign commercial vessels entering and leaving the Shatt-el-Arab River, its navigable channels and its inlets into the Arab Gulf. The Iranian authorities announced Iran's airspace closed to civil aviation and the Straits of Hormuz closed to Iraqi shipping, and at the same time it declared general mobilization, massed large military forces on the borders and began a large-scale military action in which its regular armed forces were used openly. Beginning on 18 September 1980, the Iranian armed forces issued four military communiqués on their activities. In the third communiqué, issued on 19 September 1980, the Iranian authorities boasted about setting ablaze the Naft-Khaneh oilfields, one of Iraq's important oil-producing areas. In the fourth communiqué in 1980 the Iranian authorities boasted about demolishing more than 14 tanks, apart from setting an oilfield ablaze.

Iran's acts and attitudes prior to 22 September 1980 constituted as a whole a flagrant violation of the principles and provisions of the international law governing friendly relations among nations as laid down in the General Assembly's Declaration on friendly relations adopted by consensus in resolution 2526 (XXV), on 24 October 1970. Among the salient principles embodied in that declaration are the principles and provisions of good-neighbourliness, of non-interference in internal affairs, of sovereign equality of States, and the duty of implementing in good faith international obligations.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Furthermore, the end result of the series of Iranian aggressive acts and measures, manifested in the first place in Iran's initiation of the use of military force against Iraq with effect from 4 September 1980, comes under the concept of armed aggression, direct or indirect, as defined in General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX), adopted by consensus on 14 December 1974.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

The measures taken by the Government of Iraq since 4 September 1980 to face up to Iran's continued aggression have been in conformity with the right of self-defence in view of the fulfilment of the two conditions of necessity and reasonableness set by international law for the legitimate exercise of such rights.

The essential difference between the positions adopted by the two parties has been clear since 1979. It was as clear during the period prior to the outbreak of the war as it has been throughout these six years of fighting. One party, Iraq, believes in international law and good-neighbourly relations, rejecting the policy of tutelage over others and seeking to safeguard its sovereignty, security and right to determine its own way in life. The other party, on the other hand, believes in an ideology alien to the laws of the age, a fanatic, aggressive, expansionist ideology the imposition of which on others, by any means available, is considered to be a divine duty.

Iran is the party that, in the pursuit of its objectives, has used all possible methods, including armed force, murder, lies and fabrication. Those methods, while condemned by mankind, seem quite legitimate to the Iranian régime as long as they help it attain its desired objectives. What happened during 1979 and 1980 has been repeated over the six years of the war. Indeed, it is being repeated today. The Iranian régime is now beating the drums of war and perpetrating armed aggression against Iraq, reiterating the same old slogans of 1979 and 1980. After six years of war, that régime has neither changed its course nor given up its ambitions. Its business is to wage war, and its aim is to expand.

Iranian representatives to this Organization and to other forums try, through deception and fabrication, to distort the facts. They claim that Iraq invaded their country to overthrow the régime in Tehran. That was what they said recently in Harare before the representatives of 101 non-aligned States. We challenge them,

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

as we did in Harare, to produce any evidence to this effect. There is an endless catalogue of evidence beginning in February 1979 and continuing to this day which shows that the Iranian régime has always had the overthrow of Iraq's political system at the centre of its objectives. There is a mass of evidence, too, of Iranian attempts to destabilize other Governments in the region. But we challenge the Iranian régime to produce evidence substantiating its claims against Iraq.

Confident of our position and of the justice of our cause, confident too that we have always been faithful to the principles and values cherished by this Organization and the international community, we have over the years challenged the Iranian régime to accept United Nations arbitration, or that of any other international organization or forum, on the two questions relating to the initiation of the aggression and the continuance of the war, so that no doubt may linger in this respect. The General Assembly is well aware that the Iranian régime has always rejected, and does today, that proposal, which is in conformity with the principles of the Charter, international law and the practice of States, simply because it cannot prove its allegations or substantiate its lies. All it can afford to do is to live under the shadow of war, immersed in a blood-bath and amidst the corpses of its dead.

The representatives of the Iranian régime claim in this and other international forums that the war was imposed upon them. We ask this: which party is it that regards the war as a divine mission? Is it Iraq or Iran? How can a war be imposed upon a State when the State itself considers it a godsend and insists upon its continuance as a divine duty and a perpetual mission? What the rulers of Iran used to state six years ago and repeat hysterically today is in itself sufficient evidence as to the party that started the aggression and initiated the war.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

This fundamental difference between the positions of the two parties has been clearly demonstrated throughout the six years of the armed conflict. From the outset, Iraq has expressed its readiness to settle the dispute by peaceful means, according to the rules of international law and on the basis of respect for the sovereignty of each people and its right to determine its own political and social system. Iraq has always accepted United Nations jurisdiction over the dispute. For its part, the Iranian régime has rejected all this and insisted on continuing the war while declaring its intention to overthrow the Government in Iraq and impose its tutelage over the people of Iraq and the other peoples of the region.

During the last session of this Assembly I explained in detail how the Iranian régime had rejected peace immediately after starting its war against Iraq and set absurd pre-conditions for ending its aggression, pre-conditions that are in sharp contravention of the rules of international law and the principles regulating relations among States; pre-conditions, indeed, that reflect accurately the nature of the Iranian régime, which is both anomalous and alien to our world, and the aggressive, expansionist, evil dilections of that régime.

I also referred to the international efforts made to resolve certain questions arising from the dispute so as to lessen its complexity, in the hope that step by step a comprehensive peace could be achieved. I explained how the Iranian régime had responded to those efforts in an opportunistic way as long as they served its plans to prolong the war and achieve its morbid dreams of dominating Iraq and the countries of the region. I pointed out to the General Assembly that the common denominator in Iran's methods of tackling the various aspects of the dispute was the adoption of a selective approach to the Charter and international law, taking only such elements of the law as suited its self-interest and served its plans for continuing the war, while rejecting the elements that called for peace, justice,

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

respect for sovereignty, good-neighbourliness, non-interference in internal affairs, and renunciation of the concepts of hegemony and tutelage and the methods of violence, terror and aggression.

It was Iran's strange conduct that led us to respond with great caution to the efforts to find partial solutions to the problems arising from the dispute. I announced here in the General Assembly, and repeat today, that it was on the basis of that stance on our part, a stance stemming from experience corroborated by fact, that we conducted our discussions with the Secretary-General in 1985 both in New York, following his eight-point proposal to the two parties, and during his visit to Baghdad.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

What happened, however, as the Assembly is well aware, was that the courtesy and appeasement with which the Iranian régime was treated impeded the sound implementation of the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law, for it lifted the political pressure already exercised on this aberrant régime and hence encouraged it, in effect, to continue its aggression. Allow me to stress once more that to be courteous to aggressive and expansionist régimes neither helps in the establishment of peace, nor contributes to the strengthening of security and stability; for such régimes usually see in any international appeasement or courtesy extended to them a willingness to overlook their crimes and violations of the rules governing relations among States. Appeasement and courtesy, therefore, encourage such régimes to persist in aggression and subversion, which is what has actually happened with Iran.

On the night of 9-10 February 1986, the Iranian régime launched a big military offensive which resulted in its forces occupying the Iraqi port of Faw. Iran began speaking of "the liberation of Iraq" and issuing threats against the Arab Gulf States advising them to deal with the invasion forces as their new neighbour. The Security Council, as the Assembly is aware, spent many days discussing this development. During the discussion Iraq declared that it was not prepared to accept any course that was not in line with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, international law and inter-State practice in the settlement of international disputes. Iraq also called for an end to be put, once and for all, to the selective and partial approaches to the question, to vague statements, and to the efforts that fail to emphasize the pivotal issue of ending the war in accordance with international rules. We also made it clear that erroneous diplomatic judgements have cost us rivers of blood and untold devastation, and encouraged the Iranian régime to persist in its war with an arrogance unprecedented in the history of the United Nations.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

The result of the Security Council deliberations was the unanimous adoption on 24 February of resolution 582 (1986) which contained a comprehensive framework for the settlement of the dispute. Despite the fact that the Council adopted this resolutions without being influenced by the attitudes of the two parties, the Iranian régime refused to abide by it. Iranian officials declared time and again that they would carry on with their war against Iraq in execution of a "divine duty" by which they were entrusted with "the liberation of the Iraqi people." They also announced that they were making preparations for a new invasion of Iraq in further discharge of that duty; and new offensives were actually launched against the northern and southern parts of Iraq on the nights of 31 August-1 September and 10-11 September. Then the Iranian rulers pointed out that these offensives were only a prelude to what they described as "the decisive offensive." In spite of all this the United Nations and its competent organs are still reluctant to exercise their authority seriously and to discharge the responsibility entrusted to them in the Charter. Resolution 582 (1986) still awaits earnest attention and practical implementation.

An essential difference between the two parties is also seen in their respective positions on the issue of security and stability in the region. All States in the region have expressed concern over Iran's policy of destabilization and disturbance. The Organization may recall the complaint filed by the States of the Gulf Co-operation Council in 1984 against the Iranian régime following Iranian acts of aggression against commercial vessels trading with these countries. The Security Council then adopted resolution 522 (1982) which was subsequently rejected by Iran in the same way as it had rejected the Council's resolutions on the Iran-Iraq dispute. Iran continued its acts of aggression and piracy against

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

shipping in the Gulf. I should like to refer in this connection to the statements issued by the Gulf Co-operation Council during their meetings of 1-2 March 1986 and 26-27 August 1986.

The Iranian and Zionist régimes have become the two main sources of threat to the security and stability of the region. They are the only régimes in the region which flout the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly. They are the only régimes which use force in pursuit of their territorial ambitions and in imposing their tutelage on the peoples of the region. They are unrivaled in the art of lying, misrepresentation and the distortion of facts. While adopting similar ideologies, they both use methods that are absolute and contrary to the spirit of the age in justifying their policies and deluding their followers. No wonder, therefore, that not only have they found strong allies in each other, but they are also conducting a common fight against Iraq, in Lebanon and in other areas. The Zionist régime exploited the circumstances of the war waged by Iran against Iraq and in June 1981 attacked the Iraqi nuclear reactor intended for peaceful uses. Arms co-operation between the two régimes is as extensive as the stories about it have become commonplace in the world press. Like all hypocrites and impostors, the representatives of these two régimes come to this forum to exchange abuse in order to deceive the international community. However, the light of truth cannot be hidden behind a web of lies and misrepresentation of the kind employed by the rulers of Tel Aviv and Tehran.

The political struggle of the peoples of the region should be geared towards putting an end to the Zionist and Iranian aggression, and towards confronting the common campaign of racism and expansion conducted by the forces of zionism and Khomeinism, so that these peoples may live in security, peace and freedom.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Our people has demonstrated throughout six years of fighting its undoubted capability to crush the aggressors, protect its independence and sovereignty and to abort the expansionist dreams of the Iranian régime. Despite the sacrifices made by our valiant people in its pursuit of peace and in defence of its freedom and dignity against the Iranian aggression, our people has never hesitated to extend its hand to peace time and again. Our most recent call for peace came in the open letter addressed by President Saddam Hussein to the rulers of Iran on 2 August 1986, in which he invited them to an honourable peace based on the following principles: first, a total, comprehensive and unconditional withdrawal to the internationally recognized boundaries; secondly, a total and comprehensive exchange of prisoners of war; thirdly, the signing of a peace and non-aggression treaty between the two countries; fourthly, non-interference in each other's internal affairs and mutual respect for each country's choices; fifthly, both Iraq and Iran must be positive elements in all that might contribute to the establishment of stability and security in the region as a whole, and in the Arab Gulf in particular.

Although these principles should have been sufficient to safeguard the legitimate rights of both parties, the Iranian régime rejected them, and resorted to raising doubts about the possibility of a renewed escalation of the war in an attempt to justify its anomalous attitude. In order to remove all doubt, we announced our willingness to accept a guarantee from the five permanent members of the Security Council concerning mutual non-aggression between the two parties. We also expressed our readiness to have the agreement on such a guarantee properly documented at the United Nations, and further stated that if this proposal was not to meet with Iranian acceptance, then we would propose an alternative: that the guarantee for mutual non-aggression should come from 60 countries, 30 of which

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

would be selected by Iran and 30 by Iraq. We also proposed another alternative according to which the guarantee for mutual non-aggression could come from member States of the Organization of the Islamic Conference. This was in addition to Iraq's readiness to be party to a treaty of non-aggression and good-neighbourliness involving all States on the Arab Gulf besides Iraq and Iran.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Such a treaty should state in clear and basic terms that, if any signatory State perpetrated aggression against a fellow State, then all States parties to the Treaty should use military force to put an end to the aggression.

Iran also rejected these proposals, a fact which exposed yet again the Iranian régime's false claims about the guarantees. Iran's rejection confirmed once again that the sole objective of its régime was to wage war, nothing but war.

Those have been our attitudes and those of Iran. Our demands are clear and simple: we want an honourable peace that safeguards the rights and interests of both parties on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law and practice. That has always been our policy with regard to Iran from the very beginning, and it will continue to be our policy regardless of the sacrifices that our people has to make in defending its dignity and honour and in safeguarding the sovereignty, territorial integrity and cultural heritage of our country.

The United Nations cannot, and should not, remain neutral vis-à-vis two such sharply contrasting stands: one totally committed to the Organization, its Charter and its principles; the other scorning it, rejecting its resolutions, and using it merely as a forum for promoting its lies and as a means for continuing the war and threatening the security and stability of the region. It is incumbent upon the United Nations, on the basis of its Charter and in accordance with the responsibilities entrusted to it, to abandon its old negative stand in favour of a new one, a serious and responsible stand that would warn the party insisting on war against such insistence, and would show that the Organization was prepared to punish the perpetrator and exert all kinds of pressure upon it to make it desist from the aggression and accept peace.

The United Nations and its various bodies should also endeavour to establish peace on the basis of the resolutions of the Security Council, the organ entrusted

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

with the task of preserving peace. It would be a grave violation of the Charter if the Council's resolutions were in any way ignored in favour of partial diplomatic proposals and appeals, or useless statements of the kind that we have heard throughout the six years of the conflict.

We look forward to seeing the United Nations shoulder its responsibility for the maintenance of peace through the position it takes on what has now become the longest war of the century. It is only by living up to its responsibilities that this Organization can justify its existence and deserve the confidence of the peoples of the world.

Mr. DIZDAREVIC (Yugoslavia): I should like to extend to you, Sir, warmest congratulations on your election as President of the United Nations General Assembly. It is indeed a great pleasure to greet in this high office the representative of Bangladesh, a country to which we are linked by bonds of friendship, joint commitment to the policy of non-alignment, and mutual and broader co-operation.

I should also like to express my appreciation to Mr. Jaime de Piniés, a distinguished representative of friendly Spain, for his successful conduct of the deliberations of the fortieth anniversary session of the General Assembly.

Our appreciation also goes to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his continued efforts to solve international problems and, in particular, his endeavours to preserve and strengthen the role of the United Nations at this critical juncture for our Organization and for multilateral co-operation in general.

The anniversary session of the General Assembly last year provided the right opportunity for us to ask ourselves what we had done in the past 40 years to implement the objectives we had set before ourselves in creating the United

(Mr. Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia)

Nations. Our joint assessment was that the world had undergone enormous changes in the past 40 years, that progress had been achieved in all areas of mankind's development, and that a vital contribution had been made by the United Nations.

Together we assessed that we still owed a great debt to those aspirations of the world enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations more than 40 years ago. They are aspirations for a world free for all; a peace lasting and secure for all; a world in which the differences in development would be diminished and the progress of all would be ensured; a world without divisions into blocs; a world in which we should all bear in mind that we share a common present and future, and that it is only by joint efforts that we can make them better.

In the anniversary year we proclaimed 1986 the International Year of Peace. We are faced with the question: What have we done this year to bring about peace? What steps have been taken and what steps could or should we have taken to move with greater confidence along the road leading to lasting peace?

All the dangers, contradictions and conflicts that have plagued the world for years still prevail and threaten our very survival. The values and achievements that we have patiently built up through joint endeavours in the struggle for peace, security and equitable international co-operation are threatened today, perhaps more than ever before. Confrontations, the arms race, crises, the spread of poverty and the underdevelopment of a large part of humanity, the attempts made by some of the most powerful countries to resolve global political and economic problems, denials and efforts to push aside the achievements and emancipation of peoples and countries: all these things bring home the bitter truth of the world in which we live.

Is it possible to say that we have taken a step towards peace this year even though nothing has been done at least to start eliminating the causes of the crises

(Mr. Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia)

in southern Africa, the Near and Middle East, South-West and South-East Asia, and Central America; while the problems of Cyprus and the reunification of Korea remain unresolved; and while new tensions, demonstrations of force and the use of force and dangers for peace emerge, as is the case in the Mediterranean?

A just and lasting solution of these crises calls for renunciation of the policy of fait accompli and of the positions acquired by force, withdrawal of occupation forces, the cessation of all intervention and interference in internal affairs and, above all, the exercise by peoples of the right to self-determination, independence and free development.

However, there were certain developments in this International Year of Peace that raise hope and call for further efforts. The representatives of 100 non-aligned countries have come here from their summit conference in Harare, from a large meeting of peace and co-operation, resolved to make a contribution to the relaxation of tension and the renewal of détente, disarmament, the overcoming of crises, and the quest for solutions to development problems.

(Mr. Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia)

The summit Conference worked out a programme for the involvement of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in the struggle for peace and development. It took clear positions, launched initiatives and called for co-operation in the resolution of international problems. The decisions of the eighth summit Conference are a reflection of the determination of non-aligned countries to continue and strengthen their involvement.

This year has also seen a continuation of the dialogue between the two super-Powers. We still expect it to bring about concrete results. There is a widespread readiness in the world to support and make a contribution to the success of that dialogue. However, there is an impression that mutual mistrust and rivalry are so deeply rooted that it is difficult to turn away from confrontation and towards negotiation and agreement. The world is plagued by continuous uncertainty as to whether the orientation towards dialogue and negotiations will survive, whether the progress that is being made will be maintained. It lives in fear that the fate of peace, co-operation and development will become lost in the maze of negative tactical moves. All experience shows that negotiations bear fruit only if they are directed towards solving problems. After all, that is what negotiations are all about.

It is encouraging that in the year between two Assembly sessions a number of proposals and initiatives have emerged, aimed at halting the arms race and reducing and eliminating nuclear or conventional arms, which constitute a realistic basis for fruitful negotiations. Further, it is encouraging that the first stage of the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe was successfully completed. That is telling proof of the vital interest of all European countries in co-operation and in overcoming bloc barriers. Europe has no alternative but to strengthen understanding and co-operation. The coming

(Mr. Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia)

follow-up meeting in Vienna to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe will provide an opportunity and impose an obligation to continue along this road, in the interest not only of Europe, but of all.

From their meeting in Harare the non-aligned countries addressed an appeal to the super-Powers to undertake urgent measures to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war, to discontinue confrontation and conflicts and to move along the road of dialogue with a view to bringing about the cessation of the arms race and reaching substantive agreements in the field of disarmament, including an immediate nuclear test ban and early agreement on preventing the arms race in space.

Last year, at their summit meeting in Geneva, the United States and the Soviet Union committed themselves before the world to accelerating the negotiations, with the following aim:

"to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability". (A/40/1070, p. 3)

The world is expecting decisive steps. It supports every effort of the two super-Powers leading in that direction. We hope that another summit meeting between the Soviet Union and the United States will take place and that it will make a concrete contribution to the process of relaxation of tension and disarmament.

The summit Conference of non-aligned countries in Harare and the recently concluded special session of the General Assembly on Namibia reminded us once again how much we owe it to the peoples of southern Africa to remove the vestiges of a dark past. Nowhere in the world today are human rights, fundamental freedoms and human dignity so ruthlessly suppressed as in South Africa and occupied Namibia by the apartheid régime.

(Mr. Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia)

The international community has only one choice: either to accept a situation in which mass bloodshed is unavoidable and of which the proportions and the final outcome are unforeseeable or to resort without delay to the last available peaceful means - the imposition of sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The appeal of the non-aligned countries from Harare was addressed primarily to those that still hesitate to join in the general request for the imposition of sanctions. The opposition to sanctions cannot be justified by alleged concern that their consequences would affect the black population of South Africa. After all, no curse is worse for them than apartheid. The people of South Africa and Namibia ask to be saved not from sanctions but from racial discrimination, lawlessness and slavery.

It is an illusion to think that by opposing sanctions the narrow interests of individual countries in southern Africa can be preserved. They will be consumed by the fire set by apartheid. Only a southern Africa rid of apartheid and colonialism can open vistas for co-operation, which is possible only between free countries and peoples and in which everybody can find, preserve and realize his interests.

The continuation of the crisis in international economic relations and its ever more difficult consequences for developing countries make it incumbent upon our General Assembly not only to devote greater attention to these problems but also to initiate the necessary action. International co-operation in solving the economic problems of the world is in crisis. In the absence of dialogue between North and South, the differences in the level of development may grow into political divisions and confrontations. In disarray and mutually confronted, guided by narrow interests, we shall not curb negative trends in world economic relations and development.

(Mr. Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia)

The developing countries are exposed to the devastating consequences of factors over which they have almost no influence. One of the most difficult problems besetting them is that of debt. At the same time this is one of the most pressing political, economic and financial problems world wide. Debt has become a means of extracting enormous profits from developing countries. Objectively, it maintains and deepens the differences in development. In the 1981-1985 period alone, the developing countries paid the developed ones about \$US 340 billion in interest payments; none the less their overall debt increased by a further \$US 300 billion. The postponement of a genuine solution obviously only exacerbates the problem of debt. It was therefore high time to include this issue as a separate item in the agenda of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia)

We expect the General Assembly to take positions which will guide all the institutions within the United Nations system that are directly and concretely dealing with these problems. We are deeply convinced that it is necessary to proceed, first and foremost, from the need to ensure a stable and accelerated development of debtor countries, alleviate the conditions for the service of debts to the maximum extent, and launch a process of a genuine solution of interrelated issues of money, finance, debt, trade and raw materials.

The recent Eighth Summit Conference of Non-aligned Countries in Harare has confirmed once again that the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries remains consistent in its independent orientation, authentic principles, and the goals it opted for at its First Summit Conference in Belgrade twenty-five years ago.

In the positions the Harare Summit has taken, the policy of non-alignment is yet again asserted as a factor in the relaxation of tension and in active and peaceful co-existence. It was and remains a force deeply committed to the overcoming of confrontation and the strengthening of co-operation. Naturally, it has resolutely opposed and continues to oppose each and every threat to peace, freedom, equality, independence and a free development of all countries, not because it seeks confrontation, but rather because it seeks to remove from international relations all causes of confrontation and threats to peace and the free development of all countries.

The Movement aspires to overcome the bloc and all other divisions in the world which lead to confrontation and impede the progress of the world and its overall relations. The Movement can evaluate the policy of any country only on the basis of its substance, on the strength of its contribution, at each particular moment,

(Mr. Dizdarevic, Yugoslavia)

and on each specific question, to peace, co-operation, equality, relaxation of international tensions, disarmament, unhampered development of all countries, overcoming of differences in development and co-operation between North and South. After all, the value of a specific policy can only be measured against deeds.

The United Nations is the best expression of one of the greatest achievements in the development of international relations: equitable participation of all countries in the solution of questions that concern the destiny of the whole world. We must safeguard and promote this achievement. We, therefore, do not accept the attempts to determine the rights of the United Nations Members according to their might and wealth.

We do not close our eyes to the shortcomings of the world Organization. What we need is common concern and joint efforts to eliminate them. We have already taken the initial steps and we should continue along these lines.

The United Nations was created and can survive only as an organization of independent and sovereign States, acting on an equitable basis in the quest for a better world today and a better tomorrow.

The world has long been living between confrontation and co-operation, conflicts and accommodation, mistrust and understanding. We live in a world beset by deep-rooted divisions; however, we all live in this one and only world. Without faith in our common survival and progress, without mutual understanding, we are all equally threatened. What has been said so far from this rostrum strengthens our hopes that we can and must confront resolutely the legacy of the past and the challenges of the present, and build a future with shared responsibility for our common destiny.

Mr. MWANGALE (Kenya): Permit me, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, to congratulate you, Sir, most warmly on your election to preside over the deliberations of the forty-first session of the General Assembly and the recently concluded fourteenth special session on the Question of Namibia. I am particularly pleased to see you, a son of Bangladesh, a country with which Kenya shares a common historical experience and fruitful bonds of friendly relations, assume the high office of the presidency of our Organization. We are confident that your vast experience and diplomatic dexterity, coupled with the assistance of your able officers, will guide our deliberations to a successful conclusion. Let me also take this opportunity to extend a well deserved tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Piniés of Spain, for his able stewardship of the fortieth anniversary session of the United Nations General Assembly and the thirteenth special session on the critical economic situation in Africa.

Similarly, I should like to pay tribute to Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, the Secretary-General, and his staff, for the good service they have faithfully continued to render to the international community. We recognize that the work of this body would be impossible to accomplish without the able and dedicated service of the Secretariat staff led by the Secretary-General, who, in the execution of his important responsibilities, has demonstrated both foresight and tenacity of purpose.

Last year the international community celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, when statesmen and other leaders reaffirmed their dedication to the noble and high ideals that inspired the founding fathers of our Organization. Kenya reiterated its commitment, highlighting some of the achievements of the United Nations, such as the implementation of the process of decolonization, prevention of global conflict, peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

the accepted norms and principles of international law, promotion and respect of human rights and fostering of international economic co-operation. We also reflected on what we felt were significant shortcomings which impede the full realization of the lofty goals enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Regrettably, during this forty-first session, we still find many long-standing disputes eluding solutions and strong resistance in the negotiation process to bring to an end such evils as apartheid and the last vestiges of colonialism. On the economic scene, we find the economies of many countries still crushed under the weight of unfavourable terms of trade and external debt crisis.

The Charter of the United Nations exhorts States to adhere to and act in conformity with the obligations imposed by international law, and respect the fundamental principles enunciated in the Charter. However, we note with a tinge of sadness the emergence of a dangerous trend, where nations are abandoning the machinery laid down by the Charter in favour of acts which sometimes amount to coercion, aggression and illegal use of armed force. My delegation wishes to re-emphasize the need to uphold the supremacy of law in the conduct of international relations.

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

When the many challenges which continue to face the world are viewed against our experience over the past several decades, the process of multilateralism and the role of the United Nations in that process become both apparent and compelling. Yet just when the world needs to strengthen multilateralism and the United Nations, both seem to have come under cynical attack. We are witnessing more instances of unilateralism and the erosion of support for the United Nations, as evidenced by the crisis through which the Organization is going and which necessitated the resumption of the fortieth session of the General Assembly.

Although the crisis is described as financial, it must be quite obvious to all of us by now that the United Nations is facing one of its worst political crises yet, a crisis of which the financial difficulties being encountered are mere symptoms. It is therefore incumbent upon all Member States to demonstrate their faith and commitment to our Organization in deeds rather than in words. Kenya, for its part, welcomes the report of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts entrusted by the General Assembly at its fortieth session with studying ways and means of enhancing the effectiveness of the financial and administrative capabilities of the United Nations. In the group's recommendations, we find a number of positive elements which deserve serious consideration by this Assembly. We look forward to working with others to find durable and generally acceptable solutions to the problems facing the Organization so that it may better serve the international community. However, if that endeavour is to succeed, we must all accept and recognize the fundamental fact that ours is first and foremost a political organization with many tasks. At the same time, our efforts to reform and reactivate the Organization must be strictly in accordance with the Charter.

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

In Africa we are deeply disturbed that our continent is currently facing a greater threat to its political stability than ever before. That threat stems from the fact that the obnoxious racist régime in South Africa has not only intensified its brutality against those seeking freedom and justice within its borders and in Namibia but has also arrogated to itself the right to launch aggression and inflict murder and destruction against its immediate neighbours. We in the rest of Africa cannot remain indifferent when our brothers and sisters continue to be subjected to vicious assaults for crimes of which they are innocent, and to constant threats to their national security. The front-line States continue on a daily basis to suffer from the racist régime's acts of destabilization and direct military aggression, a flagrant breach of the principles of the United Nations Charter relating to respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States. These aggressive and illegal acts brutally committed by the racist régime have led to increasing loss of innocent life and of property beyond that régime's borders.

In South Africa itself, an explosive situation currently obtains, a situation without any doubt as a direct result of the continued existence of the evil system of apartheid, which has been universally condemned and which has been declared a crime against mankind. Moreover, having carefully scrutinized the policies of apartheid, the international community long ago concluded that apartheid is an evil which cannot be reformed and which must, therefore, be dismantled. In that connection I wish to emphasize the words spoken by my President, His Excellency Mr. Daniel Toroitich arap Moi, when he addressed the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session in his capacity as then Chairman of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). He stated that

"Across the whole spectrum of impact and meaning, apartheid lies as an anguish upon the conscience of all civilized men. It violates those

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

universal principles of human dignity and conduct which the United Nations has been authorized to codify and to harness. And there is no doubt that it affronts the very foundation of international law. On those three grounds alone, and there are many more, the only conclusion to be reached is that apartheid must be destroyed. In any case, there should never be any compromise with evil - and apartheid is, in every aspect, evil."

(A/36/PV.11, p. 11)

Those words are as valid today as they were then.

By now it is clear that consensus has emerged at the international level that the system of apartheid must be dismantled. Regrettably, however, the various measures proposed to accelerate the demise and destruction of apartheid have met with stubborn resistance, particularly by the racist régime itself and by those who have chosen to make compromises with apartheid, particularly the régime's allies and major trading partners. That resistance has made it impossible for the Security Council to agree unanimously on the measures necessary to undo apartheid. We firmly maintain that there is a moral duty on the part of every country and people to do its utmost to achieve the total destruction of this abhorrent system. To make compromises with it would lead us to catastrophic situations that we should all live to regret.

Attempts to induce the Security Council impose comprehensive sanctions against racist South Africa because of the racist régime's arrogant defiance of the will of the international community to dismantle apartheid have time and again been subjected to vetos. While the Security Council remains in a stalemate on this question the situation in South Africa has continued to deteriorate. The racist Pretoria régime has shamelessly and relentlessly intensified its repressive measures against all those opposed to the evil system, especially the black

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

population of the country. It has entrenched its brutality, particularly by the recent proclamation of a state of emergency in a number of black townships and districts. In this way the racist régime hopes to frustrate and impede the rising tide of resistance and the escalation of the liberation struggle. Yet despite all this the struggle has gained momentum and intensity in the effort to secure freedom and independence in a free, multiracial South Africa.

We are keenly aware of the enormous sacrifices the oppressed and suffering peoples of South Africa and Namibia are called upon to make because of an unfortunate, deliberate "accident" of history. We say this because most delegations from former colonial countries represented here have had their share of experience in the freedom struggle or are the offspring of freedom fighters. For them, the tribulations of a liberation struggle need not be emphasized. Independent Africa has proved to the world that racial harmony and respect for human rights can be achieved even after extreme intolerance and brutality. With this experience behind us, we find it imperative to remind the South African régime and its allies that majority rule does not of necessity lead to acrimonious relations. At this juncture it is pertinent to underscore the fact that the liberation struggle cannot and must not be confused with terrorism or indiscriminate violence, which we all condemn. The liberation struggle going on in that part of the world is the last resort of an oppressed people denied all other peaceful avenues. Moreover, history has demonstrated very clearly that a war of liberation against colonialism and racism will always triumph, because it is a just war.

In the struggle to liberate South Africa and Namibia from the tentacles of apartheid we salute, and declare our unwavering solidarity with, the peoples of South Africa and Namibia in their struggle against oppression, exploitation and the

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

denial of the exercise of their inalienable right of self-determination. We therefore demand the unconditional and immediate release of Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners and detainees, so that they can participate fully in the political process in South Africa; the immediate lifting of the state of emergency and other oppressive measures; the lifting of the ban on the liberation movements operating both inside and outside South Africa, and the immediate and complete dismantling of apartheid.

Since the racist régime has consistently defied with impunity the call by the international community to dismantle apartheid, the only peaceful alternative is the imposition of sanctions against the obnoxious racist régime. We must uncompromisingly insist that the Security Council impose comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, as called for at the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, recently held at Paris.

It is clear to everyone that the arrogance of the minority racist régime in South Africa stems from its relative military superiority, coupled with the economic and political support it enjoys from a number of its Western allies and friends. That support to the racist régime has fostered the false belief that the régime can continue indefinitely to defy the rest of the world with impunity. That arrogance must be brought to an end; we must act now.

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

The Assembly is meeting at a most crucial period in the history of southern Africa; it is meeting against a background of a rapidly deteriorating situation in that region. South Africa has been experiencing the most widespread, persistent and destructive unrest in its post-war history. In the past two years alone, more than 2,000 people have lost their lives, many in clashes with the so-called security forces or through State-inspired violence. Thousands have been injured. Since the Government declared a new state of emergency in June this year, at least 12,000 people have been indefinitely detained. Schoolchildren of all ages, including some as young as six years, estimated to number 2,000, are today languishing in detention camps in conditions reminiscent of Hitler's concentration camps.

Unfortunately, while these violations of human rights are going on in South Africa and Namibia, and while this obnoxious régime continues its repressive defence of the status quo, the burning moral issue of human rights violations is being deliberately watered down by a highly dramatized opposition to the efficacy of sanctions, without any definition by those who profess to value democracy, human rights, individual liberty and equality of what alternative measures should be taken to fulfil the moral obligations. To dismantle this universally condemned system of race classification and subjugation, condemnation and expression of repugnance alone are not sufficient. Vocal opposition without tangible measures is hollow. In any case, change in South Africa will come about, and it is a question of vital importance how it comes about. We hope members of the Assembly will be counted on Africa's side. We salute an ever-growing section of the world community that has been taking a principled stand by imposing various forms of sanctions.

With regard to the international Territory of Namibia, illegally occupied by the racist régime of South Africa, much has been said over the years in various

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

international forums, including this body. It is therefore not my intention to rehearse it again or dwell on the sad history of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. But let me underline a few points that are crucial to this question and that the Assembly should always bear in mind as we deliberate on the course of action that now must be taken to ensure that Namibia moves to genuine independence within the shortest time possible.

First, from the moment the League of Nations gave South Africa the Mandate to administer the then South West Africa, the racist régime took to flouting the terms of that Mandate. Under the Mandate South Africa was, in particular, required to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory and their progressive development towards self-government or independence; to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion; and to ensure equal treatment in social, economic and commercial matters. What happened over the years in that Territory, however, was a complete breach of the terms of the Mandate. Consequently the United Nations in 1966 abrogated it.

Secondly, even after the International Court of Justice and the Security Council further confirmed the illegality of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia, the racist régime defiantly refused to evacuate the Territory.

Thirdly, efforts by the United Nations to persuade South Africa to allow the United Nations to assume its full responsibility over the Territory of Namibia and implement Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) have met with the obstinate and arrogant defiance of South Africa, and to date Namibia remains illegally occupied and its independence has been unduly delayed.

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

Even friends and allies of South Africa must now agree with us that South Africa has no intention whatsoever to relinquish its control over Namibia peacefully. It is now imperative for this Organization to use coercive measures, as provided for in the Charter, to force South Africa to evacuate the Territory of Namibia and thus enable the Organization to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978). The Secretary-General reported that the provisions of the resolution had been agreed upon by the parties directly concerned and that all the outstanding issues relevant to the resolution had been resolved by November 1985. Hence, we reject any attempts to delay Namibia's independence any longer on account of irrelevant and extraneous issues such as the attempts to link the independence of that Territory to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. In addition, it is intolerable that the racist régime has continued to engage itself in creating futile institutions in the Territory with which it hopes to circumvent the terms of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The world has for a long time been treated to a series of deceitful manoeuvres and tactics all designed to delay indefinitely the genuine independence of Namibia or replace it with a puppet administration subservient to and controlled by the racist régime in South Africa. These evasive moves by South Africa to delay Namibia's independence further must be brought to an end. In this regard, my delegation fully accepts and supports the recommendations of the Paris World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa and the International Conference for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, which culminated in the holding of the recently concluded fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, on the question of Namibia. We joined in the call by that special session to the Security Council to convene immediately and take a firm decision with respect to the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), which

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

remains the only internationally accepted basis for the independence of Namibia. We now expect the Security Council to adopt an enabling resolution to trigger off the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence.

On the Middle East, we have consistently supported the just and legitimate demands of the Palestinian people for a homeland and a State of their own. We consider the right to self-determination which the Palestinians have for so long been denied to be the core of the problem in the Middle East. We should recall that the exercise of the right to self-determination constitutes one of the basic principles of the United Nations. We, in this regard, are obliged to continue to support the just demands of the people of Palestine and to reject totally the Israeli practice of acquiring and occupying territories by threat or use of force. We in Kenya firmly hold the view that no nation should ever attempt to justify its own existence at the expense of others. Thus, we insist that all States in the region have an equal right to coexist in peace and security and within internationally recognized and secure borders.

Elsewhere in that area, Kenya is gravely concerned about the prolonged and destructive war between Iran and Iraq. The war represents a negation of one of the cardinal principles of the Charter of our Organization - that is, the peaceful settlement of disputes. We hope that wiser counsel will soon prevail. We believe that the United Nations has a vital role to play in this and we reiterate our appeal to the parties concerned to bring this fratricidal war to an end.

In Lebanon, a civil war continues to inflict untold sufferings. It is our hope that all the parties concerned will do everything possible to facilitate the restoration of peace in that tormented country. In this connection, we must express our strong opposition to foreign intervention or interference in the internal affairs of sovereign, independent States. We believe that parties to any

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

dispute should seriously endeavour to resolve the dispute peacefully in a spirit of good-neighbourliness and respecting each other's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. We hold this position firmly as it also relates to the situation in Afghanistan, to Kampuchea and Cyprus and to the unstable situation in Central America.

Kenya is convinced that disarmament is a moral imperative in this nuclear age if the basic purpose of the United Nations Charter - that is, the maintenance of international peace and security - is to be achieved. It is self-evident by now that the continued accumulation of sophisticated, lethal weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, does not provide additional security. On the contrary, the arms race has further jeopardized international peace and even brought mankind close to the precipice of self-destruction. The situation clearly demands dialogue and meaningful negotiations, and it is in that context that we have expressed our appreciation at the ongoing bilateral negotiations between the super-Powers in Geneva and elsewhere. It is our earnest hope that their negotiations will have a favourable impact on the global disarmament efforts and on the lessening of world tension. Indeed, we take note that the United States and the Soviet Union have now embraced the idea of reductions of offensive weapon systems.

We, on our part, reject the notion that increased armament superiority between the two super-Powers is a means to achieve peace. Today, nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States spend colossal financial resources annually on the manufacture, improvement and acquisition of arms.

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

This indeed is a deliberate waste of the world's resources, which should be redirected to the improvement of the well being of mankind, particularly the poor and underprivileged. At a time when the world is reeling under severe economic strains, when the level of poverty in developing countries staggers the imagination, the two leading super-Powers fail to heed the passionate pleas of the world community for a halt to the arms race.

The current economic situation continues to reflect persistent structural imbalances between the countries of the North and the South. These imbalances have been compounded by growing protectionism, deterioration of the terms of trade, mounting external debt, inability in the international monetary system, and the emerging reverse transfer of net resources from the developing to the developed countries. Against this background the gap between the developed and the developing countries continues to widen, posing a threat to international peace and security. The crisis is not merely a cyclical phenomenon but a symptom of the deep-rooted structural imbalances that afflict the world economic system.

In that regard the existing economic system requires thorough reform, including the restructuring of the international monetary, financial and trading systems for the mutual benefit of the developed and the developing countries.

International trade is going through one of the most disturbing periods in history. Current trends of protectionism and threats of unilateral restrictive actions comparable to those which plunged the world into the depression of the 1930s are increasingly being erected in most developed countries to the point where protectionism seems to be the order of the day. While tariff barriers are the most obvious of all protective measures, non-tariff barriers have, under many euphemisms, become more and more insidious and widespread. The international community has a duty to ensure the smooth working of the international trading

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

system and to correct inherent disparities. In working out modalities for free trade, the necessary measures should be taken to accelerate development and to ensure the distribution of accruing benefits to all the peoples of the world. In this regard Kenya looks forward to the new round of multilateral trade negotiations as well as to the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD VII), both of which will provide an opportunity for the search for solutions to the problems hindering the growth and expansion of world trade. For our part, we shall make every effort to contribute to the success of the new round of multilateral trade talks and of UNCTAD VII by approaching the negotiations in a spirit of compromise. We believe such an attitude is necessary for the realization of the objectives of those important conferences relating to trade and development.

Kenya continues to emphasize the urgent need to recognize the interrelationship of problems in the areas of trade, development, finance and monetary systems, including the indebtedness of developing countries. It was most appropriate that at its second regular session, held in Geneva this year, the Economic and Social Council focused its attention on the interrelated issues of money, finance, resource flows, debt, trade, raw materials and development. My delegation shares the view that a political dialogue should be established between the Governments of creditor developed countries, international financial and banking institutions and developing countries in order to reach a global and equitable arrangement on relieving the debt burdens of developing countries. For the same reason, due to the prevailing uncertainties in the international monetary system my delegation reiterates its support for the convening of an international conference on money and finance. Such a conference would address itself to many of the critical issues which up to now continue to be on the agenda of various international forums disjointedly in spite of their interrelationship.

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

For the first time in the history of our Organization, early this year the Assembly convened a special session devoted to the development crisis afflicting the African continent. The special session focused comprehensively on Africa's Priority Programme for Economic Recovery and Development. At the conclusion of its deliberations at the special session, the General Assembly, inter alia, adopted and endorsed by consensus the United Nations Programme of Action for Africa's Economic Recovery and Development, 1986-1990. This constitutes an important step that demonstrates the political will of the international community as a whole to tackle Africa's economic problems with renewed determination. However, the implementation phase of the Programme of Action is most crucial for the achievement of its noble objectives. Kenya and other African nations are keenly monitoring assistance from the developed countries and others in a position to help in that regard. The period 1986 to 1990 is a short one, and we therefore appeal for the expeditious adoption of practical measures towards mobilizing the resources necessary for the successful implementation of the Programme.

African countries have individually and collectively embarked on a concerted comprehensive programme to deal with the development crisis. As can be seen from the records of the twenty-second summit session of the Organization of African Unity Heads of State or Government recently held in Addis Ababa, from 20 to 31 July, we have committed ourselves to a series of bold and radical measures to save the African economies from collapse and to ensure fundamental restructuring and policy reorientation that will launch the continent on the path to self-sustained development. I wish in this connection to put on record my Government's appreciation of all the efforts and determination of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, during his tenure of office, in search of solutions to the African development crisis.

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

Economic co-operation and technical co-operation among the developing countries, commonly referred to as ECDC/TCDC activities, should be viewed as being complementary to North-South co-operation. Economic co-operation among developing countries should not in any way be seen as the application of an isolationist policy but rather as a means of widening the scope of international co-operation with the objective of accelerating economic growth and increasing the productivity of developing countries. In this context Kenya has endeavoured to work closely with other countries of Eastern, Central and Southern Africa in the economic and technological fields. Together with the sister countries of our subregion, we have worked out co-operative arrangements which are important instruments for enhancing economic and technical co-operation among our countries. These arrangements include the Preferential Trade Area, encompassing 15 countries of East and southern Africa, the recently established six-member State Djibouti-based Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development and the Northern Corridor Transit Traffic Agreement.

In another area the world today faces another serious problem, one almost as serious as the threat posed by nuclear weapons. I refer to the problems of drug abuse and the associated illicit trafficking. In recognition of the seriousness of the social problems posed to certain populations of the world community by drug abuse and the illicit trafficking of drugs, this Assembly adopted resolution 40/122 and agreed to convene an International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking at the ministerial level in Vienna in 1987. The problem of drugs and drug trafficking is not only social but has deep economic and political ramifications. We look forward to the outcome of the Vienna Conference, which will definitely give us all an opportunity to discuss this subject in detail and to map out concrete solutions.

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

I am convinced that in the activities of our Organization in the recent past we have not in any way been short of declarations, programmes or strategies. We have, for example, adopted very impressive documents like the 1985 Nairobi Forward Looking Strategies adopted by the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women, and the Vienna International Plan of Action on Aging, and we have marked the International Year of Disabled Persons, 1987. All have had a serious bearing on social development and its relationship to economic development. As we proceed individually and collectively in implementing these programmes and strategies, every effort should be made to increase their momentum.

In the area of population, we continue to applaud the good work being done by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. In spite of the progress made, developing countries are still confronted with problems such as urbanization, internal migration, high mortality rates and environmental degradation. Moreover national and international economic problems have jeopardized measures taken to redress adverse population trends. Kenya considers population control to be an essential component of development. Solving crucial population-related problems requires both national attention and international co-operation. In this connection we welcome the decisions of the recently concluded Barcelona International Conference on Population and the Urban Future. Rapid population growth and a sudden upsurge in urbanization are among the most dramatic trends in Africa's demographic picture. This situation is expected to persist and will certainly increase the demand for employment, housing, health, education and related services.

(Mr. Mwangale, Kenya)

Closely related to the population problem is the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless, which will be observed next year. Kenya is committed to the objectives and strategy of the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless and we have already instituted the necessary administrative procedures in preparation for the observance of the Year, which will coincide with the tenth session of the Commission on Human Settlements.

The forty-first session of the Assembly coincides with the observance of the International Year of Peace, as proclaimed by the General Assembly in resolution 40/3 of 24 October 1985. There is no doubt that the International Year of Peace is a landmark in the effort to which we are all committed and provides a unique opportunity for us all to reaffirm our support for and dedication to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

It cannot be overemphasized that peace is a universal ideal. The maintenance and promotion of peace constitutes a primary purpose of our Organization. In observance of the Year we in Kenya have set aside a full month, from 16 September to 16 October of this year, during which we are dedicating a few minutes each day to contemplation on the importance for mankind of peace in the world.

I conclude by extending good wishes to all the nations assembled here today as we move ahead in pursuit of world peace, security and co-operation in all our endeavours.

Mr. AL-SABAH (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): I have the honour, Sir, to extend to you on behalf of Kuwait, its Emir, its Government and its people our heartfelt congratulations on your election to the presidency of the forty-first session of the General Assembly. You come from Bangladesh, a friendly Muslim country with which Kuwait has the strongest bonds. We are confident that your great skill and long experience will effectively assist us in making the work of

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

this session successful. I also wish to commend the skill and expertise with which Mr. de Piniés performed his task as President of the fortieth session of the General Assembly and his praiseworthy efforts in directing the affairs of that historic session.

I take pleasure, too, in expressing to Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar our full appreciation of his endeavours, good offices and diplomacy in handling the various complex world issues and of his command of the administrative situation in our Organization, as reflected in his valuable report to the current session. We welcome his presence today, following his recuperation, and we wish him good health for the future.

The General Assembly resumed its fortieth session five months ago to discuss the most serious financial crisis experienced by the United Nations since its inception. Unfortunately, that crisis, which still casts a dark shadow over the activities and future of our world Organization, has taken on political dimensions that are already complicating and impeding multilateralism.

Kuwait views with great concern the crisis which the United Nations is facing. We believe that in order to deal with it fairly and prudently we must all refrain from exploiting the Organization for political purposes - as are certain countries with their own ideas of what the effective role of the United Nations should be. Instead, efforts should be focused on the definitive fulfilment by all countries of their political and financial obligations in accordance with the Charter. We hope that the crisis is merely a passing cloud that will not affect the principle of collective action and that the role of our world Organization will regain the status envisaged for it under the Charter, in the interest of international peace and security and of the survival and continued progress of mankind.

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

We must try with all the vigour at our command to transform that crisis into momentum for administrative reform, rationalization of expenditure and the creation of an exemplary world structure within which constant efforts are made for the well-being of all humanity. After all, the viability of the United Nations and the preservation of its role are in the interest of all mankind and all nations, regardless of narrow political concerns. It is reassuring and auspicious that the Organization has lately been witnessing the gradual abandonment by critical Members of their intransigence and a renewed recognition on their part of the Organization's significance for world stability and the importance of collective action in the sphere of international relations.

In this regard, we wish to place on record our appreciation of the efforts of the Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts in reviewing the efficiency of the administrative and financial performance of the United Nations. We hope that the General Assembly will seriously consider and study the Group's recommendations in the interest of multilateralism.

In recognition of the importance of collective international action, whether in the framework of the United Nations or that of other international or regional forums, Kuwait will host next January the summit conference of the Islamic countries, which is convened every three years. We wish to stress that our work when we welcome the leaders of Muslim countries to Kuwaiti soil will constitute an important brick in the edifice of collective international action and a contribution to the consolidation of world peace and security and the solution of complex global problems.

With this lofty aim of serving world peace and the peoples of the region, we look forward to the forthcoming summit conference of the leaders of the Arab Gulf Co-operation Council, which will be convened, God willing, in the United Arab

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

Emirates in November. We are confident that what is achieved there will give an impetus to the drive towards well-being and peace initiated by States members of the Council at their first summit meeting.

Kuwait is deeply concerned about the continuing intensity of disputes, tensions and the arms race, as well as the exacerbation of international political conflicts and economic problems and their repercussions, which lead to the escalation and extension of disputes and divisions in various regions of the world. We are also increasingly concerned that the phenomena of terrorism, particularly State-sponsored terrorism, have become so widespread as to endanger the security of peoples and States alike.

The most serious threat to the ability of the international community today is that attention is being distracted from the vital issues of man's survival, development and prosperity by regional and international conflicts, in which precious resources are wasted, innocent blood is shed and lives are lost and which engender ill will and animosity that threaten mankind's future.

A case in point is the Iran-Iraq conflict, which has now entered its seventh year. That tragic conflict causes heavy loss of life and saps the resources of two States Members of the Organization. It also constitutes a threat to the security and stability of the countries of the region and freedom of navigation in the Arab Gulf region as a result of the seizure and bombing of ships and tankers that belong to countries not parties to the conflict.

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

Kuwait's commercial fleet has been affected over the past three years by the numerous unjustified attacks, the latest of which was directed against the Al-Funtas tanker on Tuesday, 16 September 1986. In conformity with Security Council resolution 555 (1984), we have given the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council a detailed account of that incident. While referring to the above-mentioned Security Council resolution, which is considered to constitute a framework which the parties to the conflict must observe, Kuwait believes that the Security Council has a special responsibility under the Charter to maintain peace and security in the world in general, and to influence the hotbeds of conflict in particular, and to ensure that the flames do not spread to other States that are not parties to the conflicts.

We, the small States, look up to the Security Council and expect it to shoulder its responsibilities under the Charter and put an end to this conflict.

The persistence of this tragic conflict has afforded outside Powers the opportunity to seek to exploit and perpetuate it for in it they found a chance to weaken the Muslim ranks, throw them into disarray, upset the balance of relations in the Arab world, and undermine the unity and solidarity of the developing nations, which are bound by the fundamental issues of a common destiny. Being an Arab Gulf country and a member of the Co-operation Council of Arab Gulf Countries, we believe that the international efforts at mediation, in which our world Organization is supposed to play a decisive role, must continue relentlessly and unceasingly until peace and stability have been restored to the region. In co-operation with its sister member countries of the Gulf Co-operation Council, Kuwait has sought, and still continues to seek, to end this devastating dispute. The international community must also close ranks and work as a whole to bring this conflict to a final and immediate end. We have now come to a crossroads, and

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

should this danger be allowed to persist, the consequences will doubtlessly affect everyone and will extend beyond the regional scope, with the result that no one would stay unscathed from its evil effects.

While blessing every well-intentioned endeavour and every constructive proposal, by whomsoever it is put forward, to end this conflict, Kuwait declares its support for the latest initiative taken by the Government of Iraq because it includes important principles on the validity of which the world community has agreed and which would ensure the achievement of a just and lasting solution to the conflict between the two neighbouring countries, a solution that would preserve the legitimate rights of both parties in accordance with international conventions and laws. Kuwait also calls on the Islamic Republic of Iran to respond favourably to this new initiative and to all genuine efforts directed towards putting an end to the bloodshed, saving the resources of the two Muslim peoples and ensuring a safe and honourable life for them.

We must refer in this regard to what the non-aligned countries called for at their eighth summit conference at Harare this month in regard to the Iraq-Iran conflict, both in the commendable statement of the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, Mr. Robert Mugabe, at the opening session, or in the final declaration issued by the conference.

We believe the resources and wealth of Iran and Iraq are being wasted on the wrong front. The right place for those capabilities is the front where the battle is being fought for the region's future against the common foe, whose four-decade occupation of Palestinian lands has unmasked its true aggressive and expansionist intentions towards all countries of the region.

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

The Zionist entity, which was created on the basis of false historical premises and by virtue of absolute support from well-known Western quarters, is the entity that was based on the policy of aggression and expansion at the expense of Arab countries, the entity that continues to occupy Palestinian and Arab territories, the entity whose activities of State-terrorism have branched out to various areas inside and outside our region.

Israel does not declare publicly its rejection of peace: rather it would have peace on no other basis than the recognition of the fait accompli, namely its seizure and control of the Arab-occupied territories, those of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Syrian Golan Heights and South Lebanon. Not content with this it blatantly interferes and undermines the security and stability of Lebanon through a series of brutal raids and barbaric military operations. Clearly, had it not been for this continued aggression and blatant intervention, Lebanon would not have remained in the morass of its crisis and internal turmoil.

Israel is required to submit to the will of the international community which calls for the withdrawal of its troops from South Lebanon. These troops have persistently maintained their illegitimate presence since 1978, either directly or by proxy. The members of the Security Council have the undoubted duty of making a concerted and determined effort towards achieving this withdrawal. We concur with the Secretary-General's recent call for them to take immediate action, individually and collectively, to implement Security Council resolution 425 (1978).

What we have affirmed in the past, and what we continue to affirm, is that peace, as we Arabs perceive it, does not mean Israel's mere pledge not to expand its fait accompli policy, namely not to occupy and annex more Arab territories, but rather, in essence and inevitably, the restoration of the lands that were usurped and the re-establishment of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people,

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

especially their right to self-determination, in order to enable them to create their independent State on their own soil under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

In spite of Israel's barefaced persistence in committing acts of systematic State-terrorism, namely murder, detention without trial, plunder of lands, Judaization, colonization and other well known Zionist actions, we still hear some Western voices making cries for help on behalf of the party their propaganda portrays as the tame Israeli lamb, while hurling accusations of terrorism and barbarism at those who have inalienable rights and become targets of aggression when they defend themselves against that aggression and try to repulse the weapon of tyranny and brutality away from their women, children and the elderly.

Israel has been, and continues to be, the first to ignore and bring disgrace upon the Charter of the United Nations and the will and the resolutions of the international community, including the resolution on the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East, which represents a focal point for any movement towards a peaceful settlement. Should the aggression-oriented and peace-rejecting entity persist in this course and continue to make futile attempts to impose the fait accompli policy, under the spell of the illusions of separate and partial solutions, the consequences will dangerously exacerbate the situation with regard to security, regionally and internationally.

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

This forty-first session is convened at a time when this year, 1986, has witnessed an intensified escalation both on the level of the national struggle waged by the oppressed majority in South Africa and by the Namibian people, and that of the heroic resistance by the front-line States in southern Africa as well as in the international support and sympathy accorded to that legitimate struggle and honourable resistance. In 1986 two international conferences have been convened under the auspices of the United Nations on Namibia and sanctions against South Africa, followed by a special session of the General Assembly on Namibia, which was concluded only a week ago, not to mention various other meetings conducted within the multilateral context and devoted to the just causes of southern Africa.

We have also seen the leaders of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, a movement which represents the majority of the members of our international community, meeting at the beginning of this month in Harare under the chairmanship of one of the leaders of the struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination. That successful summit meeting was conclusive evidence of the ultimate and firm solidarity of the broad majority of the international community with the peoples of southern Africa.

There is no need for us to draw the attention of the world community, whose representatives are gathered here today, to the crimes the racist Pretoria régime is perpetrating against the indigenous majority in South Africa, its continued occupation of Namibia and evasion of the implementation of the provisions of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), and its unjustified acts of aggression and the blackmail policies it pursues against the front-line States. However, we wish to assert anew from this rostrum that the arrogance and insistence on eschewing the logic of justice, right and peace exhibited by the racist Pretoria régime and its supporters is tantamount to the pursuing of a misleading mirage, from which nothing

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

will be reaped but defeat and loss and which will lead nowhere but to the acceleration of the downfall of such artificial entities that are a legacy of the colonial past. The independence-loving and freedom-loving peoples of the world will not rest until apartheid and racial discrimination are eliminated and majority rule instituted in South Africa, and until colonialism in the territory of Namibia is uprooted and its people have regained their national legitimate rights under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), their sole legitimate representative.

The problem of Afghanistan lingers on despite the lapse of seven years since the foreign military intervention began in the territories of that peaceful Islamic nation. In spite of all the continuous international efforts and resolutions that advocate allowing the Afghan people to choose their own polity and determine their own future without foreign interference, Afghanistan continues to suffer under the burden of the illegitimate foreign military presence. Kuwait urges the international community and its organizations to continue their endeavours towards settling the Afghan problem and solving it peacefully through the withdrawal of the foreign forces from the Afghan territories, non-intervention in the country's internal affairs, respect for its sovereignty and repatriation of Afghan refugees. We hope that the progress towards settling the problem we have noticed during this year will lead to the achievement of those goals.

Our position with regard to foreign intervention also applies to the Kampuchean question. We are firmly convinced that both covert and overt forms of intervention pose a grave threat to international peace and security and to the peoples of the regions afflicted by them.

The Latin American States and the region of Central America have not been immune from painful regional disputes. That region is still turbulent and tense as a result of the extension of the great Powers' sphere of rivalry there, and

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

innocent lives have thus become hostages of an ideological and political conflict extraneous to the region and incompatible with all its interests. The major Powers must respect the national choices of the people of the region and refrain from interfering in their domestic affairs, while all parties concerned must abide by the norms of international legality and the noble principles of the United Nations Charter. Kuwait supports all peaceful efforts aimed at settling the region's problems, primarily those of the Contadora Group and its Support Group.

For some time now a perilous phenomenon has been becoming more and more noteworthy in the arena of international relations, namely, terrorism in its various forms. This phenomenon has begun to undermine the stability and security of peoples and States and to expose innocent lives to devastation, outrage, terror and dismay. It erodes the fabric of international relations and destroys bridges of coexistence among countries and peoples. The phenomenon has, regrettably, taken on many forms and has become a bane to which nobody is immune.

While vehemently and firmly condemning this dangerous phenomenon, Kuwait believes that countering it is a collective international responsibility that must be shouldered with full determination and loyalty. The historic resolution on terrorism adopted by the General Assembly at its fortieth session should rally international action against this phenomenon. In our view, that resolution is a beginning for steps that must be expeditiously taken to eliminate the evils of this bane and its tragic human consequences.

While adopting this basic position towards terrorism, Kuwait emphasizes once again the necessity for distinguishing and drawing no parallels between terrorism and the sacred right to legitimate struggle of national liberation movements, especially those in Palestine, Namibia and South Africa.

If we cast a general look at the world economic situation we find that the aspects of disequilibrium and inequality in international economic relations have

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

intensified and that growth rates in most developing nations are either at a standstill or declining. We find that the limited economic recovery experienced by some industrial countries was of no benefit to developing nations and soon began to fizzle out again, since it was based on the narrow interests of the major industrial countries, their economic parochialism and their growing tendency towards unilateral action, away from the framework of collective action and the mechanisms of joint international activity.

We find that instead of providing for a flow of financial resources from industrial to developing countries to support the latter in their difficult development efforts, and instead of seeking to stimulate exports between the two regions of the world, the policies of some Western countries have produced a reverse flow of capital, a negative trend that strengthens the dynamism of disintegration in regard to exchange rates, the imbalance of monetary systems and the rising of interest rates in the industrial nations, which serves to exacerbate the world debt crisis and has proved to be a heavy burden for developing countries.

The world economic situation has deteriorated to a degree that is reflected particularly in the economic crisis of the African continent, which we are called upon to deal with diligently and in detail through the implementation of the United Nations plan for reviving and developing the African economy adopted by the special General Assembly session earlier this year.\*

---

\*Mr. Osman (Somalia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

The gravity of the world economic situation is also reflected in the severity of the debt crisis in many of the developing countries, and it is therefore imperative, in the light of these alarming conditions, to seek to establish without delay a comprehensive economic system that depends on the palpable reality of the international economic situation.

The requirements of development are among the paramount priorities of the developing countries, and the call to end the global arms race undoubtedly constitutes a crucial element in this regard, for the link between development and disarmament is one of the axioms of today's world.

In conclusion, I wish to appeal on behalf of Kuwait to all Members of our international community to renew their pledge and commitment to the lofty principles and goals of our Organization, and to devote genuine and self-denying efforts to the achievement of advancement for the international community and for mankind. Let us work together to ensure the success of this session, so that it can provide a new brick in the edifice of constructive international action in the interests and future of our peoples.

Mr. MALMIERCA PEOLI (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The Heads of State or Government, meeting in Harare, Zimbabwe during the eighth summit Conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, expressed their deep concern over the acceleration in nuclear rearmament, and stated that never before had mankind been so close to self-destruction, and that the alternative today is not between peace or war, but between life and death. It is in those circumstances that the forty-first session of the United Nations General Assembly takes place.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

In his address to the Harare Summit, President Fidel Castro said:

"Our world faces two deadly and hitherto unknown dilemmas: peace or total self-destruction, and a just international economic order or the most horrible fate for the vast majority of the peoples of the earth represented here, even if peace prevailed."

That state of affairs is the legacy the consequence, of the centuries during which our peoples suffered exploitation, plunder and slavery, imposed first by the colonial Powers and then by the neo-colonialists and the imperialists. We have fought for centuries to shake the yoke of foreign domination, to attain freedom and independence, to achieve the right to strive for development. That battle is not over yet. Everywhere around the world, the stubborn refusal of the main developed capitalist countries to accept the true independence of our peoples is evident.

That is the explanation of the nuclear rearmament policy, the uninterrupted development of new weapons of mass destruction, the accumulation of every type of strategic bombers, aircraft carriers, battleships, submarines, and strategic missiles, and of the installation of military bases all over the world by the imperialists who, not content with militarizing our planet, are also attempting to militarize outer space.

The deployment of weapons, on earth and in space, is aimed at maintaining or recovering their military predominance and superiority, in order to continue to exploit the human and natural resources of the world. The United States leads and promotes this terrible process which is threatening the world with war and hunger, with nuclear destruction and endless poverty. Enormous sacrifices have been required to deal with that situation.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

As President Fidel Castro stated in Harare:

"Socialism, intrinsically, is incompatible with war, with the exploitation of the sweat and natural resources of other peoples. Socialism does not need to make investments abroad, to establish military bases outside its borders, or to carve up the world. It does not need to produce weapons to give impetus to the economy and enrich monopolies; it knows perfectly well that resources can and should be invested in factories, hospitals, schools, homes, recreation and cultural centres, and other more noble endeavours. The heaviest burden imperialism has imposed on socialism is the need for arms expenditure, as my country, only a few miles away from the United States, knows it all too well."

In Harare at the eighth summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Heads of State or Government expressed their concern over the rapid acceleration of the arms race, especially in the nuclear field. They expressed their deep concern over the announcement by the United States Administration that it would not abide by the provisions of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty of 1979 (SALT II). They called upon the United States Administration to reconsider the attempts to take the arms race into outer space and strongly reaffirmed the principle that outer space is the common heritage of mankind and should be used only for peaceful purposes. They welcomed the comprehensive and timely nuclear disarmament programme, with a phased timetable and various deadlines, recently proposed by the Soviet Union. They called for a moratorium in the production and deployment of nuclear weapons while negotiations for a nuclear-test-ban treaty were under way. They welcomed the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests declared by the Soviet Union in August 1985, which has been extended several times, most recently, until January 1987; and they called upon the United States to join the moratorium.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

Cuba wishes to take this occasion to reiterate its firm support for those demands, which enjoy the support of the Non-Aligned Movement, which virtually means the support of mankind as a whole.

The abundant resources now invested in the arms race could well be devoted to improve the quality of life of human beings, millions of whom suffer from hunger, and from lack of medical care, employment, education and social welfare.

Aware of the significance of the link between disarmament and economic and social development, Cuba regrets that the international conference on that question, which had been scheduled for last August, was not convened, and looks forward to the adoption of the relevant decisions needed so that it can be convened and meet without fail in 1987.

The continuing world economic crisis whose cruel consequences are felt above all by the under developed countries, continues to cause deep concern. Despite years of efforts, despite the good will and flexibility that developing countries have displayed in multilateral organizations, it is shameful that they are still coming up against a lack of political resolve in developed capitalist countries, particularly in the United States, to begin a just and reasonable negotiating process to deal with and solve the problems of international economic relations.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

The economic picture in 1985, and so far in 1986, and its main trends, confirms that the continuance of the present system of international economic relations perpetuates a state of economic instability and crisis. Even in industrialized countries an unprecedented imbalance in trade and financial relations was recorded during this period, while the net transfer of resources from developing to developed countries continued.

The majority of underdeveloped countries experienced negative or zero growth in their per capita gross national product in 1985. In Latin America, in particular, national income per capita decreased for the fifth consecutive year; and in the case of Africa this indicator is lower now than it was 15 years ago.

Sustained high interest rates, increased trade protectionism, growing manipulation of commodity prices, including the collapse of oil prices, to which there is no end in sight and which has had disastrous effects on the economies of many underdeveloped countries, as well as monetary speculation and unilateral variations in exchange rates, are evidence of an international economic order which is unjust and at a critical stage.

Unequal flows, the increasing deterioration of the terms of trade, subsidized agricultural production, dumping and the flight of capital to the major financial centres in the United States and Western Europe are problems which, far from being resolved, have become more entrenched in the system, thus widening the abyss between developed and developing countries.

Several years ago before this Assembly President Fidel Castro defined the untenable situation and the nature of the foreign debt as plunder. At the fortieth session of the Assembly my delegation joined other heads of delegations, including a great number of Heads of State or Government, to draw attention to the alarming nature of the third world's foreign debt as epitomizing, the distortions I have described. A large number of the delegations present expressed the opinion that

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

the disproportionate external indebtedness of developing countries was a product of the old, unjust and irrational order prevailing in international economic relations. We stated that the decisive solution of this problem was essential and could not be postponed, and that it was an illusion to think that it could be resolved through mere palliatives, debt renegotiation and traditional prescriptions.

Only a few days ago, at the already historic eighth summit Conference of non-aligned countries, the Heads of State or Government of a large number of third-world countries confirmed this reasoning in their statements and decisions and reiterated their alarm at the political and social consequences which the persistence and growth of the foreign debt could have.

For some time now, Cuba has referred, on the basis of criteria and data analytically drawn from internationally recognized sources, to the unpayable and uncollectable nature of the debt. Recent world economic, social and political developments confirm our contention.

Today, the foreign debt of developing countries is a far more serious problem than it was a year ago. It is larger, the possibilities of repayment are even less, and a number of economic, social and natural problems have compounded and complicated the difficulties of the situation. Credit terms offered by international financial institutions have not improved, economic growth is not gaining momentum and development faces ever greater obstacles. In sum, the crucial demands made by developing countries in various groups and forums have been rejected or ignored and the political and social dangers already foreseen are becoming ever more threatening.

In this context, the imperialists continue to strive to preserve their interests. The United States Government's much lauded Baker plan proved inadequate and not in keeping with the magnitude of the problem.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

As the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 have repeatedly said, the foreign debt is a political problem, the roots of which are to be found in the unjust international economic order imposed on us. Responsibility for its solution must be shared by the developed creditor countries and the international financial and banking institutions.

In line with historical and present reality, we are, in the final analysis, compelled to reiterate that our countries are not debtors but creditors; creditors because of the sweat, the blood and the wealth extracted from our peoples during centuries of the colonial exploitation that led to the development of today's powerful capitalist economies; creditors because of the resources stolen from us, day after day, through unfair trade; creditors because of the capital which flows from our countries towards developed countries in search of what are inordinately high and unjust interest rates.

The United Nations cannot remain aloof or fail to contribute actively to the solution of this problem. If its main organ, the General Assembly, did not devote the greatest attention to this matter it would be failing to fulfil its duties under the Charter.

Cuba reaffirms once again its firm conviction that the foreign debt of the third world cannot be paid and must, therefore, be written off; that the resources required to meet these obligations without affecting the financial community might be found in a reasonable reduction in expenditure on armaments, which endangers the lives of all human beings, rich and poor alike; and that the sole, real and lasting solution to this and other similar problems relating to the survival of the majority of the people on this planet lies in development and the implementation of the new international economic order approved by this Assembly in 1974.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

We repeatedly ask ourselves how long the peoples can endure this heavy burden; how long it will be before the international community takes effective action to save the lives of millions of people and provide a more dignified life for many more whose existence is now short and painful? What should the United Nations role be in this endeavour?

We hope that the forty-first session of the General Assembly will give new life to the principles and instruments adopted on this question, such as the new international economic order, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and the International Development Strategies, which continue to have full validity. We look forward to the ratification of the Convention on the Law of the Sea by all States, to prevent the indiscriminate exploitation of the oceans and sea-bed by imperialist countries possessing sophisticated technologies. We hope that serious thought will be given to these matters by those that wish to perpetuate an order which endangers the peace and stability of the world we all share.

The history of Latin America is to a large extent a history of United States aggression against Latin American peoples for the purpose of plundering their natural resources and subjecting them to domination. Many chapters in that long and sad history refer to Cuba. For 25 years, and to this day, the United States has continued to impose an illegal economic blockade against our country, a blockade that has been extended by the present Administration. It continues to conduct spy flights, in violation of our air space, and the Guantanamo Naval Base, a putrid excrescence of empire, remains entrenched on our territory, against the expressed will of our people and Government.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

A similar and more recent case is that of Nicaragua, whose right to self-determination is violated by continued acts of aggression organized and financed by the United States with the support of its allies in the region. The dirty war against the people of Sandino has caused the Nicaraguans heavy losses and led the Latin American peoples and States to understand ever more clearly that, as long as imperialism persists, they will suffer the same fate as the Nicaraguan people when they choose to take the road towards true independence.

We recently witnessed the predominance of the United States Government when it unscrupulously vetoed a draft resolution in which the Security Council requested strict observance of the findings of the International Court of Justice related to activities against Nicaragua. In Harare, the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries condemned the rejection of the Court's decision by the United States Administration as a flouting of international law.

Mankind must not allow a country - no matter how powerful - to violate international law with impunity. Disregard for the Court's findings and the subsequent veto of a draft resolution in the Security Council are further steps in the United States aggressive escalation in the region which deserves our strongest condemnation.

The history of the more than seven years that have elapsed since the triumph of the Sandinista Revolution has shown the flexible negotiating position of the Nicaraguan Government, while revealing the real designs of the present United States Administration, which obstructs peace efforts to achieve a negotiated political settlement to the Central American crisis.

At their Summit Conference, the non-aligned countries expressed condemnation of the escalation of aggression and attacks against Nicaragua, particularly the violation of its airspace and territorial waters, the holding of international

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

manoeuvres and other acts of intimidation, the use of neighbouring countries as bases for aggression and the training of mercenary groups. They term those actions "terrorist practices". They likewise condemned as illegal and immoral the United States appropriation of funds to finance mercenary forces, while emphasizing that it is not only a violation of Nicaragua's sovereignty and independence but also an attack on the principles and objectives of the Non-Aligned Movement and a violation of the United Nations Charter.

The crisis in El Salvador is ever more serious. Despite United States imperialist's sustained support for the genocidal régime, the people's support for the struggle of Salvadorian patriots rallied around the Farabundo Marti Front for National Liberation-Revolutionary Democratic Front (FMLN-FDR) continues to grow.

The Eighth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, recalling General Assembly resolution 39/119 which called on all States to refrain from interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador, reiterated its appeal to the United States Administration to take a constructive stand in favour of a political solution of the Salvadorian conflict.

Cuba supports a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Central America, including a United States commitment to renounce its aggressive actions against the Nicaraguan people and favour a negotiated political solution in El Salvador.

My country supports Latin American efforts to seek a negotiated solution in the context of which action by the Contadora and Support Groups, in spite of all the difficulties, are an expression of the wish of Latin American countries that their sovereignty be respected without the interference of the big Power to the North.

Our America has been the theatre of imperialist intervention. If we were to mention all United States interventions in Latin America - from Mexico to Argentina, from Cuba to Grenada, from the Dominican Republic and Haiti to Colombia

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

and should we include the régimes installed or kept in power through open imperialist intervention, the map of the continent would be filled in without exception.

We must therefore reiterate our solidarity with the struggle for independence, freedom and development of the peoples of our region; with the heroic Chilean people, facing the cruel and pro-imperialist Pinochet régime, which has currently stepped up terror and repression and for which, sooner rather than later, the great vistas depicted by Salvador Allende shall be open; with Peru, that suffers pressures from the International Monetary Fund (IMF); with Panama, that demands respect for the Canal Agreements and faces an imperialist campaign of destabilization; with Bolivia, claiming its right to a recognized, useful, sovereign and free outlet to the sea; with Guatemala, which for more than 30 years has been suffering the most cruel repression by pro-imperialist military régimes which assassinated more than 80,000 citizens and labelled them as "missing"; with Paraguay, where the long-standing Stroessner tyranny drains the nation's blood; with Haiti, striving to get rid of a "made in USA" Duvalierism without Duvalier; with all the peoples who have had to face the consequences of imperialist penetration and domination.

We condemn the presence of imperialist military bases in Puerto Rico, Guantanamo, the Malvinas Islands and other parts of our America, which are a true threat to the security of our countries and to peace in the region.

As President Fidel Castro recently said:

"In the Middle East and the North of Africa, Cuba has been, is and will always be in solidarity with the just struggle of the Arab peoples, victims of imperialist and Zionist aggression. Cuba resolutely supports the Palestine

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

Liberation Organization (PLO) and endorses the noble cause of the Palestinian people and their right to independence and a national State. Disregard of those rights cannot last forever nor will it be possible to envisage peace in the Middle East while such monstrous injustice continues to exist."

Cuba calls for the convening under United Nations auspices of an international peace conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

Earlier this year we condemned the unjustified act of aggression against Libya by the United States which left a toll of hundreds of dead and wounded and many material losses. Regrettably, this Organization was unable to condemn that despicable act because of the abuse by some countries of their veto power in the Security Council.

Cuba reiterates its well-known stand on the need to persevere in efforts to put an end to the Iraq-Iran war, establish peace and initiate the process of recovery from the damages caused by a conflict which should never have begun.

Cuba supports the just cause of the Lebanese people for national unity and peace. It supports the people of Cyprus in its struggle to defend its national unity, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-alignment.

Cuba reiterates its repudiation of the continued United States military presence in Taiwan, an inseparable part of the People's Republic of China.

Cuba expresses its strongest solidarity with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in its struggle for the peaceful reunification of the country and the withdrawal of United States occupation troops from the South of the peninsula. We reiterate our position that the next Olympic Games should be shared by North and South Korea, otherwise Cuba shall not participate in an event which will serve only to support one of the most repressive and discredited régimes in the world.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

Cuba supports efforts to seek a negotiated political solution to the situation in South-West Asia, with strict respect for Afghanistan's sovereignty.

In the present world millions of human beings long for peace. However, a look around us suffices to realize the extent to which mankind is threatened today by war and destruction.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

In fact it is not a question of one war but of many wars provoked by colonialism, which refuses to disappear, and by neo-colonialism, which has followed it.

The Sahraoui people are still unable to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, notwithstanding their readiness to negotiate a just and definitive solution to the conflict in their region. The fighters of the Polisario Front, representatives of the people of the Sahraoui Arab Democratic Republic, are faced with the obstinate refusal by the Government of Morocco to discuss the implementation of the resolutions of the Organization of African Unity and of the General Assembly. My country reaffirms its support for the Sahraoui people and urges the countries which have not yet done so to recognize the Sahraoui Arab Democratic Republic.

A similar situation developed in the south Atlantic with the British military occupation of the Malvinas Islands, which in 1982 brought mourning to two States Members of this Organization. The United Nations has been unable to ratify Argentina's sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands only because of the United Kingdom's refusal to recognize it and its insistence on perpetuating that colonial anachronism. Several resolutions by this Assembly provide for a negotiated solution of this dispute, which should be settled through negotiations as soon as possible.

Puerto Rico continues to be under the colonial domination of the United States of America despite the subterfuges by consecutive United States administrations to cover up that fact. Recently the United Nations Committee on decolonization adopted a resolution on the colonial situation of the people of that country, recognizing their right to independence and self-determination, their Latin American and national identity, and the need for the Committee to continue to devote its attention to the issue after having heard several dozen petitioners,

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

representing all political views in the country, all of whom agreed that Puerto Rico was a United States dependency and therefore was fully entitled to choose freely its political status.

Before concluding my statement I should like to mention an issue which will undoubtedly have a bearing on our work. We are taking part in this forty-first session under the shadow of the financial uncertainty created by the policy of blackmail and pressure exerted by the United States Government against democratic multilateral organizations. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has already been under such pressure because of its work, which is consistent with the will of the international majority, and we are now witnessing new attempts by the United States Government to undermine the principles of the United Nations through immoral pressure which constitutes blatant violations of the Charter. It is true that the Organization requires administrative and managerial adjustments, but it is sheer fiction to call a political phenomenon, which has its roots in the design of one Government to subject the action of States in United Nations forums to its own will, a "financial crisis". The Kassel amendment and other legal schemes of the United States must not hang over our heads like so many swords of Damocles. The mere formulation of such schemes by United States legislative bodies is not enough, for those very bodies have established international commitments and obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

The problem we are facing is political and therefore it requires political solutions. Cuba will do its best to contribute to an improvement of the administrative and budgetary management of the Organization and will support any initiative honestly aimed in that direction. At the same time, Cuba will condemn and oppose actions which are directed against the democratic integrity of the

(Mr. Maimierca Peoli, Cuba)

Organization or which try to suppress, weaken or derail programmes of interest to the majority of the States Members of the United Nations.

At this time when the future of the United Nations is threatened, it is imperative that all those who believe in the Organization should reassert its principles and support its work on behalf of peace, development and the well-being of our peoples.

Only a week ago, from this rostrum, we expressed Cuba's views regarding the situation in southern Africa. We reiterated our solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia against apartheid and for freedom and independence. Twenty years have elapsed since the United Nations terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and assumed direct responsibility for the Territory. Since then, that decision has been ratified by the Security Council and many international organizations. The International Court of Justice, for its part, has declared that the continued occupation of Namibia by South Africa is illegal and constitutes a violation of international law. The United Nations has been quite clear concerning the obligation of South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and by resolution 435 (1978) it adopted a universally accepted plan for the establishment of Namibia's independence.

Efforts by the international community have, however, come up against the arrogance of racist South Africa which, protected by its shameless alliance with the Government of the United States and supported by other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), has not only remained illegally in Namibia - where it has also set up the heinous apartheid system - but has also turned it into a launching pad for its acts of aggression against independent neighbouring States, in particular against the People's Republic of Angola, making southern Africa one of the most dangerous centres of tension today.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

As President Fidel Castro aptly pointed out,

"Apartheid is a direct consequence of the colonial system, of the brutal manner in which the African peoples were forcibly deprived of their lands and natural resources and their children enslaved and sold the world over.

Apartheid has endured solely because of the support extended to it by the United States and NATO countries, which have in South Africa a strategic ally, a source of raw materials, a market for investments and profits for the transnational corporations, at the expense of the sweat and blood of millions of Africans."

Therein lies the meaning of the commitment of those countries to Pretoria: defence of the sordid interests of their corporations. It is truly a commitment to destroy human dignity, to exclude all possibility of independence, to spread the cancer of apartheid to the rest of the continent and to subject it to neo-colonial and imperialist exploitation. For that reason the struggle for Namibia's independence necessarily requires the eradication of apartheid.

The powerful movement that threatens to bring down the corrupt structure of the opprobrious system in South Africa and crown with victory the heroic struggle of the Namibian people is now joined by an international consensus in favour of the immediate implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and of the imposition of sanctions on South Africa to compel it to abide by the will of the United Nations.

President Fidel Castro proclaimed at Harare:

"Both the Yankee imperialists and the South African racists are doing everything possible to have Cuban internationalist troops withdraw from Angola and are trying to make their withdrawal a condition of Namibia's independence. The Governments of Angola and Cuba have jointly replied:

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

'Implement resolution 435 (1978) on Namibia, cease all threats against Angola, stop the foul war and support for mercenaries: then the gradual withdrawal of the 20,000 Cuban fighters who are defending strategic lines in southern Angola will begin. The rest of the Cuban military personnel will be withdrawn only when the sovereign Governments of Angola and Cuba deem it unconditionally proper.'

"The true key to the question is that as long as apartheid exists in South Africa, as long as that country is ruled by a racist and fascist Government there will be no security for Angola or for any other country in southern Africa and the independence of Namibia will be nothing more than fiction."

I must reiterate that Cuba is ready to stay in Angola, in fulfilment of its internationalist duties, for as long as necessary - that is to say, until threats against the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Angola have ceased, until apartheid has disappeared and Namibia is independent.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

The time has come to translate words into action. This Assembly must demand that the comprehensive mandatory sanctions envisaged in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter be imposed against the racist South African régime. The so-called linkage, which the imperialists and their partners in Pretoria use as a pretext for obstructing Namibia's independence, must be firmly rejected. The Security Council must ensure the implementation without further delay of resolution 435 (1978). We must condemn the shameful alliance of imperialism and Herr Botha's Boer fascism and demand the immediate cessation of the infamous imperialist support for apartheid. It is absolutely necessary to increase and broaden the economic, political and military assistance to the liberation movements in southern Africa so that they may continue to wage successfully their liberation war for independence and social justice and against racist fascism and apartheid. Further, we must strengthen our political and material solidarity with the front-line States in their struggle against the aggression of the apartheid régime.

Each day, each hour, that brings us closer to the collapse of apartheid in South Africa will be one day, one hour, less of blood and pain for the peoples who suffer under and struggle against oppression and of shame for mankind.

Those peoples and their struggling vanguards share the glory - as President Fidel Castro asserted in Harare -

"of having shown the world that today, as yesterday and tomorrow, nothing can stop the march of history; no force in the world can keep human dignity and freedom indefinitely in chains".

Mr. CHISSANO (Mozambique): On behalf of the People's Republic of Mozambique it gives me pleasure to congratulate Ambassador Choudhury on his unanimous election to the presidency of the forty-first session of the General Assembly. His election to such a high office expresses the confidence of all of us in his outstanding qualities as an able and experienced diplomat. I am confident

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

that under his guidance the deliberations of this session will be crowned with success. I assure him at the outset of our total readiness to co-operate with him in the discharge of the functions entrusted to him.

I congratulate the outgoing President, Mr. Jaime de Piniés, who guided with competence the deliberations of the historic fortieth session of the General Assembly.

I wish to express once again to the Secretary-General of our Organization, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, my appreciation of his zeal and his devotion to the United Nations cause as well as to that of the fulfilment of the principles and objectives enshrined in the Charter. I also wish to express the feelings of satisfaction of the Government I represent at seeing the Secretary-General back with us and fully recovered.

It is with deep concern that our Organization is witnessing a proliferation of conflicts and tensions in the international arena.

Southern Africa is one of the most worrying regions of conflict. The apartheid régime constitutes, by its policy and practices, a serious threat to international peace and security. In advocating theories of racial supremacy and claiming a divine mission assigned to the Afrikaner tribe, in perpetrating systematic massacres against the majority of the population, apartheid is zionism. Like zionism, the apartheid régime seeks to impose its power on the region through aggression and occupation. Thus, it occupies Namibia and parts of the territory of Angola. It attacks neighbouring countries, including those whose economic and military weakness and small populations pose no threat to the security of the South African régime. The tactics of armed banditry used by Hitler to destabilize and destroy targeted countries are today used by Pretoria in southern Africa. In Mozambique, Angola, Zimbabwe and other countries in southern Africa, armed bandits, trained, equipped, transported, organized, financed and commanded by South Africa, commit horrible crimes against people and their property.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

Hitler's ambitions to establish a Germanic Europe find their counterpart in our region in the South African theory of the establishment of a constellation of States which would be under the dominance of the Afrikaner régime. All this shows the Nazi-Fascist nature of the régime in Pretoria, a régime that constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

It is against this heinous régime that the South African people stand up with courage and determination within South Africa. It is a heroic struggle that has achieved unprecedented development in the last two years. The South African people, under the leadership of the African National Congress (ANC) and other progressive and democratic forces, have taken the initiative in transforming South African society and creating an ambiance of equality, liberty and justice. They are more conscious than ever of the justness of their cause. Assassinations and massacres have failed to deter the people's movement, thus proving that unarmed people, when they are united, determined and fighting for a just cause, can render inoperative the repressive machine of the régime.

With this struggle, the South African people are beginning to build a united, democratic and anti-racist nation. Blacks, Coloureds, Indians, whites, South Africans of varying beliefs and social status, are fighting side by side for the abolition of apartheid. Even in the bantustans the people are rebelling against the régime and its collaborators, thus destroying the illusion of a fragmented and submissive South Africa.

In the process of the liberation struggle, the ANC has been the catalytic force in the struggle for the abolition of apartheid. It has been able to sustain the burning torch of the liberation struggle for the fulfilment of the principles enshrined in the Freedom Charter. The ANC's cause has become one that is embraced by all nationalist organizations, be they political, trade-unionist or religious.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

The commitment of the South African people to the struggle for their liberty grows all the time. Against this strong determination of the South African people to free themselves from racist oppression, the apartheid régime throws its murderous machine. Thus, in the last two years thousands of men and women, young and old, have been imprisoned, tortured, banned or assassinated.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

Those patriots and martyrs exemplify the courage of a people that no longer fears the régime's repressive apparatus. Facing armoured cars and bullets with bare hands, the South Africans are deciding on their country's future and are ensuring that South Africa will be free. I should like once again to express our solidarity with those heroic people and with their struggle.

The struggle of the South African people for liberty, equality, justice and democracy is paralleled by the struggle of the Namibian people for the realization of their inalienable right of self-determination and independence. Their struggle enjoys the unconditional support of the People's Republic of Mozambique.

Twenty years have elapsed since this Organization terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. In the course of those years we have adopted numerous declarations and resolutions either demanding the withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory of Namibia or condemning South Africa's refusal to abide by the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

Just a few days ago the fourteenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to the question of the independence of Namibia, was held. We noted with regret that the United Nations has once again been prevented from unanimously adopting effective measures against South African colonialism. We also noted with dismay that despite professions of agreement on this fundamental question of Namibia's independence, some of us remain indifferent to the continued imprisonment, torture and massacre of the Namibian people by the Pretoria régime. These parties persist in making Namibia's independence conditional on the withdrawal of Cuban internationalist troops. They question the legitimacy and justness of the armed liberation struggle the people of Namibia have been compelled to wage.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

What other possible avenues are open to colonized peoples when oppressive régimes are indifferent or, as in the present case, when a régime challenges the international community as a whole? What alternatives are left to the Namibian people when the colonial régime defies United Nations resolutions to which it has agreed and challenges the international community, when it is unwilling to accept the dialogue that would lead to the genuine independence of the Territory, when it arrests, tortures and massacres the people of Namibia and when it turns the Territory into a prison where every ten inhabitants are under the permanent control of one soldier? There is neither moral nor religious justification for demanding greater patience of these people.

In the history of the struggle for independence the people of Namibia are not the first to tread the path of armed struggle. Peoples of Europe, Asia, America and Africa duly represented here affirmed their right to independence through armed struggle. Europe, weapons in hand, fought against Hitler's occupation and fascism. The People's Republic of Mozambique is itself a product of armed struggle for national liberation.

Given the intransigence of the illegal régime of Ian Smith and the non-compliance by some States with the sanctions imposed by our Organization, Zimbabwe would not have acceded to independence and become a full-fledged Member of the United Nations had it not waged armed struggle.

Namibia is a former German colony that should have acceded to independence in the 1960s, as did Tanganyika, Burundi, Togo, Rwanda and Caméroun. Historical facts prove that the question of Namibian independence has nothing to do with the situation prevailing in Angola. It was still a Portuguese colony with Portuguese troops on its soil when South Africa declared the annexation of South West Africa. Eight years before the independence of Angola the United Nations established the Council for Namibia to administer the Territory until independence. Pretoria opposed that process.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

In 1978 the Security Council, by a unanimous vote and with the acquiescence of South Africa, adopted its resolution 435 (1978). Cuban troops were already in the sovereign territory of Angola, and neither South Africa nor any other Western country raised that issue as being an impediment to the Territory's independence. We recall that other arguments were advanced by the racist South Africans. It is only after all those arguments had been overcome that South Africa and this or that other country raised the false pretext of the presence of Cuban forces.

Pretoria is thus blocking the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It is contrary to ethics and to international law to link the independence of any people to issues extraneous to that people's country and concerning which they do not have the power of intervention or decision. Today as yesterday the purpose of South Africa's manoeuvres with respect to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is to preserve the colonial occupation of Namibia and to prevent the international community from concentrating its attention on the total elimination of apartheid.

The obstinate attitude of Pretoria is possible only thanks to the support and complicity of certain Western countries which allow the South African authorities to buy time and create the conditions for undermining the unity of the Namibian people and destroying the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole authentic representative.

We must reiterate here our rejection of linkage and reaffirm that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) remains the sole acceptable basis for a negotiated solution of the problem. It must be implemented immediately and unconditionally.

When one talks of apartheid, one speaks of the aggression constantly perpetrated by South Africa against the independent countries and peoples of southern Africa. One speaks of armed banditry and organized terrorism that are the

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

preferred instrument of the racist régime in its political and economic destabilization of the countries of southern Africa. South Africa's is a strategy for regional domination that seeks to turn our countries into docile instruments of apartheid.

Part of the territory of Angola is under racist occupation. With the objective of consolidating its aggression against and occupation of the sovereign territory of the People's Republic of Angola, the Pretoria régime protects and renders all forms of military assistance to the puppet bands of UNITA. We vigorously condemn this aggression against the People's Republic of Angola, a full-fledged Member of our Organization, and we demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angola.

The People's Republic of Mozambique has not been spared from this aggressive and bellicose policy of destabilization. Through armed bandits, the Pretoria régime is waging a veritable undeclared war against our country. That war is translated into terrorist acts such as the systematic destruction of communal villages, schools, hospitals, farms and sugar and tea factories. The terrorists, in the pay of Pretoria, cruelly assassinate farmers, foreign technicians, students, nurses, priests, nuns and clerical members of several religious denominations.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

As an example, it is estimated that overall destabilization since 1975 has resulted in the destruction of about 500 schools, leaving 90,000 students without classes; 800 shops have been destroyed and put out of operation, with serious effects on agricultural marketing; one in every 10 health units has been sacked.

Those are just a few instances of the impact of the external aggression against Mozambique. Our Government has assessed the direct effects of this undeclared war at more than \$US 4 billion. The estimate does not include the indirect effects of the paralysis of production and the strangling of the distribution, transport and shipment system. Nor does it include the cost of rehabilitating the economic and social infrastructures that have been destroyed.

These acts of terrorism against the People's Republic of Mozambique give concrete effect to a strategy conceived outside our country. Only a plan engendered by external forces could conceive of such cruelty, such great destructive fury and such a total absence of the most elementary national and human sentiments.

We are witnessing manoeuvres by Pretoria and other imperialist circles to transfer the operational bases of the armed bandits to countries other than South Africa, with a view to extending the conflict between the peoples of the region and apartheid to relations among certain African States.

We have frequently reaffirmed our vigorous condemnation of terrorism. We are concerned about the fact that members of terrorist groups that sow death and destruction in Mozambique enjoy the support and public complicity of some Western countries, countries that proclaim themselves to be champions of the struggle against terrorism.

The southern African experience teaches us that apartheid is an intrinsically violent and bellicose régime that refuses solutions through dialogue and a negotiated solution to the conflict between it and the people of the region.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

Solutions proposing the abolition of apartheid have had no response from the authorities in Pretoria. That is the reason why the Pretoria régime imprisons the genuine leaders of the South African people and imposes a state of emergency, refuses to negotiate with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO); and dares to violate the agreements and commitments that should bind the régime to put an end to its bellicose policy in its relations with the neighbouring countries.

In the history of the diplomatic struggle aimed at persuading the Pretoria régime to abandon its racist policies, the Western countries themselves have met with South Africa's intransigence. The international community has arrived at a consensus that the apartheid system has no mechanisms of self-correction and that it cannot be reformed. In that respect, may I quote the following said by President Samora Machel:

"There is no democratic apartheid. There is no humane apartheid. There is no peaceful apartheid. Apartheid is the negation of justice, equality, social interaction. It is an institutionalized expression of the violation of every human right. Apartheid, like colonialism, cannot be reformed. Apartheid, like colonialism, must be eradicated."

The so-called reforms heralded by the apartheid régime, under the slogan "adapt or die", are nothing but attempts to deceive the people of South Africa and international public opinion as well as to appease the popular revolt and thus safeguard and perpetuate the supremacy of the white minority.

The Pretoria régime has already shown itself to be insensitive to persuasion through dialogue conducive to a speedy end of the system. As we stated at the Paris International Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, certain Western countries that continue to refuse to contemplate effective measures against South Africa should tell us what to do when they say no to violence, no to sanctions, no to pressures; and South Africa tells us: no to dialogue.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

These countries should show us the road to take in view of the failure of the pseudo-reformist movement undertaken by the racist régime itself. The arguments that sanctions would hurt the black South Africans the most and would affect the economy of the countries of the region are not consistent.

In South Africa nothing can be worse than death itself. Death and murder are daily occurrences there. Even corpses are riddled with bullets on their way to the cemetery. Mourners are also shot at and end up being corpses themselves to be buried. That is one of the reasons why the South African people call for sanctions as a means to shorten their suffering.

Addressing the issue of the effects of the sanctions on the neighbouring countries, the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique, Mr. Samora Moises Machel, told the Summit Conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in Harare:

"In reality, South Africa has applied undeclared sanctions, since 1975, against countries of the region, apart from the destruction caused by aggression".

While South Africa considers the application of sanctions against it as immoral, it has none the less applied sanctions against the States neighbouring it. The apartheid régime has systematically destroyed communication and transportation systems that ensure the economic life of the countries of the region.

By sabotaging, through the armed bandits under its command, access to the Mozambican ports of Maputo, Beira and Nacala and the Angolan port of Lobito, South Africa aims at impeding the economic emancipation of the peoples of southern Africa that at present is being undertaken by the Southern African Development Co-ordinating Conference. In this context, the losses caused by the apartheid

BCT/aa

A/41/PV.11  
104-105

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

régime up to 1985 to the States members of the Southern African Development Co-ordinating Conference are estimated at \$US 10 billion.

Apartheid is a crime against humankind and therefore must be eradicated. The elimination of apartheid demands that the whole international community take effective, concerted and forceful measures.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

I reiterate here the appeal we have on various occasions addressed to all Member States to denounce, condemn and fight by all means the South African bellicose policies; to restate their moral, diplomatic and material support for the African National Congress (ANC) and the other democratic forces in South Africa that are struggling for a just and democratic society; to fight the armed banditry and State terrorism that are devastating our region and demand that South Africa henceforth terminate its support of terrorists; to provide concrete multifarious assistance to the front-line States, particularly Angola and Mozambique, so that those two front-line States may strengthen their defence capability and safeguard their independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity and ensure the good functioning of the port and railway systems vital to the economies of the hinterland States.

The twenty-second Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held in Addis Ababa in July, and the eighth Summit of the Non-Aligned Countries, held in Harare this month, adopted two special declarations on southern Africa. In them the Heads of State and Government reiterated their commitment and determination to struggle for the establishment of freedom and justice in South Africa and in Namibia through the total dismantling of apartheid. They expressed the support of the two Organizations for the demands of the Commonwealth countries contained in the Commonwealth Agreement on southern Africa.

The Heads of State and Government of the two Organizations adopted concrete measures to be implemented, inter alia the following: first, to exert pressure on the South African régime to bring it to change its policies; secondly, to support the people of South Africa and Namibia in their struggle against apartheid and the front-line and other States of southern Africa in their endeavours to reduce their dependence on racist South Africa.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

We appeal to the Member States of the United Nations to support and fully implement those declarations.

In the Maghreb region, the Sahraoui people have been struggling for the past 10 years for reaffirmation of their right to self-determination and independence. That is a right enshrined in the Charter of our Organization, and it has been constantly reaffirmed year after year. The efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General with a view to finding a negotiated solution for the Sahraoui conflict cannot but be considered positive. It is our strong desire that these efforts may lead to direct negotiations between the Kingdom of Morocco and the Polisario Front in fulfilment of the relevant resolutions of the Organization of African Unity, the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations.

We express our solidarity with the Palestinian people, led by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), in their struggle towards the achievement of legitimate and inalienable rights, including the right to create a free, independent and sovereign State. We demand the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab territories and strict respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States of the region, in particular Lebanon.

The ongoing fratricidal war between Iran and Iraq, two Member States of our Organization, is a matter of great concern. The resolutions of the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations reflect a strong expression of the will of the international community to assist in bringing about an end to this war. We appeal to the two parties to the conflict to abide by them.

The people of East Timor continue to struggle heroically against foreign occupation and for respect for their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. We commend the efforts undertaken by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the search for a just solution compatible with the true aspirations of the East Timor people. We invite the parties involved, Indonesia

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

in particular, to implement the resolutions of our Organization. We warmly greet FRETILIN, which has been able to keep alive the flame of the liberation struggle of the Maubere people. We reiterate our unflinching solidarity with FRETILIN.

On the Korean peninsula, we support the efforts and proposals of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea for the peaceful reunification of the Korean nation. We reject the idea of two Koreas. The international community must make every effort to ensure that a united Korea will be admitted as a Member of our Organization in the near future.

The conflicts in Central America must end with a solution that respects the independence and sovereignty of the peoples of the region. We condemn the acts of terrorism perpetrated against the defenceless population, and we call for an immediate end to the interference in the internal affairs of Nicaragua. In this context, we hope that the findings of the International Court of Justice will be respected.

The People's Republic of Mozambique pays special attention to, and regards as very important, the question of the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace free of nuclear weapons in the context of resolution 2832 (XXVI) of the General Assembly. We are concerned by the presence of foreign military bases in the region since they constitute a threat to regional peace and security. We therefore reaffirm our total support for the convening of a United Nations conference on the Indian Ocean. We reject every attempt aimed at postponing sine die the holding of such a conference.

This year having been declared the International Year of Peace, the attention of humanity continues to be directed to the question of disarmament. General and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, stems from humankind's need to preserve life on our planet, to guarantee its own survival. It is a task of paramount importance that must be undertaken by the entire human race. We

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

consider it to be urgent that all States, in particular the nuclear Powers, collectively and individually take positive and concrete measures conducive to total disarmament.

Only a realistic and responsible attitude on the part of all States will enable us to guarantee security and tranquillity for every nation in the world and to establish a peaceful, prosperous and happy future for succeeding generations.

We wish to commend the efforts undertaken by certain States or groups of States in support of nuclear disarmament. We commend the unilateral moratorium undertaken by the USSR in the field of nuclear testing, which is a demonstration of its willingness to move towards nuclear disarmament.

For the People's Republic of Mozambique, disarmament does not only mean saving humanity from total annihilation but also enabling nations to tread the path of development and prosperity.

The spending of financial, material and human resources for military purposes is contrary to the aspirations of the people to economic and social development. We cannot accept the present situation, in which roughly \$2 million is spent each minute on the manufacture of arms, while at the same time 30 children die of hunger, disease and malnutrition. It runs counter to human solidarity for military expenditures to be 25 times as great as the total sum available for assistance to developing nations.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

Underdevelopment, as a negation of the legitimate right of the peoples to development, constitutes a threat to world peace and security. We therefore consider important the international community's commitment to eliminate the ever-widening gap between developed and developing nations.

The international community warmly welcomed the decision of the United Nations General Assembly proclaiming 1986 the International Year of Peace. In pursuance of that decision, various initiatives have been undertaken around the world with a view to educating mankind to cherish, defend and preserve peace.

The people and Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique have associated themselves with the international community, through nationwide celebrations, in this universal exercise of reflection on and campaigning for peace.

With this in mind, a national committee was established to co-ordinate a vast programme to promote the objectives of the International Year of Peace. In the same context an international seminar on peace was held in Maputo in July.

The response of the People's Republic of Mozambique to the declaration made by the General Assembly at the fortieth session stems from the will of our people and State to live in peace and to contribute to the easing of world tensions and conflicts.

In Mozambique, as in southern Africa as a whole, peace continues to be the main aspiration of men, women and children, and of the young and old of all races, creeds and social levels. It is a dream that everyone dearly loves and deeply cherishes.

In this regard, I should like to fulfill a pleasant duty by bringing to the attention of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, a message - an appeal - by a group of children from my country who represent millions of others who long for a peaceful world. Those children are preoccupied with the present, but above all, with the future - the future of humankind. Those children addressed

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

to me, in my capacity as Chairman of the co-ordinating committee for the celebrations of the International Year of Peace, the following letter:

"The earth is the home that was given us to live in, to love and to suffer in. To destroy it would mean destroying all its inhabitants. In other words, it would as if we were left without a home, forced to sleep in the open.

Worse still: its destruction would mean the end of all of us who inhabit this marvellous planet.

Unfortunately, we are at the beginning of that end. We are at the brink of this catastrophe, this holocaust, this monstrous crime.

We are now like a grenade just before the moment of detonation. We are like a gunpowder keg, ready to explode.

We, human beings, are bringing closer our own end. We, human beings, are setting the day of final judgement.

We kill, assassinate, loot, destroy...

We channel our intelligence into the production of weapons rather than the promotion of health, education, science and beneficial technology.

Today, the earth is nothing but a mountain of dung, and we its worms.

Hunger, misery, war, destruction...

Our planet is suffering from a disease whose cure only we, the human species, can diagnose.

And to do so would not be difficult: we would need only mutual understanding.

...Love of children, flowers, men and ourselves.

Love of our existential being, respect for the world that shelters us.

But in the midst of so many minds uniquely devoted to destruction, there are people who still believe in the future, who still have faith in the human capacity to build and to safeguard the good.

Amidst the exploding bombs, there are still those who dream of establishing peace and making this marvellous planet a quiet place for humanity to live.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

"In the midst of such meanness and injustice, there is still hope of saving the flowers, the fields, and the children ... and of giving them all possible love. Of guaranteeing them a secure, comfortable and pleasant place to live. We are proud to know that we belong to that group. Even though we are living in a country suffering the consequences of meanness, war, assassinations and hunger resulting from destruction, we hope one day to see the Mozambican people living their daily lives in tranquillity.

To see a child, in the city, in the countryside, in the communal village, walking calmly to school, without showing in its face signs of fear that it may not return home ... or return and not find its parents.

We are privileged to live in a country where teaching comes from men who have fought, still fight and will always fight for peace, for what is good. Who have established and preserve equality, fraternity, justice and love.

... And if war exploits are still a daily happening in our lives, this due to the mean character of human beings without spirit, without soul, without the least human sentiment, who are bent purely and simply on destruction.

However, history has taught us that the just will prevail. Those who value peace, justice and love will win. We shall win.

For our party and State, for all of us, peace-loving children, the year 1986 is of the highest significance in our struggle. Because it is, as is well known, the International Year of Peace. In prompt response to the United Nations, our country dedicated a week of celebrations in support of peace. This response to the appeal by the United Nations on the part of our Party and State shows the extent of their concern with the problem of peace and the maintenance of peace. We are a group of youngsters who also agreed to contribute to the International Year of Peace as testimony to our support for the United Nations declaration, and also in recognition of its efforts in the promotion of peace.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

"Although humble, our contribution consists of two books, entitled Independence and Peace. That theme was born of the fact that without independence there can be no peace.

The first consists of signatures of various peace-loving people, dedicated to peace.

The second is a more personal way of expressing our sentiments to the world and its problems, to the permanent struggle for peace.

... Both are the result of a contest on peace initiatives promoted by the United Nations and in which we are participating.

We entrust the Chairman of the co-ordinating committee for the celebration of the International Year of Peace, Mr. Joaquim Alberto Chissano, who is also a great fighter for human rights, to deliver those two volumes to United Nations Headquarters. We hope that the competent authorities at the United Nations will echo our initiative so that the rest of the world may know how much we love peace and strive for it. We also express our willingness and determination to pursue our ideals. Our initiative will not end here. We want to give birth to the spirit of love and peace and we will act accordingly. We also want to live in happiness and to transmit that happiness to the uncounted thousands of succeeding generations.

That is the best way of preparing our future and of preserving the present. Everything could begin with a simple handshake. We want and love peace.

Signed, peace lovers Gizela Machungo, Tatiana Cabaco, Habiba Marta Guebuza, Isabel Silesio, Salome Silesio, Sinamwemba Namashulua, Oscar Namashulua, Sergio Namashulua, Ernesto dos Santos, Nyimpine Chissano, Chinguane Mabote, Jose Mabote, Eduardo Matsinhe, Henrique Manu and Samora Machel Jr."

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

I shall have the pleasure, in due course, of handing over to the Secretary-General the two works I have mentioned. The first work, a book of 185 pages, consists of clippings of articles and pictures relating to the struggle for peace selected from various magazines and newspapers in Portuguese from various countries. This compilation includes texts selected from the works of several writers, statistical data and statements by and interviews with scientists, authors and peace-loving persons. It is the result of research and reflection on and the study of peace by children.

The second work, as I have said, is of the same length and contains the signatures of several personalities, including Heads of State or Government of several countries, students and teachers, who, besides signing it, agreed to provide a written commentary on the issue of peace.

In the name of the children of the People's Republic of Mozambique, I ask the Secretary-General, through you, Sir, to convey to the entire international community the sentiments they have expressed in their works.

Twenty-two years ago today, on 25 September 1964, the Mozambican people, under the leadership of FRELIMO, launched the epic task of liberating the land and the people from the foreign yoke. In celebrating this date we are marking the beginning of the exercise of democracy by our people and their participation in determining the destiny of their country. At this very moment, the second general election is taking place nation-wide, which makes a reality of and consolidates the democratic, popular nature of our State.

The beginning of our armed struggle for national liberation was also, for us, the beginning of the Mozambican people's contribution to the struggle for peace in our region, Africa, and the world as a whole. We have thus joined hands with the community of nations in its efforts to build a better world.

(Mr. Chissano, Mozambique)

Today, 25 September 1986, the People's Republic of Mozambique, an African, non-aligned, socialist country, wishes to reaffirm from this high rostrum its adherence to the United Nations Charter and its determination to struggle for the promotion of the principles and objectives enshrined therein.

For this reason we say: for the liberty and independence of peoples, for democracy and equality among men and nations, for justice, for co-operation and development, for international peace and security, the struggle continues.

Mr. FILALI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): I should like, first of all, on behalf of the delegation of the Kingdom of Morocco, to extend to Ambassador Choudhury our sincere congratulations on his election as President of the General Assembly. We are convinced that his eminent qualities as a statesman, together with his great experience in international affairs, are the best guarantee of the success of this important session. We are particularly satisfied at seeing him preside over our work because brotherly ties and many affinities link his country, Bangladesh, with the Kingdom of Morocco.

I also take this opportunity to express to his predecessor, Ambassador Jaime de Piniés, our deep satisfaction with the remarkable way in which he fulfilled the mandate we entrusted to him at the opening of the previous session. Once again he provided proof of his exceptional skill and his great faith in our Organization.\*

---

\*Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

We wish to reiterate to our Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, our profound esteem and our appreciation of his tireless and persistent efforts in the past five years to enable our Organization fully to shoulder its responsibilities in the maintenance of international peace and security and in the attainment of a better world characterized by stability and co-operation between all States. Since his election as Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar has continually sought, with courage and selflessness, to strengthen the role of the United Nations, by his many initiatives and by suggesting measures which could give the United Nations the means to react more effectively, to both threatened and actual armed conflicts.

We hope that the Secretary-General will accept, at the end of his first term, the assurance of our trust and our gratitude for his services to the community of nations. He may be sure that we shall continue to extend our co-operation to him.

The commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations provided us last year with an opportunity to take stock of the achievements of our Organization and analyse the shortcomings and flaws which prevent it from attaining the goals and objectives we have set ourselves. It is encouraging that we have unanimously reaffirmed the continuing validity of the principles of the Charter and clearly asserted our desire to promote the strengthening of our institution to enable it to respond better in future to the requirements of our time.

To this end, the General Assembly has devoted great attention to the question of improving the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of our Organization. Thus, we have expressed our collective belief that the United Nations would be better able to make its contribution to solving the many problems disrupting our world if its structures and methods of work were rationalized and

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

its financial situation definitively improved. The Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts set up for this purpose has just submitted detailed recommendations, which deserve our careful consideration, with the need to strengthen confidence in the United Nations uppermost in our minds.

The Moroccan delegation, for its part, is eager to make its full contribution towards the adoption of rational, objective decisions which will increase the efficiency of the Organization and its ability to cope with the political, economic and social problems for which it is responsible.

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

We have unanimously proclaimed the year 1986 the International Year of Peace. We have thus shown our determination to initiate fresh ideas and action in favour of peace, which remains the primary objective of our Organization. In proclaiming an International Year of Peace, we were guided by the conviction that the promotion of international peace and security requires a commitment on the part of all States to resolute action on non-recourse to the use of force, the peaceful settlement of disputes, non-intervention, disarmament, decolonization, respect for the principle of self-determination, and the elimination of all forms of discrimination. The promotion of peace also requires a collective and sustained effort in favour of development.

Of course, many demonstrations have been held throughout the world which have helped to increase public awareness of the urgent need to think and to act in a systematic and innovative way with a view to achieving the goals of the United Nations. However, it must be noted that the international scene continues, as in the past, to present a disturbing image because of the persistence of many flashpoints of tension, the exacerbation of certain conflicts, the widening of the gap between the rich and the poor nations and the continuation of the uncontrolled arms race.

In southern Africa one of the most explosive situations continues to confront the international community. Pursuing its reactionary and anachronistic policy, the Pretoria régime is maintaining and stepping up its oppression of the people of South Africa. Despite all the initiatives taken to bring about the advent of a democratic multiracial society, the Government of South Africa is continuing to strengthen the shameless system of apartheid. Its proclamation of the state of emergency and its long list of crimes and violations of the most fundamental rights

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

of the human person provide, once again, proof of the intransigence of the Pretoria régime and its refusal to respond to the general indignation aroused throughout the world by its policy of racial discrimination.

Turning its back on the inevitable course of history and the most sacred values of civilization, the South African régime has opted for an adventurous policy of headlong onslaught and is engaged in repeated acts of aggression against its front-line neighbours, thereby sowing the seeds of a general conflagration in southern Africa.

Supporting the people of South Africa and the other peoples of that part of our continent, the Kingdom of Morocco will continue to provide them, as in the past, with unreserved assistance in their struggle against the apartheid régime.

Universal awareness of the seriousness of the situation prevailing in southern Africa and the dangers inherent in it has led to the rallying of the entire international community around the idea of imposing sanctions on South Africa. We express the hope that our Assembly will be able during this session to decide on appropriate sanctions to compel the Government of South Africa to respect the rule of the majority and the fundamental rights of the human person.

Eight years have elapsed since the Security Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), which established a plan for the peaceful and democratic settlement of the Namibian problem. Here again, the Pretoria régime has contrived to erect obstacles to prevent the implementation of the United Nations plan which was to lead Namibia to independence. The Kingdom of Morocco reiterates its unreserved support for our Namibian brothers and calls upon the international community to redouble its efforts to hasten the liberation of Namibia from South Africa's illegal occupation.

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

For 40 years the Middle East has been the theatre of bloody conflicts seriously endangering international peace and security. However, that region, the cradle of the revealed religions and the part of the world where civilization has flourished from time immemorial, has always been a land of coexistence among all the children of Abraham. Jews and Arabs have lived there on perfectly good terms, contributing through their common genius to the enrichment and flourishing of the heritage of human civilization. This model of harmonious relations between Jews and Arabs prevailed for centuries, throughout the Arab-Islamic world. In Morocco particularly, this coexistence was strengthened over the centuries and has been maintained intact to this day, with tolerance and respect for the differences between Jews and Muslims in Morocco, bound by their common commitment to being Moroccan and to the sacred values of the nation.

Thus we can only deplore the fact that the tragedy created in the Middle East over the past 40 years and the vicissitudes experienced in the region in that time have exacerbated the antagonisms to the point where people have come to believe that any coexistence between Jews and Arabs is out of the question. However, an effort of imagination should make it possible to overcome existing obstacles and to lead to a return to the original harmony which formerly permitted the children of Abraham to contribute together to the building of one of the most brilliant civilizations of the Mediterranean world.

For this to happen, Israel must come to its senses and realize that its own interests impel it to put an end to its intransigent attitude, which undermines the path to peace. It is undeniable that this objective can be attained only if Israel recognizes all the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, in particular its right to return to its homeland and its right to the establishment of its own State.

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

It is also undeniable that the establishment of peace requires withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories. The solution of the tragic problem of the Middle East would enable the peoples of the region to recover the spirit of understanding and the foundations of their ancestral symbiosis, a source of progress and renewed prosperity in that part of the world. This vision of the future is embodied in the Arab peace plan adopted unanimously at Fez in 1982, which established the most appropriate principles for a just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Hence we regret that this realistic and constructive step, which has met with broad approval, has so far, unfortunately, been blocked by Israel.

We consider that it is the duty of the international community to pursue its efforts to bring about an age of peace in that part of the world. To achieve this, several formulas have been put forward in search of a comprehensive solution for the Israeli-Arab problem. Reference has been made to an interational conference or a preparatory committee, as well as the possibility of an international forum. As far as we are concerned, we believe that pragmatism and realism should guide us in our quest for peace and stability in that troubled region. Any solution which has the support of the parties and the principal Powers concerned will enjoy our full support.

We feel that an international conference bringing together the countries concerned, the Palestine Liberation Organization, which as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people is alone able to make the necessary commitments, and also the Powers with vital interests in the region and world responsibilities would constitute an appropriate forum for the search for and implementation of a comprehensive peace plan for the Middle East.

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

Morocco and Lebanon are linked by so many ties and affinities. We share with that brother Arab country common roots in history and the same commitment to the values of democracy and respect for fundamental freedoms. Therefore we must reiterate once again our grave concern at the tragic situation and upheaval that have prevailed in Lebanon for a decade. The tragedy experienced by this brother country is exacerbated by foreign interference and the presence of foreign troops.

We are convinced that the Lebanese people are capable of finding a solution to their problems within a national framework that they are capable of recovering their cohesion and unity, provided that an end is put to all occupation of the territory by foreign armed forces.

The continuation of the fratricidal war between two members of our Organization, Iraq and Iran, is a matter of grave source to us. That conflict, which has lasted all too long, has already cost considerable loss of life and threatens at any time to spread its destruction to the entire Gulf region. Nevertheless, there has been no lack of attempts at mediation to put an end to it. The United Nations, the Islamic Conference and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have endeavoured to convince the two warring parties of the need for an immediate end to hostilities and for a peaceful settlement to their dispute. We must acknowledge that Iraq has shown its good will and has agreed on many occasions to commit itself to a process of negotiated settlement. We hope that the Islamic Republic of Iran will finally heed the many appeals made to it. Wisdom, the voice of reason and the enlightened self-interest of all peoples in the region so require.

The denial to some countries of their right to choose freely their political, economic and social systems, manifested in outside interference and foreign occupation, is yet another source of tension in international relations.

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

The Kingdom of Morocco, which stalwartly defends full respect for independence, territorial integrity and the sovereign equality of States, makes an urgent appeal for the evacuation of foreign troops from Afghanistan so that that country may regain its original role as a non-aligned, free and sovereign country. The efforts of the Secretary-General of our Organization to bring about a peaceful settlement of that problem deserve our encouragement and support.

My country deeply deplores the continued occupation of the territory of Democratic Kampuchea. We remain convinced of the need for the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops so as to allow for a peaceful settlement of that problem and for the establishment of a lasting peace in South-East Asia.

External interference has also seriously disturbed stability in Central America. Morocco hails the efforts of the countries concerned to establish regional joint efforts and eliminate interference in their internal affairs. It is incumbent upon the international community to support and encourage the efforts of the Contadora Group to set up the machinery for a peaceful solution, based on respect for national sovereignty and for the territorial integrity of all States in the region.

As regards what has come to be called the question of the Western Sahara, my delegation has on many occasions in the past 10 years presented to this Assembly the various aspects of that problem. I should like, however, to recall the most recent developments in that issue, and more specifically, the peace initiative undertaken by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. For indeed the Kingdom of Morocco, like all the other parties concerned, received a letter, dated 20 March 1986, in which Mr. Perez de Cuellar proposed:

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

"to begin in New York on 9 April 1986, under his own auspices and with the presence of the personal representative of His Excellency Mr. Abdou Diouf, President of Senegal and current President of the Organization of African Unity, negotiations with a view to establishing a cease-fire and organizing a referendum in the Western Sahara, pursuant to the relevant resolutions of the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations. It is to be understood that those negotiations will take place separately between the parties to the conflict."

All the parties concerned responded favourably and in writing to this appeal by agreeing to the framework and to the objective proposed.

Consequently, the United Nations began to deal with that problem and on that basis two series of negotiations took place in New York in April and May of 1986 in the Office of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, following which Mr. Perez de Cuellar submitted to the parties a memorandum setting forth precise questions concerning the overall aspects of a referendum. I should like to inform this Assembly that the Kingdom of Morocco has officially and solemnly agreed to the organization of a referendum for self-determination, monitored and safeguarded by the United Nations.

The Kingdom of Morocco has therefore participated, and will continue to participate, sincerely and in a constructive spirit, in the process of good offices undertaken by the Secretary-General. His Majesty King Hassan solemnly confirmed to him, during the Secretary-General's visit to Morocco on 15 and 16 July of this year, that that was the case. Morocco believes that this process deserves the support of all peace-loving countries, for it is part and parcel of the basic principles of our Organization, to wit, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the right of peoples to self-determination. We should then encourage the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the current President of the

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

Organization of African Unity to continue their efforts to bring about a just and final solution to that problem. We hope that solution will lead to harmony and dialogue, which have always been inherent in sub-Saharan relations and without which our region will remain prey to upheavals and foreign designs.

As a Mediterranean country, bordering on the important maritime navigation route of the Gibraltar Straits, Morocco attaches special importance to the maintenance of peace and stability in the Mediterranean. My country will spare no effort to transform the Mediterranean region into a zone of peace, security and co-operation, free from any tension or confrontation. In our view, co-operation and joint efforts among the countries in the north and those to the south of the Mediterranean are an excellent way to achieve that objective.

Over recent years terrorism has continued to wreak havoc the world over. That criminal scourge endangers and destroys innocent human lives. It seriously endangers the fundamental freedoms of the human person and the stability of States. Morocco, which has always opposed all practices contrary to the universal values of human civilization, condemns the use of terrorism whatever its provenance.

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

My delegation welcomes the increased awareness the world over of a need to combat this evil. We would recall in this connection that Arab leaders meeting at the special Summit Meeting in Casablanca in August 1985 vigorously denounced terrorism in all its forms and origins. We are pleased that last year the international community expressed its belief in the need to heighten the awareness of world public opinion as to the dangers of this grave scourge and to increase international co-operation so as to put an end to acts of terrorism and their underlying causes.

Since its inception the United Nations has attached great importance to the issue of disarmament. Aware of the close links which exist between security of States, development and disarmament, we have continued to work for the adoption of concrete measures which might put an end to the unbridled arms race.

It is regrettable to note that the stockpiling of armaments, already at levels which threaten the very survival of mankind, is increasing, and this only heightens our legitimate concern.

The frenetic arms race causes colossal expenditures amounting annually to hundreds of billions of dollars, at a time when two thirds of the world population is living in poverty, squalor and underdevelopment. In this connection, we regret the fact that the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, scheduled for last July, was not held. We note, unfortunately, that the aim of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which we set for ourselves, is nowhere near achievement.

The Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, the only body for multilateral negotiations, is deadlocked and finds itself unable to produce an international instrument on priority questions of disarmament, particularly in the sphere of nuclear disarmament and chemical weapons.

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

Within the framework of bilateral negotiations we are now witnessing an exchange of proposals and counterproposals on both sides, especially in the sphere of nuclear disarmament.

The contacts and meetings which took place recently between representatives of the two major Powers, especially those held in Geneva and Moscow, give us further hope for a forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting with tangible results in the sphere of disarmament.

When we consider the international economic situation we observe that the world is going through a period of great confusion. A cumulative process of long-lasting crisis is developing without any agreement being reached either on the gravity of the symptoms or on the adequate therapeutic means to be applied.

Therefore, the objective of the new international order has become a subject of contempt, the Charter of economic rights and duties of States has been opposed; the international development strategy disregarded; multilateral co-operation weakened; the very uniqueness of underdevelopment as a typical phenomenon of modern times has been systematically denied. Even though we live in a shrinking and increasingly interdependent world, the major developed countries continue to prefer piecemeal measures to global and lasting solutions.

Their trade and technological competition goes hand in hand with the divergence of their monitoring initiatives and budgetary programmes, with the resulting adoption of economic policies incompatible with development requirements.

It is widely recognized that the economic crisis is world wide. It is neither a cyclical phenomenon nor mere happenstance but rather the result of deeply rooted structural inadequacies. It is rooted in the close relationship which exists between monetary, financial, trade relations and development prospects. It is characterized especially by the unbearable weight of a growing and virtually

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

insoluble indebtedness, by the considerable drop in the price of commodities, the grave deterioration in the terms of trade, increased protectionist policies and a reverse transfer of resources.

The crisis of external indebtedness, in particular, will not be satisfactorily solved for the developed creditors or the developing debtors and international financial and banking institutions without, first, a massive transfer of resources of all types towards the developing countries; secondly, without a common campaign against protectionism and restrictive business practices; thirdly, without adequate stabilization in commodity markets; and fourthly, without new forms of debt rescheduling and terms and conditions based on growth and the development strategies of the debtor countries.

Finally, we must add that the debt crisis cannot be reduced without a new substantial decrease in interest rates in real terms, which in the past decade have reached record figures, and without a stabilization of exchange rates whose excessive fluctuations have been exacerbating the uncertainty of the world economic environment.

As long as these questions are not considered in a comprehensive and integrated way, the activities of some will be constantly offset by the reaction of others, without the slightest chance of a renewal of growth, investment and development.

The Kingdom of Morocco therefore believes that the co-ordination of economic policies among developed countries and the compatibility of such policies with development requirements would be greatly facilitated by the establishment of a multilateral monitoring machinery which would, in a symmetrical and equitable way, find comprehensive and joint solutions to the distressing problem of widespread crisis, growth and development. Despite the crisis of multilateralism, there is no

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

reason for the United Nations, in its work and deliberations being unable to help decide on broad ways and means for the convening of a conference on a reform of the international financial and monetary system which might guarantee the interest of all and more specifically those of the developing world.

Prosperity for one region at the expense of another is less and less possible without jeopardizing the foundations of our common future.

As for the thirteenth special session of the General Assembly on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa, even though it may be too early to evaluate all of its implications, our feeling remains that a cautious policy of support and vague promises made by the international community were not on a par with our common responsibility, nor with the tragedy of a sorely tried continent. The enormous commitment in concrete, precise terms, which is the African act of faith, has not had an impact on the needs of a continent wallowing in its debts which must face the most serious obstacles at each and every step of its development process. The Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) predicts that in this region, by the year 2000:

"There might be massive and repeated famine; imports of foodstuffs might reduce even the most prosperous African States to bankruptcy and many countries will find themselves at the limit of survival."

At a time when some do not hesitate to call Africa "the lost continent", we, on the contrary, would like to hail the courageous efforts made by our continent in its struggle for recovery, development and dignity. Morocco, at any rate, hopes that international commitments will meet African needs, as regards the mobilization of financial resources, the development of technical capacity, the relieving of the external debt burden and its servicing within an appropriate international institution.

(Mr. Filali, Morocco)

Our world Organization is the only one in the world where peoples can forge a pact of solidarity to overcome the dangers and tragedies facing mankind.

Our differences and the variety of our problems and ideas should not be an obstacle to our living together and to the establishment of true co-operation among nations. We must draw upon the principles and ideals of the Charter for the materials with which we must build a better, more supportive and more humane world where peace, security and progress for all mankind can prevail.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to exercise the right of reply. I remind the Assembly that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, the first statement in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes and the second to five minutes, and that such statements should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. RAJAI-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to exercise my right of reply in order to elaborate a few points with regard to a futile attempt made by the envoy of President Saddam Takriti this morning in which he did his best to insult the intelligence of this international body. The envoy of President Saddam Takriti poured out a load of the lies to which every defeated aggressor usually resorts.

First, the envoy of President Saddam, Mr. Yuhanna Tariq Aziz, seems to have forgotten that on 17 September 1980, at an extraordinary session of the Iraqi National Assembly, Saddam Hussein unilaterally nullified the 6 March 1975 Algiers Accord between Iran and Iraq, to which Saddam Hussein himself was a signatory. On that day Saddam Takriti said:

"I announce before you that we regard the 6 March 1975 Algiers Accord nullified, and declare it void."

Tearing up the Accord on a televised broadcast to the entire Iraqi nation, the so-called Iraqi President declared:

"This agreement pertained to a time when we were weak, and now that we are strong we no longer need it."

Secondly, in order to offer his best services to the imperialist forces, President Saddam Takriti then launched his war of aggression against my country, on 22 September 1980, with the intention of breaking down our beloved Islamic revolution. He attacked our revolution because it was, still is and will remain an anti-imperialist, anti-Zionist and anti-apartheid revolution.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

Thirdly, President Saddam Takriti has forgotten - indeed, this morning his Envoy also forgot - that they are hiding their aggressive, expansionist faces behind a peace-loving mask of deceit. That is a tactic to which every defeated aggressor usually resorts. He has also forgotten that for at least two very painful years important parts of Khuzestan, Bakhtaran, important areas of Lorestan and Azerbaijan - four important provinces of my country - were occupied by the Iraqi forces of aggression. The occupation was undertaken in an opportunistic, dishonest, expansionist attempt at a time when we were in a post-revolutionary disarray, had no army or police force, and were hardly able to maintain our own internal security against the counter-revolutionary forces backed by the United States and remnants of the monarchy régime. It was during that revolutionary disarray that they invaded us.

Fourthly, President Saddam Takriti has forgotten that he assaulted a revolution which, immediately after it embraced victory, closed the Zionist Embassy established in Tehran during the Shah's time and replaced it with the Palestine Embassy with the Palestine flag hoisted atop the same building that had previously been given to the Zionist régime. Thus the Iraqi régime must have been deliberately serving the Zionists in the region.

Mr. Yuhanna Tariq Aziz, the envoy of President Saddam Takriti, has also forgotten that when they invaded our country the Iraqi Ministry of Information published a book entitled "Al Ahwaz" in which they had already registered their evil intention, in the form of a new map of the region which covers an important part of my country with the names of the cities and villages changed according to the taste and interest of President Saddam Hussein.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

Here I should like to read out two quotations. When the Iraqis occupied important parts of my country on 18 January 1981, they said that President Saddam's country had reached its rightful borders with Iran - the same borders as he predicted in his "Al Ahwaz", the book published by them with a new map, new names and new designations - and that Iraq would never withdraw from the position it was then holding even if it meant that its armed forces had to remain in those areas for another 10 years.

On 22 January 1981, President Saddam Hussein again declared in a meeting with rank and file members of his armed forces:

"The Iraqi armed forces will never withdraw to pre-war borders with Iran... The Iraqi armed forces are capable of penetrating into and completely occupying any part of Iran and levelling any city or town."

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani,  
Islamic Republic of Iran)

As the Assembly knows, and as United Nations documents show, so many cities were levelled by President Saddam Hussein's armies.

The next point I should like to make is that the envoy of President Saddam Hussein Takriti is not happy with the role of the United Nations regarding the imposed war. I would remind him that the Secretary-General, the Offices of the Secretary-General, the Secretariat and the Security Council are all parts of the United Nations. The Offices of the Secretary-General have made great contributions to curbing - if not completely stopping, at least partially stopping - the chemical warfare of President Saddam Hussein against us. The Secretary-General was able to establish the moratorium of 12 June, which, like the 1975 agreement, was violated and abrogated by Saddam Hussein and never revived in spite of the many appeals of the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General has made a great contribution to controlling Iraqi crime, such as the well-known war on cities and attacks on civilians. The Secretary-General suggested his famous eight-point plan -

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Iran, but his 10-minute period is over. I therefore ask him to be kind enough to conclude his statement.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I will do my best, Sir. When we responded positively to all the proposals of the Secretary-General in his eight-point plan and all his appeals, the Iraqi aggressors were unhappy and simply said that they responded with great caution. So far as peace is concerned, the Iraqi occupying forces are not in a position to make any peace proposals. I do not think the United Nations Charter permits an aggressor to wage war and then, when defeated, to call for peace. That is not acceptable by any standard, and definitely not according to the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): We are not surprised to hear from the representative of Iran new lies relating to the dispute between my country and his. He has attempted in those lies to distort documents and to invent documents which are only present in the imagination of those warmongers and expansionists, the leaders of Iran. I challenge the Iranian representative to bring before the President the original formulation of the documents he mentioned. He spoke about certain statements by Iraq, particularly by my President, and specifically about a book published by the Ministry of Information of Iraq.

The representative of Iran went beyond all bounds, in his claim that Iran is anti-Zionist, for instance. The facts are known to all. Iran currently obtains a large part of its armaments, as it has for many years, from Israel. The press here in the United States of America has uncovered attempts to smuggle weapons from the United States by a gang under the direction of a particular Israeli military leader. Those facts show clearly that Iran is not anti-Zionist.

Furthermore, he claims that Iran is against racial discrimination and apartheid. That also is an untruth, because the régime in Iran is based on the Persian discrimination of the leadership of Iran, which persecutes all minorities in Iran and is currently waging war against Iranian Kurds. It is a leadership based on ethnic and communal discrimination. All religious groups are being persecuted in Iran.

As regards entering into an endless discussion about who started the war, we have already challenged the Iranian delegation and Iran to accept an arbitration committee under the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Organization of African Unity or even the United Nations. We have agreed that any of those organizations should try to identify the party that started the aggression. Iran has rejected those proposals, as well as other proposals by Iraq, the latest of which was the proposal by the President of the Republic of Iraq, to the Tehran leadership on 2 August of this year.

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

It should be noted that, as usual, it is the practice of Iranian diplomacy unlike diplomacy in any other part of the world, to exert every possible effort to defend war and call for the continuance of war. That is unlike diplomacy in any other part of the world, where, if a war does take place, peaceful means are used to put an end to it. We therefore see that the Iranians are afraid of calls for peace, because such calls are for them a condemnation. The fact that delegations to the Assembly at this very session have condemned the continuance of the war and called for peace and that the Harare summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement also called for peace and condemned the continuance of the war, scares Iran and its rulers, and its representatives here. That is why we see them in this Assembly closing their ears to these appeals; either they are absent from their seats or, if one does come into this Hall, he appears to be in a deep sleep.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who have asked to exercise the right to reply a second time.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I just wish to inform those who do not know that all religious minorities in Iran have certain seats in the Parliament, regardless of their distribution in the total population of Iran. Christians have two seats, Zoroastrians have one seat, Jews have one seat. There are many Muslims, 7 million of them, in the United States. They have not been allocated any seats, and I do not know how many seats are given to the Jews. It is only in Iran, so far as we know, that minorities, regardless of their distribution in the total population, are given seats in the Parliament.

Regarding the rejection of President Saddam's proposal, I think that is the only truth, the only correct statement that the Iraqi delegation is making. We totally reject all the proposals made by President Saddam Hussein. President Saddam is just not in a position to make any proposal. He is a criminal. Criminals are usually dealt with in a court according to the principle of justice; nobody negotiates with them. We do not negotiate with criminals in any circumstances.

As for peace proposals, we believe that peace in our region is a necessity, not a choice. We look forward to comprehensive, everlasting peace for our region, and in order to reach that happy state we are making the greatest sacrifices. We are doing our best to end the war once and for all. But let me make it quite clear that there will be no negotiations with the aggressor, the criminal, the user of chemical warfare and those who attack civilian areas and aircraft. They must be punished, and we are doing our best to achieve such justice.

Regarding negotiations and mediation, I should like to quote part of a statement made by President Saddam Hussein on 28 September 1980, when a delegation from the Arab region, from our common friends, went to Baghdad to ask President Saddam Hussein to withdraw his bloody forces from my country. His response was this:

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic  
Republic of Iran)

"We should like to declare before you and before the Arab nation that we have turned down some attempts by certain Arab officials for a so-called mediation between us and Iran."

In the second paragraph, Saddam said:

"No Arab should undertake an attempt to mediate. Should he fail to support his Arab brother in the battle, then he should at least keep silent, although this is far below the minimum expectation."

I think the history of the war is very well known, but the delegation of Iraq must say something, otherwise, when he goes back to Baghdad he will be in trouble and have to face the anger of President Saddam Takriti.

Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of Iran has just used some very crude terms, unworthy of this important forum, about the President of a Member State of the United Nations. Indeed, as the proverb says, a tree is known by its fruit.

This is the morality of the Iranian delegation and the rulers of Iran. As an example of the morality and of the treachery of Iran's leadership particularly the so-called Imam Khomeini, I must tell the Assembly that when he was expelled from Iran during the Shah's rule he found only hospitality and generosity in Iraq. He was a guest of Iraq for 15 years. Yet, after receiving that hospitality, when he assumed power in Iran he treated Iraq as only a treacherous person would. As the Arab proverb says, if you reach out to a good man he will repay you tenfold, but if you reach out to a treacherous man he will turn on you. As for the real criminal, it is he who is the cause of this war, he who is perpetuating it.

In this context I do not wish to put forward any Iraqi documents; I wish merely to refer to an Iranian one. Today, 25 September 1986, there is an Agence France Presse dispatch in the newspaper Le Monde quoting a letter from Bazargan,

(Mr. Sumaida, Iraq)

first head of the Iranian Government after the fall of the Shah. In that letter, addressed to Khomeini, Bazargan accuses him openly of being solely responsible for the war and for its continuance - a war that has led only to catastrophe for Iran. That document is indeed a condemnation and testimony from the people of Iran. If there is any credibility in the Iranian representative's claim that he respects the United Nations, if he was sincere in what he said with reference to the points put forward by the Secretary-General, why does he not accept the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council pertaining to the dispute?

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.