



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

## AGENDA ITEM 9

### General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The General Assembly will hear a statement by the Prime Minister of the Republic of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. I have great pleasure in welcoming her and inviting her to address the General Assembly.

2. Mrs. GANDHI (India): I congratulate you, Mr. President, on your election to that august office. Your long association with the United Nations and your experience give us hope that during your tenure the Organization will gain strength. We are glad also to see the Secretary-General by your side. His analysis of the current world situation deserves serious reflection. We wish success to his patient and untiring labour in the cause of world peace.

3. I welcome our newest Member, St. Kitts-Nevis.

4. I am here on a quest of peace and co-operation. I have the privilege of addressing the Assembly not only on behalf of the people of India, one of the founder Members of the United Nations, but also on behalf of 100 other members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which met at New Delhi in March at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries and renewed their pledge to work for a world which would not be riven by distrust and hatred and for a truly international community where nations would grasp hands of friendship across geographical frontiers.

5. For the last 20 years the non-aligned have customarily met once in three years, and the Chairperson has reported to the United Nations. Firm faith in the United Nations is central to the non-aligned. All members of the Non-Aligned Movement are Members, current or potential, of the United Nations. However, the United Nations is an institution, the non-aligned group a movement. The United Nations is, or ought to be, a forum for solving disputes; the Non-Aligned Movement eschews discussion of bilateral problems. But the aim is the same: to maintain peace by removing the sources of tension and to bring out the humanity in human beings.

6. At the New Delhi Conference we adopted a comprehensive statement on the economic and political state of the world. Our views were summed up in what has now come to be called the New Delhi Message. The final paragraph says:

"The crisis which confronts our civilization today is unprecedented in history. Great tasks call for wise decisions. We appeal to the great Powers to give up mistrust, engage in sincere, forward-looking negotiations in a spirit of shared good faith to reach agreement on various disarmament measures and to find a way out of the deepening economic crisis which threatens

all of us. Unitedly, the members of the Non-Aligned Movement are prepared to do everything in their power to assist in this process. The earth belongs to us all—let us cherish it in peace and true brotherhood, based on the dignity and equality of man." [See A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2.]

I am here to give this message to the entire world.

7. When the non-aligned plead with the aligned to give up confrontation and conflict, it is not out of any presumption. We are only too keenly aware of our own weaknesses, of the unnecessary discords and disputes between ourselves. But, being militarily weak, we do not have to find justification for strength. Being familiar with pain and suffering, we do not want them to increase anywhere. Our plea for peace is not out of superior virtue but because peace is indispensable, because humankind now has the choice, the knowledge and the power to prevent the calamity of extinction.

8. Scientists, scholars and some notable soldiers have vividly described the outcome of a future nuclear war. Imagine a hundred or a thousand Hiroshimas at one time. Imagine a world with nowhere to hide and perhaps nobody left to hide. As more and more people in all countries comprehend the full implications of the monstrous stockpiles of nuclear death, peace movements grow in number and beyond political ideology, driven by peoples' inmost urge to live. We can all live only if we all combine in the struggle for peace.

9. Some quarters believe that nuclear armaments can be controlled, and deployed with exact calculation of cost-effectiveness. Equally frightening is the preparation and willingness to use other deadly chemical, biological and other such devices. Even more disturbing is the talk in depersonalized terms of using outer space for future wars.

10. This relentless search for ever increasingly barbaric weapons systems is undertaken in the name of security. India and other non-aligned countries are convinced that only general and complete disarmament can provide real and enduring security. Nuclear-weapon Powers owe it to humanity to renounce the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in any situation whatever. As a first step they should resume negotiations for disarmament and ban the production and testing of all nuclear weapons.

11. In four days we shall celebrate Mahatma Gandhi's one hundred and fourteenth birthday. There is renewed awareness of the continued relevance of his message of non-violence and tolerance. He said:

"Man as animal is violent, but as spirit is non-violent. The moment he awakes to the spirit within he cannot remain violent. Either he progresses towards non-violence or rushes to his doom. That is why the prophets and avatars have taught the lessons of truth, harmony, brotherhood, justice—all attributes of non-violence."

12. The other major theme of the non-aligned is development. We are largely poor and technologically backward. Even the handful of the rich amongst us are not technologically self-reliant. Most of us have become free from colonial rule only in the last 35 years. Our national

freedom is new; our national unities need to be consolidated. Freedom itself releases long-pent-up hopes and yearning for rights. In this age of instant globe-encircling information technology, the media dazzle eyes and fill ears with images and reports of affluence. Even the modest expectations of our peoples are far beyond our present means. Besides, we are hard put to preserve our independence because of the many economic, political and military pressures.

13. The present world economic order is based on domination and inequality. The basic aim of the programmes of action drawn up at New Delhi was to strengthen the economies of weak nations. We outlined a mechanism to pool our own technological resources, a South-South dialogue as a supplement to the North-South one. We also indicated some immediate measures, the most important of which was the convening of a conference on money and finance for development. To help developing countries is not mere largesse. It will directly benefit the industrialized because development in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and the enlargement of their incomes by removing obstacles to their export, will absorb industrial goods and machinery from advanced countries, stimulate economic activity and ease their unemployment problem. What better investment can the North make in its own future than by turning today's deprived of the South into tomorrow's consumers?

14. Existing international institutions and those who have headed them have done valuable work, but these bodies are not wholly representative, nor do they reflect the changes that have occurred in the international economy. No country or set of countries is without dilemmas. The affluent ones which follow market economies have problems of production, unemployment and currency instability. Industrialized countries with planned economies, which do not formally belong to the international monetary system but participate in the global activities of commerce and technological exchange, also face problems of production and renovation. We the developing are caught between the inadequacies of internal and external resources. All these are parts of one global crisis. There is no way out except through dialogue among us all. Each country, however powerful, has more to gain by accommodation and co-operation than by withdrawal into individual isolation or adoption of policies to maintain the solidarity of the strong. That is why we advocate a new international economic order based on equality and justice. Unfortunately, over the past three years the procedural hurdles to the launching of global negotiations have not been overcome.

15. The advanced countries have held consultations regarding their own problems and the accumulated burdens of the economically weakest. Nothing concrete has emerged. Intentions are offset by supposed domestic compulsions. The Summit of Industrialized Nations at Williamsburg in May and the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in June and July have shown up once again the fear of the unfamiliar, of lowering easy, safe, existing protective barriers and releasing restrictive rules. Why should these countries be afraid of the demands of the weak? It is time for bolder moves in trade and in financial and technological co-operation and a daring new initiative to eliminate global poverty by the end of the century. The demand of the developing countries for a North-South dialogue is all too often seen as yet another plea of the have-nots which has to be resisted by the haves. The world today is too complex for such a simplistic division. Political independence is not an end to problems, but only a recognition of the realities of governance in adverse circumstances.

16. Ideas and initiatives come through discussion, through collective counsel. At New Delhi the non-aligned felt the universal need for further communication and more informal discussions with one another, hence the suggestion that the current session of the General Assembly could be an occasion for heads of State or Government leaders of the developing and the developed countries, the non-aligned and the aligned, the North and South, West and East of common parlance, to be together for just a few days to think and talk about the great problems of peace and security, disarmament and development. We expect no dramatic results, but the immensity of our challenges calls for persistence. Every attempt may take us just a little further in promoting a climate of peace.

17. It is gracious indeed of so many heads of State and Government to listen to this call of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. We are having informal meetings individually and collectively, joined by the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General. Could 1983 mark a watershed in the history of the United Nations? This great world body was founded as a group of nations united in a wartime alliance. With the entry of newly freed countries, the end of the decade saw its expansion into a much bigger body. The next 30 years have brought about near universality in its composition. Today, because of the unique authority entrusted to it in controlling military crises through its instruments and its influence on social and economic developments through its various specialized agencies, the United Nations is an integral part of the lives of nations and individuals. It has not yet come near the beginnings of a global approach. Its progress has to be halting and tentative, sometimes unavoidably ineffectual in facing up to immediate problems, because of the very nature of its origin and institutional structure, particularly the ideological divide, which was not envisaged by those who drew up the Charter. It is our task to improve this institution to make it capable of facing difficulties which were not foreseen 40 years ago.

18. Some issues arouse intense feeling in individual nations, others our common indignation. One such is the persistence of racialism. How can the denial of freedom to the majority of the people of South Africa and the people of Namibia be condoned? I affirm our total support for the freedom struggle of the people of Namibia, under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization [SWAPO], and to the Governments and peoples of the front-line States, which have to endure pressure and provocation. Almost my own first conscious thoughts were admiration for those who fought for freedom and concern for those who suffered. Nelson Mandela, a flaming symbol of freedom, and many others are behind prison bars, but their voices cannot be stilled; they resound the world over.

19. The turmoil in West Asia remains the most serious threat to peace. Driven from their homes, the Palestinian people are in physical and mental agony. We support the valiant efforts of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] to secure their legitimate rights. The occupation of the land of others will not guarantee Israel's security. The Palestinians must be masters in their home, and all States of the region should live within secure international frontiers. The voice of the non-aligned spoke out firmly at the New Delhi summit for a peaceful settlement which ensures justice. This call was endorsed and reaffirmed by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva in August and September. All parties concerned should begin the process of reconciliation.

20. The sufferings of the people of Lebanon, caused by the intervention of foreign forces, have been of great concern to all of us. Here again, the Israeli aggression triggered the crisis. We are relieved to learn of the ceasefire, which we hope will be maintained. All foreign forces should be withdrawn and the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon should be respected by all.

21. The crisis in Central America must be urgently defused. We should demand and support efforts to create a climate of negotiation without external interference. India and the other non-aligned countries have welcomed the peace initiatives of the Contadora Group.

22. The non-aligned have always stood for non-interference and non-use of force. The complex situation in Afghanistan can be solved only on the basis of these twin principles. We fully support the representative of the Secretary-General in working for a solution which takes into consideration the concerns of all the involved parties. The tragic and wasteful Iraq-Iran war harms both countries. Conflicts in other regions also, including Kampuchea, admit only of political solutions.

23. Militarily, today's leading countries are incomparably more powerful than in the days when a single gunboat could silence and immobilize millions. The weak are not so weak, nor the strong so strong. The essence of the concept of non-alignment is peaceful coexistence and the promotion of constructive co-operation. The "non" in non-alignment relates to the importance of resisting attitudes of irreconcilable hostility. The positive aspects are the desire for friendship with other nations irrespective of patterns of government—which are their own business—and to strengthen the fabric of our own nations.

24. In India we work for self-reliance in action and self-respect in thought, which Bertrand Russell called "the better half of pride". But this pride is for human achievement and human potential. Its justification would be our ability to discern the future beyond the gloom of the present.

25. The safety of the weak is the strength of the strong. That is why the weakest and the poorest amongst us, within each society and in the international community, must be shielded from the inclemencies of the international climate. Continued disparities also aggravate political tensions and lead to instability. The strong, with the help of the rest of the international community, can think of measures to contain the enormous destructive potential which gives them illusions of strength but whose very power is troublesome. It is a welcome sign that the two most powerful nations are engaged in negotiations on vital strategic matters and have not allowed even serious incidents to deflect them. The myriad other problems concerning the environment, the optimum utilization of the resources of our planet and the reorganization of political and economic systems at the global and State levels need our co-operative endeavours.

26. The Industrial Revolution gave a major turn to history. Out of it emerged industrial capitalism and, as a reaction to it, Marxism in its various forms. Together these have given rise to the great social upheavals of our time. The two have followed different paths but their ethos is basically materialistic. All that begins must end. And the seeds of the ending are present from the very beginning. What we have witnessed—the two world wars, the possible approach of a third, so much more destructive and disastrous, and the struggle for power—are the end of the road for the existing order of competing systems. Out of this chaos a new order is struggling to be born.

27. This is our last chance of appealing to the old and entrenched not to infect the new with its diseases: neo-colonialism, monopoly, economic oppression, class divisions and big-Power politics, as well as the idea that power is invincible and can feed on itself, with militarization as the ultimate tool.

28. For us, the non-aligned, and for all who are deeply concerned with the future of humanity, the question is whether we help the birth of this new creation or throttle it before it can draw breath. The matter is not simple, because history has proved time and again that ideas and movements can be obstructed, but not stopped. How long can a few pockets of affluence continue to exert influence on the large populations, the natural resources, the cultural strength of the others? How long can allies and supporters, who may not have a base in their own countries and who are not in tune with the changing times, be perpetuated? You cannot kill an idea by killing its adherents. The newborn will not die; the birth can be delayed but the cost will be much higher and the affluent will have to pay. When peaceful change is thwarted, violent upheaval occurs. Previously, the end of a civilization brought destruction and trauma in its trail. If we keep to past trends, we too will be engulfed by circumstances. But today we have the opportunity, which may well be the first in human history, for humankind to bridge the transition from the old to the new in a conscious way, to build a new era, to move together to a new future.

29. The barriers which have been put up to shut out the new are the different faces of colonialism—economic, technological and the powerful weapons of food and information. These are the walls at which we raise our voices. That is why we lay stress on a new economic order, a new information order, preserving cultural identities. Walls do not move and can be got around.

30. Vast knowledge and technological advances concentrated in the hands of a few can lead to a new type of oppression, the barbarity inherent in technological excellence when it is monopolized by the powerful and used for their ends. What just a few years ago were considered as interesting fantasies are today perilously close to the facts of contemporary living. Brainwashing is not confined to any one system or one part of the world, to say nothing of the other cruelties of deprivation.

31. The shape of this new order is not clear. What form the future will take is being moulded right now by our actions. When I speak of the new order, I am not talking merely of more effective and more widespread use of technology, however dramatic it may be, of which we read so much and about which there are many prognoses. I speak of entirely different thought processes and emotional reactions in the use of technology. We must imbue technology with deeper understanding of the difficulties of others and ensure protection against any further technological colonialism. The new order cannot be confined to the economic or social or cultural. It must encompass all of these and yet be much larger. We must create a new international order of humanity, where power is tempered with compassion, where knowledge and capability are at the service of all humanity.

32. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of the Republic of India for the important statement she has just made.

*The meeting was suspended at 11.15 a.m. and resumed at 11.25 a.m.*

33. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Assembly will now hear an address by Mr. François

Mitterrand, President of the French Republic. On behalf of the General Assembly, I have the honour to welcome him and to invite him to address the General Assembly.

34. Mr. MITTERRAND (France) (*interpretation from French*): It is a great honour for me to address the Assembly.

35. Since the United Nations was founded—and I have not forgotten that France was at San Francisco as one of the founding Members—it has filled an essential role. Whatever results it may or may not have achieved, it has remained the one place where, in spite of set-backs and the eternal temptation to use force, peaceful solutions have been tirelessly sought. Through the testimony of that search and that perseverance it has become the symbol of all that is best in the international community.

36. I should like to pay a tribute, Mr. President, to the wisdom of the thirty-eighth session which, in electing you to preside over it, has underlined the important place occupied today by Panama, and also by Latin America.

37. It is my pleasure to reaffirm here the confidence of France in the Secretary-General; I have already met him several times in Paris, and my country has had the opportunity to appreciate his impartiality and talent and the high-minded approach he takes to his duties. The report he presented to the Assembly last year remains fresh in our memories. Like this year's report, it contained suggestions concerning the role of the Security Council, the reduction of tension, regional conflicts, disarmament, human rights and economic and social development, suggestions which I would solemnly endorse. It is on the subjects of disarmament and development that I shall now address the Assembly.

38. For more than 30 years a *de facto* peace based upon deterrence has prevailed between the great Powers of the northern hemisphere, whereas in various corners of the world conflicts have proliferated. There have been more than 100 such conflicts during this period. However, up to the 1970s, the world had the feeling that it was making progress—difficult progress, uncertain progress, but nevertheless progress towards a less chaotic universe where, it was thought, underdevelopment would be overcome and peace would gain ground in the south as in the north. We now see that the gap is growing wider between the rich, who are growing ever richer in spite of the crisis, and the poor, who are growing ever poorer because of the crisis. Passing from one state of imbalance to another, the arms race is accelerating. Human rights are still being trampled under foot. All too many conflicts remain unresolved. One crisis succeeds another and each gives rise to another—economic, monetary, strategic and cultural. Before our very eyes the world is being remade by blood and the sword; might responds to might, and weakness entails further weakness.

39. Are we to despair of the efforts that have been made to find solutions for the problems of our world other than domination, violence or war? If the words uttered from this rostrum have any meaning, we cannot resign ourselves to that. Poverty and war are not inexorable, but the inevitable result of a false logic that we must join together to defeat. More than ever we need to realize that this must be done, at a time when fate is making a dramatic choice between peace and war.

40. Yet, what could be more simple than the hopes of the peoples of the world—hopes centred on food, clothing, shelter, a free life, freedom from fear, access to knowledge, security of ownership and the ability to pass possessions on to one's children? However legitimate such hopes may be, are they, I should like to ask, too much to ask for?

41. Each of us, I believe, is convinced that the consequences of a new world war would be incalculable, perhaps irrevocable. But peace between nations can be maintained only on the basis of a genuine equilibrium. That is the lesson of history. It is through respect for this golden rule that the rights of all to independence and security are reconciled. To establish these equilibriums, or to re-establish them when they have been disturbed, to guarantee their stability, to reduce forces gradually to a lower and lower level, and to provide for continuous monitoring of the information provided—that is the only possible approach to the problems that confront us.

42. In the recent past the negotiations between the Soviets and Americans on strategic arms limitation, known as SALT, have made it possible to limit certain technological developments and to slow down the qualitative strategic arms race, but at the same time we have seen a rapid development of the destructive capacity of these weapons, multiplication of the number of their warheads and improvements in their accuracy.

43. Thus the two great Powers, which each possess a central nuclear system of 2,000 to 3,000 delivery vehicles carrying 8,000 to 9,000 warheads, can attack each other and destroy each other—if I may so put it—seven to eight times over.

44. One set of negotiations under way at Geneva is attempting to bring about a reduction of strategic inter-continental weapons with a view to bringing about a balance between American and Soviet armaments. France hopes that these negotiations will be successful, but for the time being world attention is focused on another set of negotiations, those dealing with what are known as intermediate nuclear forces. I should like to make my views on this subject absolutely clear.

45. As a result of continuous escalation on both sides on the ground in Europe, a new situation has come about in which today in our continent the Soviet Union alone possesses a considerable intermediate nuclear force of three-headed missiles which are mobile and accurate, with a range of about 5,000 kilometres, which, since they cannot cross the Atlantic, consequently have as their only possible target the nations of Western Europe. The same reasoning applies to the missiles installed in the Asian part of the Soviet Union, aimed at the States bordering on that region. France welcomed as a very positive act the opening at Geneva of negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on weapons of this type, after the latter, in compliance with the twofold decision taken by the member States of the integrated North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] command—a body to which France does not belong—made plans to install Pershing II missiles and cruise missiles in various European countries at the end of this year.

46. I shall not here go into all the aspects of a debate which I have dealt with elsewhere and which does not involve France directly even if it concerns it. But I should like to make my country's position clear in the face of the request that its nuclear weapons be included with a view to a Euromissile balance of some kind. In this respect I recall that France, for a quarter of a century now, has possessed a nuclear deterrent force, defensive by its very nature, against any possible nuclear aggressor. That force forms a whole and constitutes for my country a central defence system essential to its security. A few figures will demonstrate its defensive character: each of the two major Powers today possesses 8,000 to 9,000 warheads; France, for its part, possesses 98. I am sure that is enough for our own deterrent, but it excludes the possibility of any other use. These 98 missiles are, furthermore, part of a strategic concept and not a tactical



one, nor an intermediate concept, if we are to use the extremely precise vocabulary used by the Soviets and the Americans when discussing their own affairs.

47. Moreover, it would be paradoxical to have my own country depend on the results of a conference in which it is not participating and which, without its consent, would be debating strategic weapons, particularly underwater weapons, which neither the Americans nor the Russians, who possess many more of them, are debating among themselves, at least in that conference.

48. We can only compare what is comparable. The idea of weighing the central weapons system on which the independence and survival of my country rest against the intermediate nuclear forces of the two major Powers, which for them constitute a mere supplement to their formidable strategic arsenal, is unacceptable. Since in fact this is a request by the Soviet Union, on what grounds can that country expect France to give up something essential, namely its own national defence? Of course we are told—and I am prepared to believe it—that this is not the aim of the request. Of course we are promised that the inclusion of the French force at Geneva will in no way lead to its reduction. But if France were to enter into a calculation it has nothing to do with, would it not be running the risk of having the modernization of its means of defence placed under the control of others? Would it not be taking on a responsibility which it rejects, that of disrupting the world balance?

49. My country is independent. Its deterrent force obeys the orders of the President of the Republic alone. Its loyalty to the Atlantic alliance does not affect its autonomy. It respects the great Russian people and wishes to maintain the age-old good relations linking us. It has neither the intention nor the means—and it does not wish for them—to impose its law by force of arms. It possesses weapons for its own defence, no more, no less. It would not understand a monopoly of intermediate nuclear forces in Europe being agreed to for the Soviet Union in particular, which is the case today, and it hopes that mutual concessions between the two Geneva partners will make it possible to end that monopoly, while creating conditions for a new balance, which I fervently hope for. This presupposes a continued tireless search for a midpoint from which we shall be able to see whether preference has been given to reduction of tensions rather than to their exacerbation.

50. However, since we must consider the whole picture, we must not forget that several conflicts, the direct or indirect results of the policy of blocs, or stirred up or aggravated by such a policy, are giving rise to concern.

51. The unjustifiable destruction of a South Korean civilian aircraft by a Soviet military aircraft leads us to deplore the contempt for moral standards and the tragic absence of laws strong enough to make the perpetration of such an act impossible. I hope that France's proposals to ICAO will finally be heeded.

52. But beyond this event, how many unacceptable situations exist, how many countries are occupied or threatened by foreign armies and how many peoples on all continents are prevented from choosing their own destiny, from Central America to South-East Asia, through Africa, the Middle East, central Asia and not forgetting Europe! Let us stop; the list would be long. I am also thinking of these men and women throughout the world, in exile, refugees, political prisoners, victims of torture, those whose most elementary rights are flouted. On this latter point, surely the international community has been too sparing in its protests and sanctions, and finally has it not resigned itself to these crimes?

With regard to the former point, has it shown enough intransigence whenever a people has been threatened or has lost the right to self-determination? This is a principle which brooks no exception. Where it is possible, why do we not envisage a process of disengagement which would confer a status of neutrality, once these three conditions are met—the will of the State concerned, the evacuation of foreign forces and the solemn undertaking not to interfere in other countries—under the supervision of the Security Council?

53. But I should like to dwell on two conflicts in which France is involved: the conflict in Lebanon and the conflict in Chad. In Lebanon, the French are present as soldiers of peace, first within a United Nations force, the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon, and later with three other countries at the request of the Lebanese Government, as part of a multinational force in Beirut to act as a buffer between the opposing forces there. Has it been forgotten that France contributed to the dignified departure of the Palestinian soldiers and then to protecting the survivors of the tragic Sabra and Shatila camps? We regarded this mission as an honour and we fulfilled it. As for the situation recently created by the partial withdrawal of the Israeli Army and by the new increase in lethal fighting involving civilian and foreign forces, we have tackled this task by placing ourselves at the service of peace. I proclaim loudly from this rostrum: France has no enemy in Lebanon. It is protecting its nationals, as it must. That is all. Its wish is for the Lebanese to manage to overcome their divisions within the framework of their institutions and respect for their legitimate authorities, for Lebanon to regain its independence, sovereignty and unity and for the United Nations to broaden its mission as soon as possible, if necessary, in line with the proposals of relevant leaders. Departure of the foreign armies will make it unnecessary to maintain an international security force.

54. As regards Chad, we went to that country at a time when it was the victim of external aggression, at the request of the Government recognized by the international community and in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and Security Council resolution 387 (1976). Our efforts today are aimed at mediation, and as a matter of priority mediation by the Organization of African Unity [OAU], making possible a cease-fire between the opposing parties and the opening of negotiations the primary purpose of which would be to guarantee the integrity of Chad and the withdrawal of foreign armies. Then, I assure the Assembly, France will not delay by one hour the repatriation of its troops. I have mentioned the OAU, thus indicating France's interest in regional efforts, which are an excellent way of dealing with the conflicts. I could have praised, in this regard, the action undertaken in another part of the world by the Contadora Group, and I can think of many other examples.

55. It is time, at this stage of my statement, to come back to strategic nuclear armaments in the world. We cannot reject the idea—and I do not—that the five nuclear Powers should together debate, when the time comes, a permanent limitation of their strategic systems. We must therefore set out clearly the conditions for progress in this field.

56. The first of these conditions is the correction of the fundamental difference, in terms of type and quantity, between the armaments of the two major Powers and those of the others, and the difference between a country that might use them to assert its power and a country which might be forced to make use of them for its own survival.

57. The second condition flows from the wide gap between conventional forces, particularly in Europe, a gap which has become even wider, I fear, because of the existence of chemical and biological weapons, the manufacture and stockpiling of which must be prohibited by a convention.

58. The third condition is the cessation of the escalation in anti-missile, anti-submarine and anti-satellite weapons.

59. It is also essential to safeguard peoples against threats from space. Is space to become an additional field for the limitless development of the old earthly antagonisms? Space is surely by its very essence the common heritage of mankind, as the Earth itself should be. It would be a betrayal of the interests of our peoples if we were to fail to define, in time, a code of law which would preserve it.

60. Now there is no curb on the development of anti-missile weapons in space, no limit to the number of satellites, because only weapons of mass destruction—that is, nuclear weapons—are banned by the 1967 Treaty.<sup>1</sup> An amendment to that Treaty which banned the placing in orbit of any type of weapon, brought about the gradual withdrawal of arms already in orbit and provided for effective verification would give it its proper scope.

61. In another field which concerns us, and whatever may be the controversies about its tests—controversies with which I am familiar—I wish to stress that France has decided to open its underground nuclear test sites next month to a fact-finding visit from foreign scientists from the South Pacific. I hope this example will be followed.

62. I shall end this part of my statement as I began it, that is, with Europe. If peace has reigned in this continent since the Second World War, it has been in a Europe divided, rent asunder, and which has barely invented ways and means of protecting its future and its own security. No true European will renounce the possibility of doing away with the consequences of this division, renewing the ties that were broken and repairing the situation born in Yalta. It was with this in mind that France worked for the success of the Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and will continue to work for the success of the conference in Stockholm. Only good mutual knowledge of military activities throughout the region stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals will restore the conditions for greater trust.

63. I would recall that the relations between France and Germany were very important in laying the foundations for the European Community, thus making war unthinkable among the 300 million West Europeans. This commitment and this experience explain our support for any process which would ensure increased security for all Europeans. Believe me, the contagion of peace can overcome the consequences of war.

64. The States represented here are going through the worst recession afflicting their economies in the last 50 years. The crisis affects us all. The upsurge, sometimes remarkable and always difficult, experienced by the developing world has been halted. While in certain industrialized countries there are signs of a recovery, the difficulties are getting worse for the majority. The burden of the past—that is, the burden of debt—is being added to the uncertainties of the present to impose upon the fragile societies efforts at austerity and discipline which are exceptionally severe.

65. Of course, we must improve public finances. Of course, we must reduce deficits which are too high. But when the solution to the economic crisis only exacerbates it, where are the signs of a cure? When the increase in poverty and hunger sows the seeds of social and political

crises, surely the difficulties are increasing. When the North is content with its own recovery, does it believe for a moment that it can find lasting well-being alone? What does it propose to those who are living today and what does it propose for the 2 billion men and women who will be born within the next 15 years? Silence has become the ally of the worst. Let us all resume dialogue between the two hemispheres. Let us urgently respond and lay down firm foundations for the future.

66. A transfer of resources from the countries of the North to those of the South is a natural course and is desirable for the well-being of all. The present levels of aid should be considered irreversible. The principal donors should undertake not to reduce their aid as long as the recipient countries show no sign of economic growth. The banking sector must be encouraged not to slacken its efforts.

67. But these immediate actions will not spare us damage to our societies if the currencies in which the third world debt is payable and the interest rates on this debt reach excessive levels. It is up to each industrialized country to shoulder its responsibilities.

68. France, for its part, is making steady progress towards the aid target it has fixed for itself: 0.7 per cent of its gross national product for the third world, 0.15 per cent for the least developed countries. We intend to do everything possible to see to it that the seventh replenishment of the International Development Association represents a significant increase. We shall continue to give our support to the Paris Club to seek ways of dealing with the most critical situations of indebtedness. We support the idea of an increase in the resources of IMF to be assigned as a matter of priority to the developing countries.

69. We have to attack the deep-rooted causes of the instability and disarray which mark international economic relations. For my part there are three major priorities: currency, primary commodities and technology.

70. If I begin with currency it is because, after all, it is the main primary commodity. A few months ago I put forward the idea of a new Bretton Woods. This was a symbolic reference, as far as I was concerned, to stress the need to recreate the conditions of an ordered monetary system with currencies sufficiently stable and reflecting the actual evolution of economies. That is a need felt by us all. The Prime Minister of India and the Prime Minister of New Zealand were right to issue an appeal for international monetary co-operation. The seven industrialized countries decided at Williamsburg to consider the role that could be played at the right time by a monetary conference with a view to improving the international monetary system. This, I know, is something that will take a great deal of time and requires very thorough preparation, and all the countries interested must be involved in this enterprise. Consideration of stricter rules for the establishment of exchange parities, diversification of reserve instruments, agreement on a rate of evolution of international liquidities, definition of the necessary disciplines in the light of the specific economic and social situations of each country—these are the principal subjects to which thought should be given.

71. With regard to primary commodities, the path was laid by the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held at Belgrade last June. But the matter cannot rest there. France proposes improvement of the functioning of private commodity markets by regularizing futures markets, which too often by their erratic and speculative movement mislead economic agents instead of informing them. Stricter discipline in the area of competition would return those

markets to their proper role. And I stress that vital primary commodity, energy. The current stabilization of the oil markets in no way diminishes the importance of encouraging the financing of investment in non-renewable energy sources, whether through the World Bank or any other specialized agency.

72. Over and above the difficult situations it has created, the crisis has made it possible for us to understand the growing role of technical progress. It is certainly necessary to make constant efforts at adaptation, but it also offers exceptional opportunities for the development of the South and the progress of the North. This fact seems obvious, and yet too often some countries tend to consider that this is their own business, as if technical progress were a privilege reserved for the richest, the cleverest or the most advanced. We are well aware that nothing is more ambivalent than technical progress—a source of growth but also a decisive element in the arms race. Are we to remain content with this finding? Are we to concede that the major efforts of the biggest countries must be devoted to military technology? Are we to concede that the overarming of the planet should prevail over its development? This is the most important question, and it is becoming ever more acute from one generation to the next. It is something which has been unceasingly asked in and by France, and not France alone. From the beginning of the century Jean Jaurès, Albert Thomas, Edouard Herriot, Aristide Briand and Léon Blum each in turn tried to banish the threat of a modern war and to work for disarmament. They carried further the inextinguishable hope, hope that has resisted all set-backs.

73. The world will recover its equilibrium and security only if solidarity—which today, unfortunately, is expressed in military terms—assumes another dimension, for solidarity is the higher form of security. But how are we to give expression to it? The General Assembly has already repeatedly reaffirmed the link between the tasks of development and the endeavour to achieve disarmament, between the rejection of poverty and the rejection of arms escalation. Our Governments, in spite of their differences on the approaches to disarmament and security, would surely subscribe to the disarmament-development link and the establishment of an international fund which would make it possible to give effect to this. France itself has put forward suggestions along these lines: as far back as 1955 by the Government of Mr. Edgard Faure, who is here today, and in 1978, on the initiative of my predecessor, during the first special session on disarmament.<sup>2</sup>

74. To deal with the problem of overarmament at its roots and put disarmament at the service of development, it is not enough—although of course the idea may be supported—to seek to use for the benefit of the countries of the South a tax levied on military budgets or procurement expenditures. The prolonged crisis we have experienced leads us to adopt a global approach—or should lead us to adopt a global or, more precisely, a political approach. We have to go back to the origin of these expenditures, that is, the close and growing link between military insecurity and economic insecurity which characterizes the world today. By a series of paradoxes, the deregulation of the international economic system strengthens the need for security and by the same token fuels the arms race, which, in its turn, causes disequilibrium. In view of this, the following essential tasks must be tackled. First of all, we have to determine the true weight of armaments, and urgent questions arise: for example, how to overcome differences in terms of both data and estimates; how to work out a basis of evaluation acceptable

to all. Next, we must assess the internal and external economic effects of the increase in military expenditures. Thirdly, how do we judge the relationship between the increase of military expenditure and the major factors of international economic disorder? Finally, while clarifying the above points, the essential issue is the possibility and the means of carrying out the tasks of interest to mankind as a whole, those concerning health, vocational training and agricultural development in the third world—to all of which we must devote the sizeable resources that would be released by a gradual but methodical reduction in military expenditures in the principal countries. And there is also the question of how we are to ensure favourable economic effects of these reductions and conversions in the contributing countries themselves, and how to devise mechanisms to assist in this switch to disarmament and development.

75. Each country can provide only a partial response to these major questions, but no country can escape them. Indeed, what country today can deny that after 10 years—sometimes even longer—of crisis the patterns of military expenditure are creating increasing difficulties for it? What is the point of spending more for less security, whether military or economic? That is the fundamental question which everyone has to face. It is a question which I wanted to bring before you.

76. All countries have an interest in this important debate which transcends our differences, but since what is essential in this field depends upon a small number of States, I think it desirable that action should be taken in two stages. In the first stage there should be, as early as possible, a meeting on the problem posed by the link between disarmament and development and the creation of an international fund provided for by the General Assembly. When the major military Powers have announced their agreement, France is ready to be host to such a conference in Paris. As a second stage, representatives of the Governments participating in that meeting could set themselves the task of preparing a United Nations conference, which would be open to all Members of the Organization, and that preparatory meeting could, without delay, define an initial series of targets to be reached for transfers for the benefit of development.

77. In the words and logic of the time, the Prime Minister of France, Mr. Pierre Mendès-France, appealed in 1954, at the 498th meeting of the General Assembly, for co-operation between the Eastern and the Western Powers. "By making them partners in life-giving tasks, it is bound to deflect them from the path of death. By facilitating and promoting exchanges among them, it may break down impassable barriers, clarify mysteries and dispel distrust."<sup>3</sup>

78. I myself, 30 years later—and the weight of facts having now become almost unbearable—wish to state that no country can avoid this debate.

79. Let us begin now to free ourselves from our acquired reflexes, from fear, from mistrust, from habits of which we ourselves are the first victims, and embark on this common endeavour.

80. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the President of the French Republic for the important statement he has just made.

81. The General Assembly will now hear a statement by the President of the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Mr. Mika Špiljak. On behalf of the Assembly, I have the honour to welcome him and to invite him to address the Assembly.

82. Mr. ŠPILJAK (Yugoslavia):\* Mr. President, for me and for my country it is a source of genuine satisfaction to see you, the Vice-President of friendly, non-aligned Panama, with which Yugoslavia maintains the best of relations, guiding the work of the General Assembly this year. Your rich experience and your high personal qualities give us ample assurance that the proceedings of the General Assembly will be conducted efficiently. I assure you that in this the delegation of Yugoslavia will give its full support.

83. At the same time, I wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to the President of the thirty-seventh session, Mr. Imre Hollai of friendly, neighbouring Hungary, who has ably guided the Assembly's deliberations during the past year.

84. I wish also to express from this rostrum our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his tireless efforts in strengthening the role and effectiveness of the world Organization.

85. At the same time, I should like to congratulate the delegation of Saint Christopher and Nevis on the admission of its country to the United Nations.

86. We fully agree that there has been a serious deterioration in world political and economic relations. Contradictions in all fields of international relations have been sharply exacerbated. This is a great burden and threat to mankind today.

87. The present crisis in political and economic relations—perhaps the gravest since the Second World War—is reaching the critical boundary of risk. This is the consequence of inequalities and disparities and is further aggravated by the policy of bloc rivalry and the arms race. The independence and social development of peoples and nations are increasingly threatened by the use of force and pressure. Interference in internal affairs of other States, military intervention and other forms of encroachment upon the sovereignty and territorial integrity of countries are in the process of becoming common practice. The flaring up of old and the emergence of new foci of crisis, most frequently in the regions of non-aligned and developing countries, are among the most adverse consequences of such a development, threatening world peace and security.

88. None of us should acquiesce in the situation in which, almost 40 years after the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations, many peoples have not yet achieved freedom and independence and still find themselves under colonial and foreign domination. The prolonged plight of the peoples of Palestine and Namibia provides a striking example in this respect.

89. The economic situation in the world is characterized, above all, by the shifting of the bulk of the burden of the economic crisis on to the shoulders of developing countries, especially the least developed among them. The economic problems are of global proportions and can therefore be solved only by the joint effort of the entire international community. What is needed is comprehensive support on the part of developed countries and international institutions for the efforts of developing countries to overcome the stalemate in their economies, enormous debts and other problems.

90. The arms race is increasingly getting out of control—even out of the control of its own proponents—and is leading mankind to the verge of an abyss. Never before have so many resources and efforts and such know-how been invested in the production and development of armaments. All this creates an atmosphere of uncertainty

and fear and fosters the use of force, thus jeopardizing democratic achievements and developments in the world. This is particularly evident in Europe, divided between the blocs, where the largest arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons are already concentrated, and there are threats of new means of destruction as well.

91. It is encouraging that the awareness that exacerbations have reached the upper limit—a limit which it would be dangerous to overstep—is also increasing. Although the dialogue between the big Powers is being conducted on a narrow front—and, first of all, I have in mind here the Geneva nuclear talks—we are convinced that it could contribute to the alleviation of confrontation and to the relaxation of tensions. This is exemplified by the successful outcome of the Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, where the neutral and non-aligned countries of Europe played a significant and constructive role. We hope that these hints of positive development, coupled with the efforts of the largest number of countries, can lead to universal détente. This would constitute a significant step towards the establishment of confidence, equitable co-operation and the solution of key international issues.

92. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi, launched numerous initiatives in this regard. It also proposed the gathering of world leaders at this session of the General Assembly; Mrs. Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India and Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, spoke very convincingly about this.

93. Mankind is dramatically faced with the question: peace or war? The answer to the dilemma is found in the policy of peaceful coexistence and broadest international co-operation, which is also the essence of the policy of non-alignment. Therefore, at this critical hour our Movement is calling upon the international community, and upon the big Powers in particular, to prevent the world from sliding towards a nuclear catastrophe.

94. The non-aligned countries are ready to assume their share of responsibility and to co-operate with others with a view to improving the general international situation. As a movement of sovereign States and peoples from all continents, with different social systems, we are united in the efforts aimed at safeguarding peace and security, at the establishment of equitable international relations, the promotion of free economic and social development and the consistent implementation of the Charter of the United Nations. These are, at the same time, the aspirations of the majority of States and of the influential political forces of the world at large.

95. The peace that we advocate is not a state without war, nor is it peace at any cost. It is a peace in which all nations can freely enjoy the fruits of their independence and freedom of development in conditions of equal security. As an independent factor outside blocs, the non-aligned countries are making a substantial contribution to the attainment of that common goal. We expect that the constructive co-operation of all the Member States of the world Organization, particularly of the nuclear Powers and developed countries, will be displayed at this session with a view to finding acceptable ways out of the present crisis.

96. It is high time to adopt measures to halt the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and to launch a process of genuine disarmament. The emphasis placed on nuclear disarmament should by no means cover up the fact that, in terms of destructive power, the distinction between nuclear and conventional weapons is becoming increasingly blurred. Millions of people all over the world demand that reason should prevail over arms and that

\*Mr. Špiljak spoke in Serbo-Croatian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.



the potential of mankind should be used for the purposes of peace and progress, since peace cannot be secured by a constant rise in the level of the balance of armament. So far, unfortunately, there has been no adequate response on the part of those most responsible for the present dangerous developments.

97. We consider that the solution of certain specific disarmament issues should be approached without delay. Here we have in mind primarily the conclusion of an agreement on strategic arms reduction and on medium-range missiles, as well as a treaty on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban and a convention on chemical weapons. Furthermore, we believe that comprehensive negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament, on the prohibition of all weapons of mass destruction and on measures to prevent nuclear or any other war should start as soon as possible. We welcome all constructive proposals to that end.

98. We attribute special importance to the decision of the Madrid meeting to convene a new conference on security- and confidence-building measures and disarmament in Europe. This conference would, in our view, have wider international implications.

99. The United Nations can fulfil its mission of safeguarding international peace and security if it becomes a bulwark supporting the peoples in their struggle against colonial and any other foreign domination and protecting them against force and aggression. Therefore, the world Organization should engage itself more resolutely in the resolution of acute crises. There is today what is termed a "crisis arc", stretching from the Mediterranean and the Gulf across southern Africa and South-East and South-West Asia to Central America. Just and lasting solutions of these crises require the elimination of the policy of *faits accomplis* and of positions acquired by force, the withdrawal of occupation troops, the cessation of all intervention and interference in the internal affairs of other States and, of course, the exercise by peoples of their right to free development. There can be no peace and security as long as there are oppressed peoples.

100. The Middle East crisis is a continuous cause of concern for us. The Israeli policy of aggression is constantly in the ascendant; the Palestinian people has now been suffering from it for decades. The latest victim of this expansionist policy is Lebanon. However, the recent cease-fire there, which should open up prospects for a solution, through an agreement among all national forces, aimed at preserving the independence, integrity and non-aligned status of Lebanon, is an encouraging sign. Peace in the Middle East can be secured only through a comprehensive and just solution which must ensure the withdrawal of Israel from all the Arab and Palestinian territories occupied since June 1967. There can be no peace without the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights to self-determination, to return to their homes, to independence and to their own State, or without the exercise by all countries of that region of their right to develop in safety and independence. The peace process in the Middle East is not possible without the equal and independent participation of the PLO, the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held recently at Geneva, has reaffirmed once again these principles and the basis for the resolution of the Middle East crisis.

101. In view of the fact that security in the Mediterranean is inextricably linked to security in the Middle East, Africa and Europe, Yugoslavia has for a number of years pledged itself to the strengthening of all-round co-operation in eliminating the hotbeds of crisis in the region,

as well as to the creation of an atmosphere of trust, in order to transform the Mediterranean into a region of peace, security and equitable co-operation.

102. The situation in southern Africa is becoming ever more explosive because of South Africa's aggressive policy towards the front-line States, its illegal occupation of Namibia and the racist policy of the Pretoria régime. The aggressive acts against Angola and Mozambique have assumed the proportions of a real war. The broadest action is indispensable to achieve urgent implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia; it is indispensable in ensuring support for the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, its sole authentic representative, in eliminating the policy of *apartheid*, and in providing support for the front-line States in their resistance to aggression. The efforts of the OAU to that effect deserve our full recognition and assistance, as do the decisions of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.<sup>4</sup> The people of Western Sahara should be permitted to exercise their right of self-determination, in compliance with the decisions of the OAU.

103. The United Nations has also laid a foundation for the resolution of the problems of Afghanistan and Kampuchea, as well as those of Cyprus and Korea. It has called for the withdrawal of foreign troops, for non-interference in the internal affairs of those countries, for full respect for their national unity, territorial integrity, sovereignty, independence and non-aligned status, and for respect for the right of peoples to decide their own destinies.

104. We pledge ourselves as well to promote the exercise by the peoples of Central America of their right to free development without any foreign interference or pressure. Full support for the initiative of the Contadora Group, aimed at checking further critical developments in the region and at seeking peaceful solutions, is of paramount importance.

105. It is with deep concern that we note the prolongation of the war between Iran and Iraq. This affects most seriously those two countries, but also peace and security in the region and elsewhere. We support the appeals and initiatives of the United Nations and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and we call once again on those two non-aligned countries, with which we have friendly relations, to withdraw their troops to the internationally recognized borders and start negotiations.

106. The solution of economic problems is one of the priorities of the international community. Lasting answers can be found only through structural changes conducive to the establishment of the new international economic order based on equitable co-operation and for the benefit of all.

107. The sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development failed to fulfil the hopes and expectations of developing countries. No relevant conclusions were drawn from the broad agreement on difficulties in the world economy, growing interdependence and global responsibility for taking appropriate action towards changing inequitable economic relations, revitalizing economic activity and stimulating development, first and foremost of the developing countries. Furthermore, there is a desire to integrate the developing countries into the existing system.

108. It is high time to overcome narrow interests and really tackle world economic problems for the benefit of the entire world community and therefore of each individual country as well. That is why, more than ever before, we need today a political decision on launching

the process of global negotiations within the framework of the United Nations which could be conducted in stages, proceeding from the relatively simpler problems to the more difficult ones. In this context we also attach particular importance to the initiative of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries concerning the convening of an international conference on money and finance for development.

109. Post-war developments have amply proved that the destiny of the world cannot be decided by a few States alone, regardless of their size or power. Bloc policy remains constrained and burdened by the outdated system of balance of power based on rivalry from a position of strength.

110. The United Nations has an irreplaceable role and obligations in the search for solutions to problems of peace, security, disarmament and development. Therefore the world Organization must be not only a forum for effective negotiations but also the initiator and the protagonist of the democratic transformation of international relations.

111. The aspiration of peoples to develop in peace, freedom and independence is the basic feature of our epoch. They are with ever greater resolve resisting domination, hegemony, occupation, interference and intervention. This shows that the situation, although very difficult, is not hopeless. The direction of future development will depend to a great extent on our common and continuous action. This implies active co-operation in the struggle against everything that usurps or denies the rights of nations and States and fundamental human rights and freedoms.

112. That is why the relations among the nuclear Powers and the most developed countries, as well as their relations with other countries, are not only their concern. The international community is vitally interested in the normalization of relations and in a substantive dialogue between the great Powers on the basis of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and active and peaceful coexistence.

113. The current session of the General Assembly offers us an opportunity for a constructive dialogue and an agreement to embark, through the broadest possible consensus, on the road leading out of the crisis, to make a turn away from confrontation towards universal détente, to the solution of acute crises, to halting the arms race and to the resolution of international economic problems. This is neither simple nor easy, but there is no other alternative for the maintenance of peace and security, as well as for the promotion of general development.

114. Yugoslavia, pursuing the policy founded by President Tito, will do everything it can, together with all those striving towards the same objectives, to ensure that the spirit of mutual respect, co-operation and democratic dialogue prevails, thus opening up better prospects for the benefit of the international community.

115. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the President of the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for the important statement he has just made.

116. Mr. KHADDAM (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to congratulate you on your election to the presidency of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, and I wish you every success in your task. At the same time, I should like to pay a tribute to Mr. Imre Hollai, the outgoing President, for his efforts, as well as

to the Secretary-General for all that he has done during the past year.

117. I should also like to congratulate Saint Christopher and Nevis on its independence and its accession to membership in the United Nations.

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

118. The world today is facing serious dangers and is exposed to complex crises which jeopardize international peace and security. They threaten the détente and co-operation which followed the Second World War. Apart from the Palestine question and the Middle East problem, the occupation of Lebanon by Israeli troops, as well as the problems of South-East Asia, Namibia and southern Africa, fighting is raging in Central America and the Caribbean basin.

119. That state of tension in various regions of the world is accompanied by a failure to reach an agreement on strategic disarmament. The attempt to deploy missiles in Europe and other parts of the world is a grave set-back to international détente and has returned the world to an atmosphere of tension, heralding the re-institution of the cold war with its negative effects on the international situation and its direct threat of propelling the world into a new stage of direct confrontation among the great Powers.

120. It is imperative to point out, in particular, the world economic situation and its repercussions not only on the welfare of the peoples of the developed world, but also on the peoples of the third world that are suffering more than others because of their social and economic structures inherited from the colonialist eras. All that is bound to have grave consequences on the development of international life and the future of all nations of the world.

121. I should like to point out a number of major problems facing the peoples today.

122. Despite the United Nations resolutions on racism in southern Africa, on the question of Namibia and on the independence of the peoples of southern Africa, the racist régime still occupies Namibia, attacks Angola and Mozambique and threatens the African front-line States. The continuation of such a situation is not only a tragedy for the peoples of that region of the world, who have suffered during many centuries of injustice and oppression, but also an affront to the entire world. We stand by the side of the African peoples in their staunch struggle to bring down the racist régime and to achieve the independence of the peoples of southern Africa. Their struggle is part of the struggle of the third world for liberation, independence and sovereignty.

123. In another part of the world, the problem of Cyprus remains unsolved. That situation has led to the continuation of the suffering of the Cypriot people. It is therefore necessary to seek a quick and just solution of that issue, based on United Nations resolutions, through negotiations between the two Cypriot communities and on the basis of guaranteeing the unity of the island and its non-alignment. We hope that negotiations will continue under the auspices of the Secretary-General.

124. The Korean issue also remains unresolved. We support the unity of Korea and the implementation of the joint communiqué signed by the two parts of the peninsula in 1972.<sup>5</sup>

125. In Central America, threats against Nicaragua, Cuba and Grenada are escalating day by day as United States involvement continues to increase in that region, making the situation ever more complex and posing the danger of a conflict that would have serious consequences for the international situation.

126. We support Nicaragua, Cuba and Grenada in their just struggle to maintain their national sovereignty and independence and ensure non-interference in their internal affairs.

127. The General Assembly is still considering an item concerning Afghanistan. We believe that the Afghan Government is entitled to defend the independence of Afghanistan against all kinds of outside intervention in its internal affairs. We have strong historical and cultural links with the Afghan people. Afghanistan is also a fellow member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and we are anxious that it should remain so. The Afghan people have the right to choose its own system of government. Consequently, we attach a great deal of importance to the need to conduct negotiations between the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and its neighbours in order to achieve peaceful solutions that would guarantee the peace and security of that region and safeguard the unity, independence and non-alignment of Afghanistan.

128. In such a tense international situation, the Non-Aligned Movement represents an international approach seeking to realize peace, justice, progress, welfare and non-confrontation for all peoples of the world. The latest Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi, dealt with the international problems facing the world. It did so with a deep sense of responsibility towards the future of mankind and the right of the peoples to self-determination. The resolutions adopted at New Delhi constitute an important basis for maintaining international peace and security and keeping evolution of the international situation under control. The Conference also advanced proposals for dealing with the world economic situation.

129. However, the problem does not lie with that just and comprehensive approach of countries that constitute the great majority of the members of the international community. It rather lies with the intransigent attitude adopted by the forces of imperialism, injustice, racism and Zionism.

130. Among the most volatile and tense international problems is the situation in the Middle East. This is true because of the location of the area and its strategic, historic and economic importance. The unique characteristics of the Middle East have placed a heavy burden on it throughout history; it has been the object of colonialist designs for centuries. What is unfolding today in the region is but a modern version of past stages of development.

131. In the eleventh century the area was exposed to colonialist invasions called the Crusades. The Napoleonic expedition was another version, followed by frequent resort to military threats in the nineteenth century, especially during the events in Lebanon between the years 1840 and 1860. Western colonialism again reared its ugly head during the First World War, bringing to the region a scheme to seize Palestine and hand it over to the Zionist movement. A number of events followed, and the racist entity was created in that region, nurtured and supported by the United States and its Western allies. Because of that support in the military, political and economic fields, that entity was able to occupy Palestine and parts of Syria, Egypt and Lebanon.

132. The gravity of the situation in the Middle East region is due to the following reasons.

133. First, the usurpation of Palestine and parts of other Arab territories by the Zionist movement and the establishment of an entity based on racism, discrimination, despotism and domination, displaying an ideology that

somehow linked the colonialist and expansionist objectives of the Zionist movement with mythical illusions to furnish a pretext for the brutal crimes that Israel has perpetrated and is still perpetrating in Palestine and the Arab territories exposed to aggression. The policy of displacement, annexation and alteration of the demographic structure in Palestine and the occupied Arab territories, as well as the violation of United Nations resolutions, the Charter and international law, and the foiling of all peace initiatives proposed through the United Nations—all those policies and acts reflect the nature of the strategy of the Zionist movement and its aggressive and expansionist objectives and purposes.

134. Secondly, another reason for the explosive state of tension in the region is the renewal of greedy colonialist designs on the resources of the region and its strategic location. Our region's experiences in various historic eras are recurring today. The American and other aircraft carriers and warships are but a modern version of the colonialist expeditions and Crusades to which our Arab nation has been subjected at various stages of its history. We are confident that our Arab nation will defeat the new invaders, just as it has defeated all colonialist invasions throughout its long history. Nothing remains of those invasions but scattered ruins, which are visited by tourists who are the descendants of the previous invaders.

135. The American involvement in Lebanon and the direct interference of United States naval units in the civil war in support of one side represent a danger to the region and are a serious indication of the beginning of the "Vietnamization" of Lebanon. The United States Administration and its allies should read ancient and modern history, learn its lessons and cease to embroil their peoples and interests in wars of which they cannot be the winners.

136. We warn the United States Administration that the military involvement in the Middle East will prove as ill-fated as its involvement in Viet Nam. We remind its allies that have hastened to send their fleets and war-planes to that region that we threw them out the door following a long, bloody struggle, and we shall not give them the opportunity to return through the window. Let them be sure that through our determination and ability we have closed not just the doors, but also the windows, in the faces of the invaders. They can be sure that their aircraft-carriers and fleets will not intimidate us or weaken our determination to defend our land and future and exercise our right of self-defence.

137. The Atlantic military presence in the Mediterranean is a challenge not only to us but to the entire international community, as it is a threat to security and peace. It is an expression of the rejuvenation of the aggressive colonialist spirit against the peoples and their right to self-determination, as well as against the peoples and Governments concerned. Our nation, which has defeated all invaders by its struggles and determination throughout history, will defeat the new invaders.

138. In talking about the ambitions of United States imperialism and some of the Western allies, it is imperative to point out the interrelation of the objectives, interests and ambitions of those forces and those of the Zionist entity, which they consider their eastern military flank and use as an advanced forward base. This explains the volume of military, political and economic aid extended to Israel.

139. The gravity of the situation results from Israel's aggressive intransigence, which is enjoying all-out support and backing from the United States. After proceeding to annex the Golan and embarking on a comprehensive

programme of building settlements in the occupied territories, Israeli forces invaded Lebanon. The invasion of Lebanon has served aggressive expansionist Israeli interests. It is worth recalling here the memorandum submitted by Chaim Weizmann to the World Peace Conference in Versailles in 1919, in which he defined the political boundaries of Palestine, and not of the State of Israel. According to those proposed boundaries, the northern limit starts at a line near Sidon, crossing the eastern mountain range of Lebanon and passing through Syrian territories up to a particular point in those territories.

140. The invasion has also served United States interests within a strategic framework aimed at imposing United States hegemony on the Middle East region, but such hegemony can be imposed only by oppressing the peoples of the region.

141. The United States, as a super-Power, should have fulfilled its special responsibility for security and peace in the world and should have opposed the aggression and taken appropriate measures against Israel. Instead, however, together with Israel, it imposed, under the fire of aggression during the siege of Beirut, an agreement effected by the United States envoy, Mr. Philip Habib. Under the shadow of occupation and contrary to the Vienna accords and the Charter of the United Nations, the United States succeeded in imposing an agreement on Lebanon that threatens its national unity, violates its sovereignty, undermines its national independence, isolates it from its Arab nation and constitutes a threat to the security, the interests and the future of Syria and the Arab world.

142. There was manifest exploitation and evident blackmail in regard to the particularly painful situation suffered by the brotherly people of Lebanon because of the civil war and the national divisions imposed on them with a view to ensuring that Israel would gain as much as possible, regardless of the sufferings, the dangers and the damage inflicted on a United Nations Member State which has always been in the forefront of peace-loving States.

143. Despite the difficult situation in Lebanon—on which I do not wish to dwell, since there is no room here to discuss such issues—the Lebanese patriotic resistance confronted the Israeli occupation with great heroism, notwithstanding the difficult and complex circumstances our brothers in Lebanon are experiencing. The great majority of the Lebanese people also oppose the agreement imposed on Lebanon and do not recognize it. They have firmly declared that they will continue to oppose the agreement until it is dropped.

144. Our position on all these issues is clear and is based on the following principles. First, Lebanon's unity, independence and sovereignty are among the principles whose violation or infringement can never be accepted by Syria and the other Arab States. The Arab States will keep working towards that end and assisting the brotherly Lebanese people to recover their national unity and independence and sovereignty over all their territories. In this regard, we contributed to the achievement of the agreement concluded a few days ago between the opposing sides in the civil war in Lebanon. Secondly, Israel must withdraw unconditionally from Lebanon, in accordance with Security Council resolution 509 (1982). Thirdly, the agreement imposed on Lebanon must be overturned, since this agreement was imposed under the shadow of occupation. Any agreement imposed under occupation or through the use or threat of force is considered null and void. In this connection, it must be pointed out that no attempt of any kind to bring about the implementation of this ill-omened agreement can succeed. We shall stand

by our people in Lebanon in their struggle until that agreement is thwarted. Fourthly, the multinational forces must leave Lebanon, because they have gone beyond their declared objectives and are posing a grave threat to peace and security in the region. They remind us of the colonialist expeditions in previous stages of the history of our region.

145. Despite this complex and grave situation, the Arabs have remained committed to the principle of establishing a just and comprehensive peace, based on and within the framework of the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations, because they appreciate the repercussions of such an explosive situation on world security and peace, inasmuch as they consider their peace and security part of the peace and security of the entire world. Appreciating their regional and international responsibility, the Arab heads of State, at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, at Fez, approved a new peace initiative.<sup>6</sup> Israel, however, responded by rejecting it and by intensifying its aggression in the territories occupied in the war of 1967 and in Lebanon.

146. We believe that the attainment of a just peace requires fulfilment of the following conditions.

147. First, American involvement in the Middle East must cease. They must desist from the plans of hegemony aimed at controlling the resources of the region or its strategic location. The Arabs, who reject hegemony and aggression aimed at devouring their resources, likewise reject their resources' being used as a factor in the complication of the world economic situation, especially as they are willing to co-operate on an equal footing with all countries and peoples of the world. As they confronted colonialism in all its forms throughout their long history, the Arabs will also resist attempts to impose domination. As they are determined to keep their countries free, sovereign, independent and active in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, they equally reject subservience and alignment and the use of their countries as bases for aggression against other States and nations.

148. Secondly, a strategic balance must be maintained in the region between the parties to the conflict, since with military superiority the superior party would remain intransigent while the weaker party would become more adamant in its attitudes. In this respect we call on the United States to halt all types of aid and support to Israel, especially in the military field.

149. Thirdly, there must be a declaration of commitment to the Charter and to resolutions on the question of Palestine and the situation in the Middle East. This would mean that the Israelis should accept the following: total withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied in 1967; recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including their right to repatriation, self-determination, the establishment of their own independent State on their national soil, as well as the recognition of the PLO, their sole legitimate representative; and unconditional withdrawal from Lebanon in accordance with Security Council resolution 509 (1982).

150. These conditions constitute the basic prerequisite for halting the further deterioration of the situation, lest there come a time when it gets out of control, with all the serious implications that may entail not only in the region but also in the world as a whole.

151. Any survey of Israel's history of aggression would show it to be replete with all kinds of crime and violations of the Charter and United Nations resolutions. I do not wish to dwell on the resolutions which Israel has violated, rejected or refused to recognize, but I must raise again the question we have raised in previous sessions, namely,



that of sanctions against this Member State, one of whose basic characteristics has become violation of the Charter and continuous use of force and aggression.

152. Therefore, once again we raise the following two issues: Israel's membership in the world Organization, following its violation of its own commitments undertaken at the time of its admission to the United Nations and the decision that Israel should abide by the Charter and by resolution 273 (III), adopted by the General Assembly in 1949; and secondly, the imposition of sanctions by the Member States against this Member, which has become an odd, unique phenomenon in international life, no less infamous than the Nazi phenomenon.

153. The gravity of the situation in our region, with all the dangers of increased involvement by the United States and some of its allies, makes it incumbent upon the world Organization to take decisive positions, not only in the interests of security and of Member States, but also to safeguard the security and the interests of all countries in the world.

154. We shall remain loyal to the Organization's Charter and resolutions. This loyalty to the Charter and our commitment to international peace and security make it imperative for us always to use our legitimate right to

self-defence to protect our interests, the independence of our countries and our national sovereignty.

155. We call upon all States and peoples of the world to realize the seriousness of the situation and to stand by our side, for ours is the cause of right and justice.

*The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (resolution 2222 (XXI), annex).

<sup>2</sup>See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Tenth Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 3rd meeting.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, Ninth Session, Plenary Meetings, 498th meeting, para. 11.

<sup>4</sup>See *Report of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, Geneva, 1-12 August 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.XIV.4 and corrigendum).

<sup>5</sup>*Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 27*, annex I.

<sup>6</sup>See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510.