



President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**General debate (continued)**

1. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker in the general debate this afternoon is the President of the Government and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Commerce of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and former President of the General Assembly. I have great pleasure in welcoming His Excellency Mr. Gaston Thorn and in inviting him to address the General Assembly.

2. Mr. THORN (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, first of all I should like to express my admiration to you for the way in which you have guided this—which is indeed your fourth—session of the General Assembly. It is not given to everyone, during a term of office as President, to preside over four Assemblies, none of which can be described as easy. You have discharged this very difficult task with incomparable *savoir-faire*—and I think I am qualified in some measure to judge.

3. I should also like to convey my thanks to the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, for the competent manner in which he discharged his duties.

4. Since time immemorial, weapons and their sinister use have played all too important a role in the activities of the human race.

5. After centuries, after millennia of armed confrontations, it took two world wars, which brought mankind to the brink of a cataclysm, and the threat of nuclear self-destruction, to cause us finally to speak of disarmament at the world level.

6. Can we take it, then, that mankind has become more reasonable and that the threat of universal conflagration has lessened, or that strong cords have strengthened the fragile thread holding the sword of Damocles which, once cut, might cause the death of all mankind?

7. Without yielding to excessive pessimism, I must state that, despite all discussions on disarmament, mankind continues to fight wars in almost all parts of the world and the number of hotbeds of tension has recently tended to increase. Since balance is always preferable to imbalance, what has been called “the balance of power” has been recommended for the reduction of tension or at least of the temptation to unleash conflicts. This does not prevent the

arms race from continuing or from being intensified day by day through the production of more and more sophisticated weapons and ever more deadly ones. Must the balance of power prove its validity, its *raison d'être*, merely by the momentum of an uncontrolled rush forward?

8. The most terrible threat to mankind in our day is unquestionably that of nuclear war. Let us be wary of underestimating the size of nuclear arsenals, each able to destroy the world several times over if need were. Is it realistic to feel that through the continued production and improvement of such weapons the chances of peace become greater, or that the security of all parties is strengthened?

9. Particular responsibility in this respect seems to us to fall to the United States and the Soviet Union and also, secondarily, to the other present or future nuclear Powers. I should like to express the heartfelt hope that the negotiations on strategic arms limitation now under way between Moscow and Washington will soon be completed and will make it possible to stabilize the level of development of those weapons. At a later stage it should then quite logically be possible for the super-Powers to reduce their weapons by common agreement, without endangering their security which in any event is widely guaranteed in respect of other countries.

10. If progress were achieved in this direction, it would be easier and also more reasonable to draw away from atomic weapons the ever more numerous countries tempted to acquire them and technically capable of doing so. Those countries believe that in this way they are guaranteeing their own security, and are too blind to see that they are multiplying the dangers of self-destruction.

11. The horrors of nuclear catastrophe should none the less not divert our attention from other dangers. Yes, atomic war is the most frightful, it is that which leaves our earth and our civilization, so full of promise, the least chance of survival.

12. Yet it is not nuclear weaponry which engulfs most of the sums spent by our peoples on armaments. On the contrary, of the \$400 thousand million which this collective race to destruction costs us each year, more than 80 per cent is absorbed by conventional weapons. It is thus also in this field of conventional weaponry that the Assembly will be able to do useful work. I would even say that this field is more amenable to disarmament than the nuclear field. Among us, even the most modest will be able to make a positive contribution, because everyone here can speak on the basis of his own experience. The field of conventional weapons is not the exclusive purview of the su-

per-Powers, and let us not forget that the use of conventional weapons can by escalation and extension easily lead to the use of nuclear weapons.

13. The General Assembly at this special session which we have all so much desired will in fact have no choice in this matter. The Assembly cannot deal only with nuclear disarmament or with conventional disarmament; the two are closely related and, if we want to be worthy of the trust placed in this vast and important world session, we must tackle them both. We all know that security and threats to security are inseparable; debate is also indivisible, and therefore the debate here on disarmament must be comprehensive.

14. I have already stated my admiration for the useful and constructive work done by the Preparatory Committee under the skilful guidance of its Chairman. The basis of agreement has already been established, but the Assembly must show itself capable of giving the negotiations the political impetus required to overcome existing divergences.

15. Let us be aware that the statements made from this rostrum, regardless of the importance or the political influence of the speaker, will serve no end if they are not followed up by concrete action and flexible instructions, making it possible to reach compromises and, in the end, take decisions which will finally lead to disarmament. If this special session is not followed by action our—or, I should say, the Assembly's—final document in which so many hopes have been placed will be only another volume without any value except, perhaps, that attached to it by some historian in the future.

16. May I now mention two other aspects which seem to me interesting, not only in themselves but also from the practical standpoint; they are international security and the link which exists between disarmament and development assistance.

17. To believe that the simple fact of disarming would mean security would be to show a profound and unpardonable lack of realism. We all have an innate need to guarantee our security either with ever more sophisticated weapons or by alliances making it possible for even the smallest and weakest nations to guarantee the security of their citizens. Thus I would say that disarmament should have as a corollary the establishment of a system of international security, and I would go even further: any disarmament at the world level will depend on our Organization's capacity to establish a credible and effective security system.

18. Delving further into this idea, I would say that it is up to the United Nations to assume the responsibility for establishing such an international system of security. The United Nations alone commands the trust of all our peoples, and I can hardly believe that any Member of the Organization would refuse to submit to the requirements inherent in an undertaking of such scope. Nor do I feel that any of the 150 sovereign nations represented here would give to others a blank cheque or delegate all responsibility for their security and for international security to half a dozen, to four or even to two among them.

19. Why not imagine, for example, a standing peace and security force of the United Nations which, if need be, could rapidly be sent to the field as an essential security barrier between two or several protagonists? Events in the past months have amply demonstrated the usefulness of such a force and how difficult it is to establish it and to co-ordinate its elements. I cannot fail to express to the United Nations my admiration for its services, and to the countries which responded unhesitatingly to the Security Council's appeal. Experience has demonstrated that more permanent structures could have accelerated and facilitated the United Nations operations in southern Lebanon. Such undertakings, it may be argued, would require tremendous financial sacrifices, but, quite honestly, would that be a reason for refusal? Of course not. Indeed, special provisions could be made for the relatively poor countries, but if the developed countries were to plead financial difficulties they would be using them only as a pretext, concealing ulterior political motives bearing no relation to their own level of weaponry.

20. I am certain that our peoples are prepared to agree to financial sacrifices if, in return, they obtain a solid guarantee of being able to live in peace. Increased financial contributions towards this end would easily be covered by a fraction of the sums now devoted to the acquisition of armaments.

21. To those who would point out that the Organization will need an effective body to secure the proper functioning of all measures aimed at guaranteeing international security, and who say so by way of criticism, I would answer that they are forgetting that we already have available everything we need. The Charter, despite all the criticism which we level at it year after year, is basically not so bad. All that is required is to implement it without any second thoughts.

22. It seems to me that the Security Council is the proper body to be entrusted with the task of doing everything in its power to maintain peace and security in the world. Its authority to perform that task should be confirmed, and if the burden were to prove excessive, use could be made of Article 29 of the Charter, which provides for the establishment of subsidiary committees if required to enable the Council to discharge its duties.

23. I know that all of this gives food for thought. I simply want to state to this Assembly that it should not act timidly, spare any effort or, what would be worse, show a lack of courage. Grand designs, to be successful, call for courage, and the application of far-sighted measures.

24. This decade has been decreed the decade both of disarmament and of development. I myself have for a long time been insisting not only that the link between these two major tasks must be recognized, but also that practical and specific conclusions must be drawn. We have entered the last quarter of the decade, and we must perforce admit that unfortunately we have all failed to produce the desired results.

25. Yet what more exalting endeavour than to free the world of fear and, at the same time, by transferring re-

sources, to improve or ease the lot of millions of human beings who are living in conditions of poverty and health that are unworthy of our times, in which nothing—neither the worst nor the best—is impossible! The idea of the link between disarmament and development is interesting because it is of concern to all States.

26. Participation in the reduction of destructive potential is not a privilege of the industrialized nations alone, and that point should be stressed. Developing countries are now engaged in the frantic arms race and, therefore, they too should make an active contribution, particularly since they are more and more often becoming theatres of operation.

27. Ensuring better standards of living for mankind cannot be considered an obligation of the industrialized countries alone. Here again the developing countries should play their part, within their modest means. The funds thus saved could be devoted to more noble and productive purposes. Of course, those countries among us which are the wealthiest and most highly industrialized have an obligation to do more than others for disarmament and for development. A transfer of funds released by disarmament to the poorest countries is essential in order to help those countries to have a growing share in development.

28. If we succeed in realizing this dream of mankind, if we can summon the political will to take the right course, if we have the courage to face squarely the advantages and the dangers of disarmament, we should at last be able to discuss frankly what we call the new international economic order.

29. Disarmament will certainly not be a miracle drug to cure all our ills, and it would be rather deceptive to make it a scapegoat. I would go even further: disarmament, if we manage to channel it into specific measures, will not come about in a matter of days. It will take a long time to prepare the security measures, control machinery, industrial reconversion stages and adaptation of manpower as sophisticated as the armies we now have. There will be a need, first and foremost, for lasting political will on the part of those who, because of their economic and technological power, are called upon to take the lead in this brave move forward, the reassuring effects of which will be immediate, and the prospects so admirable that no nation and, I hope, no political leader would want to be left on the sidelines.

30. It is with anguished expectation that world public opinion awaits the outcome of this special session of the General Assembly. Let us not disappoint it. The stakes are such that only the ignorant and the irresponsible can calmly contemplate failure.

31. During the thirty-second session I said that if we were to fail in our duty we would bring upon ourselves the worst curse of all, that of our own children. As we are speaking today of a specific topic which can determine the future and the very survival of all mankind, I feel that I am in a position to go even further. Before assuming responsibility for failure, or even simply for shirking our obligations, let us all reflect carefully because, with such inac-

tion, we would perhaps be signing our own death warrant and that of all mankind.

32. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I wish to thank the President of the Government and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Commerce of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, and former President of the General Assembly, for the important statement he has just made.

33. Mr. GEDLE-GIORGIS (Ethiopia): Sir, your unanimous election to the presidency of the tenth special session of the General Assembly is of particular significance and satisfaction to my delegation. In a way, your current presidency could be regarded as a vindication to the non-aligned movement, which, at its first summit session held at Belgrade in 1961, called for the convening of a special session of the Assembly to deal with disarmament.

34. On the occasion of the convocation of this special session, Lieutenant Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam, Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council and the Council of Ministers of Socialist Ethiopia, has sent a message [A/S-10/17]. With your permission, I should now like to read it:

“On behalf of the people and the Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia and in my own name, I wish to extend sincere best wishes for the success of the United Nations special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

“A major problem of our times, and one which affects the peace and security of all States, is undoubtedly the question of disarmament. The advent of the nuclear age and the subsequent stockpiling of increasingly sophisticated and deadly weapons is today imperilling humanity and the entire human civilization with nuclear annihilation.

“The convening of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament therefore offers a unique opportunity to explore new approaches and guidelines towards more meaningful disarmament negotiations. Given the present dangerous period that we live in, to respond merely in platitudes, however noble they may be, can only make future attempts to achieve general and complete disarmament more elusive. The nations of the world, therefore, must not allow this golden opportunity to slip by.

“Ethiopia believes that this special session of the General Assembly should endeavour to make an objective assessment of the prevailing situation and determine why nations are reluctant to admit that each individual nation's security would be more positively ensured within a system of world security rather than the arms race. The session should also attempt to identify and analyse the root causes of the arms race with a view to the early reduction and eventual removal of arms as the most effective and viable strategy for genuine disarmament.

"Mankind yearns for the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Since this is the minimum necessary first step in any disarmament process, acceptance and implementation of practical measures in this respect would provide further impetus towards other disarmament negotiations. As if the stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction already accumulated are not an ominous threat to world peace, attempts to introduce a new generation of weapons of ghastly potentialities is not only callous but would also further stimulate the arms race. This should prompt us to seek urgently effective disarmament measures.

"An equally fundamental requirement in any disarmament process is the question of coping with problems of human and social inequities. While the majority of the world's population live in a state of abject poverty, we should not delude ourselves into believing that disarmament alone can bring about peace and security. Coupled with disarmament, a commitment should be made towards genuine efforts to divert the resources released as a result of disarmament measures to improve the quality of life of the world's neediest peoples. Ethiopia, being irrevocably committed to the earliest achievement of social justice at the national level, can but lend its strongest support to similar world-wide objectives.

"Ethiopia is also convinced that mankind yearns for a world secure in peace and social justice, a world free from the threat or use of force and any kind of interference in the internal affairs of each nation—in short, a world based on the noble objectives of the Charter of the United Nations. It is in this spirit that I reiterate our best wishes for this special session of the General Assembly as it grapples with one of the most agonizing problems that mankind has ever faced."

35. Disarmament has been inscribed in the Charter of the United Nations as one of the major goals of the Organization. Great efforts have been exerted within the United Nations to achieve general and complete disarmament under strict international control. When we assess the concrete results achieved in this field, however, we find them to be minimal.

36. After years of continuous efforts to perfect weapons of destruction, mankind has at last brought the most destructive weapons into its possession. The unhampered continuation of the nuclear arms race has long passed the point of absurdity. Yet, the competition for more deadly weapons is advancing at an alarming speed. What is even more frightening is the spread of nuclear-weapon capabilities to more and more countries. Each year marks the addition of new cataclysmic dimensions to an already extremely dangerous situation. As the Disarmament Decade declared in 1969 [resolution 2602 E (XXIV)] is approaching an end, we are compelled to watch, more and more helplessly, as human beings continue to act as though the chief purpose of the human race were to prepare its own annihilation.

37. An intensive qualitative improvement of the means of destruction and killing takes place side by side with a quantitative accumulation of weapons of all types, while

the imminent danger of the emergence of new kinds of weapons of mass destruction and the threat of further proliferation of nuclear weapons assumes an ever more deadly pattern. Unless significant disarmament measures are achieved now, it might soon be impossible to avert the catastrophe hovering over the human race.

38. It seems to me that if we are not to delude ourselves with regard to the disarmament problem, we must constantly bear in mind that the armaments race is merely a symptom, not the cause, of the prevailing international situation resulting principally from imperialist aggression and exploitation. There is also need to focus our attention on the inextricable link between peace, security and disarmament.

39. In order to curb the nuclear arms race effectively and eventually achieve general and complete disarmament, we have to strengthen, first and foremost, a system of international relations, whereby the principles of the United Nations Charter will be strictly and universally respected and the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes outlawed. As long as this system is not fully respected and as long as the forces of imperialist domination and reaction continue to harbour their ambitions for world domination, our call for both nuclear and conventional disarmament will go unheeded. Any realistic assessment of disarmament problems must, therefore, recognize this basic need and endeavour to fill the gap.

40. Disarmament by itself cannot assure peace. To secure peace it is necessary that equitable and progressive social, political and economic changes take place within and between nations on the basis of mutual respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political and economic independence of every nation and its right to choose its own social and political system, and the non-use of force in the conduct of international relations—in short, of full respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

41. One characteristic of the twentieth century has been the struggle of the oppressed masses to break the shackles of imperialist domination. As part of that struggle, the Ethiopian masses rose against the centuries-old feudal structure which the ruling class, in alliance with imperialism, intended to perpetuate. No sooner had the Ethiopian masses effectively overthrown the feudal régime, and were instituting in its place a democratic and just social structure, than imperialism and reactionary forces in the area coalesced to suppress and reverse the ongoing revolution. That co-ordinated effort was directed against the Ethiopian people for no other reason than the fact that they were determined to build a just social structure based on genuine socialist, democratic principles on the ruins of the feudo-imperialist tyranny and domination.

42. As a victim of successive colonial, imperialist and expansionist invasions, Ethiopia has a concern for the strengthening of international peace and security and for the building of confidence among States which is deeply rooted in its history. My delegation makes this brief reference to the recent history of Ethiopia because we believe it

is a case that illuminates the seriousness of the problems of international peace and security and the concurrent lack of any meaningful progress in the field of disarmament.

43. There is no doubt that the invasion of Ethiopia by fascist Italy in 1935—one of the major reasons for the demise of the League of Nations, as a result of the failure of collective security against aggression—heralded the onset of the Second World War, with all its catastrophic consequences. The response of the leading West European countries and of the United States to the most barbaric methods of warfare employed by fascist Italy, and the indescribable tragedy suffered by the people of Ethiopia, was the imposition of an arms embargo on the victim of aggression. By their duplicity and their moral and political bankruptcy, those Powers succeeded only in inviting the scourge of the Second World War. At this juncture I should like to remind the Assembly that the use of poison gas against the Ethiopian people by fascist Italy was the first instance in the long history of colonial cruelty. This unprecedented, inhuman act was the prelude to the suffering of the Japanese people as a result of the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

44. More recently, Ethiopia has once again been the victim of a premeditated and blatant aggression, spurred on most ignobly by an array of imperialist and reactionary forces and spearheaded by expansionist Somalia. Once again the response of the same leading West European countries and the United States has been the same—if not, indeed, worse. Not only was Ethiopia once again denied delivery of defensive weapons, weapons for which it had paid from its meagre resources, but also an attempt was made to circumscribe its sovereign right to defend itself. Ethiopia's sovereign right to seek assistance from the Soviet Union, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and other socialist and progressive countries in defence of its territorial integrity and revolution against blatant aggression by the forces of imperialism and reaction has been viciously challenged. Let me emphasize that Ethiopia independently sought assistance from those fraternal and peace-loving countries, and that they responded in accordance with Ethiopia's sovereign request and fully within the letter and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. The Ethiopian people and Government will always be grateful for this timely and principled assistance.

45. The extent of the human and material destruction inflicted upon us by Somalia's naked, blatant and irresponsible aggression is indeed enormous. As a result of that aggression, thousands of innocent lives have been lost, communications systems, water supply, electricity, school and hospital facilities, to mention only a few, have been destroyed. The continued assistance of the fraternal and peace-loving countries in the reconstruction of Ethiopia's war-torn economy and their participation in its development efforts are also highly appreciated by the people and Government of Ethiopia. Subjecting that principled support to Ethiopia to any distortion and manipulation is nothing but a continuation of imperialist intervention against the consolidation of the Ethiopian revolution and the maintenance of Ethiopia's national unity and territorial integrity.

46. Furthermore, the attempt to characterize Ethiopia's exercise of legitimate self-defence as the cause for the reversal of détente, the revival of the cold war and the lack of progress in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks is preposterous. According to the imperialists, for détente to flourish and become an effective instrument in the conduct of contemporary international relations, Ethiopia must be sacrificed. Ethiopia's legitimate struggle for national survival and the defence of its revolution cannot in any circumstances be regarded as the cause of the revival of the cold war and the reversal of détente, as claimed by the warriors of the cold war.

47. In this connexion, Ethiopia's position has been emphasized in no uncertain terms by Lieutenant Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam: "We shall be limited to defending ourselves within our borders, upholding our international obligations, only so long as our enemies appreciate this, learn from the past, remain within their borders, realize their international obligations and respect and honour the rights of others".

48. In our view, détente cannot be invoked to reward aggression at the expense of the victim; nor can it be required to be an instrument for the preservation of the *status quo* and the prevention of the fulfilment of the legitimate right of the people of any country to the fundamental socio-economic and political restructuring of their national institutions. On the contrary, détente is a dynamic force which is essentially aimed at the replacement of confrontation by rational dialogue, the total elimination of colonialism and racism, the removal of hotbeds of tension and, above all, the promotion of international peace and security through the effective utilization of the peaceful means for settling disputes outlined in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations. That is why the non-aligned movement has been forthright in advancing and encouraging the implementation of détente.

49. It is against that background that the Ethiopian delegation wishes to offer its modest observations on some aspects of the disarmament issues. If this special session is to be regarded as part of a vital and continuing process, if it is to mark a meaningful turning point towards a more serious and positive approach to disarmament, all Member States, large and small, nuclear and non-nuclear, must collectively ensure that the foundation for more effective and genuine disarmament is firmly established. In this regard, the need for a more realistic appraisal of the causes of the arms race and an awareness of the impending global destruction can hardly be over-emphasized.

50. Any objective assessment of the state of the world today would show, on the one hand, that the stockpiles of weapons at the disposal of imperialists incite and encourage the forces of aggression, expansionism, militarism, colonialism and racism and, on the other hand, that the socialist world has made great efforts to consolidate peace by countering the forces of domination and exploitation. In parallel with efforts to strengthen détente and consolidate peace, the socialist States—particularly the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—have unfailingly manifested their firm commitment to the need for halting the arms race as a

first step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament. The various initiatives and concrete proposals of the socialist States in that regard are matched only by the increase in military budgets, the escalation of the cold war and the quest for an ever-intensifying arms race engaged in by the capitalists, in direct violation of the will of the peace-loving peoples of their own countries. The peoples of the world are yearning ever more deeply for peace, security and disarmament. Gaining strength from that momentum, the cause of genuine disarmament will ultimately triumph over the profit-motivated quest for an ever-escalating arms race by the military-industrial complex of the capitalist world.

51. It must also be recognized that now is the time for the non-aligned countries, whose initiative is responsible for the convening of this special session on disarmament, to make maximum use of the opportunity provided to manifest their wisdom, goodwill, commitment and dedication to closing the gap between the universal clamour for survival and peace, on the one hand, and the absurd preparations for suicidal war, on the other.

52. My delegation finds it reassuring to note that the draft final document [*see A/S-10/1, vol. I*] clearly shows that there is sufficient common ground for the promotion of the cause of disarmament, especially in the section concerning the declaration of principles. The emphasis on the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament with a view to conducting future negotiations under its auspices and on keeping the Organization informed of progress in the implementation of disarmament measures and other related issues is of paramount importance.

53. However, much remains to be done by the General Assembly itself by way of ironing out the various points on which agreement has not been reached, as contained in the draft final document. In view of the fact that the problem of disarmament is not only pressing but also complex, the delegation of socialist Ethiopia earnestly hopes that the efforts to resolve the outstanding differences will be marked by a demonstration of goodwill and mutual understanding.

54. In our view, an early and effective prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, that is, the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty, is of paramount significance since it will strengthen the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] and make the halting of the arms race in the nuclear field all the more feasible.

55. The cessation of the production of nuclear weapons, including the neutron bomb, and steps towards their gradual elimination, as well as the prohibition of the production of new types of weapons and weapon systems of mass destruction, will surely enhance international peace and security by altering the present precarious situation in which international security rests on a frightening "balance of terror".

56. In that connexion, we should like to stress that the manufacture and deployment of the most vicious weapon,

the neutron bomb, opens a new and dangerous chapter in the arms race. The people and Government of socialist Ethiopia, together with other peace-loving peoples and Governments, are horrified at this development and demand its immediate and permanent banning. We commend the Government of the USSR and other socialist countries for their initiative in submitting a draft convention prohibiting the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of that weapon.<sup>1</sup>

57. The question of chemical weapons is also a matter that needs to be tackled without delay. In this regard we wish to welcome the decision by the major nuclear Powers to resume their bilateral negotiations. Negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States are also expected to remove the crucial problems of verification and identification, thus paving the way for speedy progress in subsequent multilateral negotiations.

58. At this juncture, I should like to state that the absence of concrete disarmament measures cannot be attributed solely to the nature of the negotiating machinery. The need for political goodwill and genuine commitment to the cause of disarmament is of crucial significance. In the opinion of the Ethiopian delegation, the positive and constructive participation of all the nuclear Powers in the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament would undoubtedly make it more effective. We therefore believe that, with minor changes, the Conference could continue to be the main international negotiating forum on disarmament.

59. Ethiopia considers a world disarmament conference to be a logical follow-up to the present special session. We believe that such a conference would provide a forum for comprehensive discussions and effective decisions on all aspects of disarmament issues. It is therefore our earnest hope that the special session will give due consideration to the convening of a world conference on disarmament and take the necessary decisions to that effect.

60. The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and the establishment of zones of peace undoubtedly give the necessary impetus to the non-proliferation Treaty. It is therefore the duty of the international community to promote all regional initiatives to create such zones. On our continent the heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, at a summit conference in 1964, adopted the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa in which they expressed their readiness to undertake, in an international treaty to be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations, not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons, and urged the nuclear Powers to respect the Declaration.

61. Yet, in open defiance of the Declaration, the Western allies of the racist South African régime have effectively contributed to that régime's nuclear capability. Thus, the racist régime of South Africa has now reached an advanced stage of testing a nuclear device, threatening

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Supplement No. 27, vol. II, document CCD/559.

the security of all African States directly and critically escalating tension in the region.

62. The military support to that racist régime in the development, production and deployment of conventional weapons has enabled the *apartheid* régime to sustain its repugnant policy of repression and exploitation. Obviously, racism and colonialism are nourished not by their power of persuasion but rather by the brute force of imperialism. Social orders based on oppression, on the degradation of man by man and, above all, on colonialism and exploitation in the pursuit of profit are by their very nature aggressive, and, therefore, can only be countered by armed struggle.

63. The central objectives of the South African military build-up are the consolidation of the criminal occupation of Namibia, the degradation of the African people, the plundering of the natural resources and, above all, the undermining of peace and security of all African States. Sustained by the traditional support they receive from certain capitalist countries, the minority racist régimes of Pretoria and Salisbury are today spearheading the vicious design to make Africa the backyard of imperialism in a manner closely resembling the nineteenth-century colonial scramble for that continent. That is precisely why, far from entering a genuine commitment to peace, security and disarmament, the representatives of the capitalist world are sabre-rattling in this very special session devoted to disarmament and pressing for a more determined armament at a North Atlantic Treaty Organization summit meeting in Washington in May.

64. Unless the link between the imperialist countries and the racist régimes is severed forthwith, the sovereignty and independence of all African countries will continue to be compromised and, still worse, international peace and security will be gravely jeopardized. The world's quest for peace and orderly international relations cannot and must not tolerate racism, colonialism and exploitation of the peoples of southern Africa. To expunge these evils is at the same time to remove the major hotbeds of confrontation in the world. Similarly, for the attainment of concrete progress in halting the arms race and promoting disarmament, a just and lasting peace in the Middle East requires the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories and the recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

65. The world today is facing a series of crucial and urgent socio-economic problems which have generated impulses and tensions unprecedented in character and dimension. These problems cannot be solved without adopting measures to satisfy basic elementary human needs.

66. For a number of years, the world military expenditure has been soaring, while two thirds of the world population has continued to live in abject poverty, suffering from famine, malnutrition and pestilence. The total arms expenditure is now estimated to be in the region of \$400 thousand million per annum, thus absorbing an amount equivalent to about two thirds of the aggregate gross national products of the countries which together comprise the poorer half of the world.

67. Speaking of the direct relationship between disarmament and economic development, Lieutenant Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam, Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council of Socialist Ethiopia, stated: "The arms race and the existing gap in terms of wealth and technology between the developed and developing world are among the main threats to world peace."

68. The stark clouds of peril that hang over humanity can thus be diverted if, and only if, the huge sum of expenditures and the scientific and technological resources devoted to this purpose are redirected for development purposes, thereby establishing a new international economic order without which the promotion of international peace and security will be far from being realized.

69. The programme of the national democratic revolution of Ethiopia clearly states that Ethiopia's foreign policy is guided by the well-known principles of the non-aligned movement. These principles are respect for peace, justice, equality, national independence and unity, and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. In asserting Ethiopia's unswerving commitment to peace, Lieutenant Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam, speaking to a group of international journalists on 14 February 1978, stated: "What revolutionary Ethiopia wishes to reaffirm to progressive forces, to democrats and to all peace-loving peoples of the world is that Ethiopia is committed to peace, socialism and justice and that she has no other motive whatsoever."

70. The supreme goal for all mankind is peace—peace under the rule of law, and peace for the progress of all peoples. There is no other case, however, where reality and desire are farther apart than they are in war and peace. As we go through a period marked by the absence of peace all nations—both nuclear and non-nuclear—must realize that there is not much time left on which to count for the evolution of peace because war in the present-day world is a war of total destruction. That is why, more than ever before, goodwill is required, and it is also why the Government and people of socialist Ethiopia—a people plagued by repeated wars of aggression—attach the greatest importance to the successful completion of this special session. Socialist Ethiopia, as always, is ready to strengthen international peace and security, to build new confidence among States, to consolidate détente, to promote respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and to create the climate necessary for the progress of disarmament.

71. Peace shall prevail. Victory is ours.

72. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia for transmitting to the General Assembly the message of the Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council and the Council of Ministers of Ethiopia, Lieutenant Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam.

73. On behalf of the General Assembly, I have the honour to welcome His Excellency General Antonio Ramalho Eanes, President of the Portuguese Republic, and to invite him to address the General Assembly.

74. Mr. EANES:<sup>2</sup> Mr. President, I should like most sincerely to associate myself with the previous speakers who have complimented you on your outstanding qualities as a diplomat and a statesman.

75. I should also like to take advantage of this opportunity publicly to express my admiration for the dedication, persistence and political skill that the Secretary-General has shown in the service of peace and the international community.

76. Being the first democratically elected President of the Portuguese Republic to speak from this rostrum, I am proud, in that capacity, to pay homage, on behalf of the Portuguese people, to the achievements of the United Nations. In recalling the successful efforts of the United Nations in the political as well as the economic, social, cultural and technological fields, I hereby solemnly declare that Portugal, free and democratic, will extend to the United Nations its most dedicated and frank co-operation for the complete fulfilment of the aims of the Organization.

77. This special session is only the beginning of a new phase in a continuing process—one which can be expected to be lengthy and difficult—aimed at guaranteeing that the United Nations will discharge its responsibilities in disarmament matters; none the less it is of great historical significance.

78. Among those who, correctly interpreting the conscience of our time, took the initiative in convening this special session of the General Assembly, I wish to single out the non-aligned countries. Few expectations are so universally held as those concerning peace and security. Therefore, the resolutions of this special session concerning the control and limitation of armaments should be approved through a consensus expressing the political will of all its members. There can be no doubt that the apprehensions and aspirations of all the peoples of the world are at stake.

79. As a result of their own detachment from traditional ideological blocs, the non-aligned countries have been more aware of the weakness of existing structures of international security. They have understood better than others the growing difficulty of preserving their independence and integrity without also becoming involved in conflicts from which they should remain detached.

80. But the international community has no illusions about the scope and difficulty of the task which this Assembly is facing. We can consider disarmament the most autonomous and important factor for peace. It is but an illusion within the perspective of the world that is neither global nor integrated. But as an instrument of peaceful international life it is still linked to measures aimed at excluding the use of force in relations between nations and at deterring international terrorism and even ideological aggression. It will also not be possible outside the framework

of a policy of détente. It is incompatible with the violation of international law, and especially with contempt for human rights. It cannot be based on hunger, injustice or the oppression of other peoples. It will never be sincerely adopted by those who wield power through the use of force.

81. The mere fact that millions of people are still deprived of the most elementary rights and are living in the most shocking and miserable material conditions gives full meaning and justification to this session and permits us to hope that concrete measures to break the present stalemate will result.

82. But let us have no illusions. Unless mankind shows a correct perception of the interests of humanity through the sincere establishment of a more just economic order; unless we reduce the nuclear threat and put an end to circumscribed conflicts, especially in Africa; unless the idea of disarmament ceases to be used as a smokescreen and a basis for ideological propaganda—it will be very difficult indeed for the United Nations to reach the goal for which it was created.

83. We are therefore perfectly aware of the accumulated difficulties and mistrust as well as the legitimate concern of each State and Government for its security and survival.

84. But if we still have hope, it is as the result of the magnitude of the challenge which we face; we are indeed too close to the universal breaking-point to allow ourselves any hesitation or to risk any failure. The verdict of history and of succeeding generations will not spare us; it will be implacable if the results of this session are little more than echoes of our statements or declarations of intentions, however worthy of merit they might be.

85. In the last 30 years the international community has witnessed the armaments race with growing concern. Tools of destruction have been created and multiplied at a pace apparently impossible to halt. They threaten the very existence of human society as we know it today.

86. The peace which we have now is an armed peace, and in this context relations between States are inevitably subject to the imposition of unjust criteria which are accepted because of existing inequities.

87. The expectations and interests of small nations should not be underestimated in disarmament strategies. When such nations are situated on the potential ground for new conflicts, they should have the right to intervene in the resolution of a question of vital interest to their security and their human values. Otherwise, should small nations be forced to bear the burden of an armed peace, they would have to choose between their security and the full exercise of their right to permanent self-determination.

88. On the other hand, the amount of resources spent on the armaments race has increased year after year, becoming an intolerable burden on most peoples. The squandering of such resources is even more unacceptable when we see that a large part of mankind still finds itself living in deplorable conditions and is the victim of suffering which

<sup>2</sup>Mr. Eanes spoke in Portuguese. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

contemporary science could, if given the necessary means, alleviate most effectively in many cases.

89. The permanent balance of the military capability of the big nuclear Powers is a minimum condition for the stability of our system of international relations. However, any lasting solution in the field of international security requires that the growth of nuclear arsenals in quality, quantity and destructive capacity be curbed. In order for the immediate and unconditional suspension of all nuclear tests to be fully acceptable, it should be followed by the elimination of existing stockpiles. The conclusion of a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons tests would be the natural outcome of these measures. We must hope that all Powers would adhere to it, thereby avoiding serious and uncontrollable risks.

90. The dissemination of nuclear technology, and its constantly-growing utilization for peaceful purposes, has dangerously increased the risk of new countries being tempted to acquire nuclear weapons.

91. Small countries like Portugal cannot refrain from denouncing the growing nuclear peril without at the same time allowing themselves to be swayed by politically motivated arguments or by apparent value judgements concerning certain types of nuclear weapons. From a moral point of view, there is no difference between the nuclear weapons belonging to the big Powers. What concerns us is the existence of nuclear weapons and not their most recent form.

92. At the same time as measures are taken to reduce nuclear arms, means of limiting conventional weapons must be found. In certain areas of the world, in particular Europe, the imbalance of conventional forces is such that some countries base their security entirely on their nuclear response capacity. That situation must be changed, in Europe as well as in other regions where zones of tension exist. It will be possible to adopt partial measures in this area so that in successive stages mistrust can be eliminated and limitations imposed on particularly destructive armaments. Very little has been done in this field, apart from the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We feel that this is one of the most important questions, to which particular consideration should be given by this Assembly and at future conferences of this nature.

93. Another area in which immediate action is required is that of chemical weapons. After lengthy negotiations it seems that at long last the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting the use of chemical weapons and providing for the elimination of the existing stockpiles is imminent.

94. We are well aware that one of the most difficult problems in this field is that of on-site monitoring of compliance with such a treaty. We understand that certain countries are reluctant to open their borders for international inspection, but the necessity of adopting efficient measures should prevail over pan-nationalist considerations. This will be a test of the coherence and sincerity of the intentions of the leaders of the countries concerned.

95. Strict respect for the sovereignty and integrity of all

countries is an essential condition of international security. Within the framework of existing international law, the assurance of internal political stability should also set a compulsory limit to any outside interference which threatens the independence of the peoples and the very identity of the nations concerned.

96. Disarmament will only be possible when there is sufficient evidence of the peaceful intentions of those that support it and when imperialist actions based on military aggression, whatever the ideological justification, are altogether suppressed.

97. Real solidarity among peoples means that due priority is given to economic development rather than to military aid, and that there is no link to any form of political or ideological subordination.

98. It will not be possible to wind up the process of disarmament successfully under an unjust international economic system that could generate tensions with repercussions throughout the world. No one will have any faith in the process of disarmament as long as relationships of domination are accompanied by political and military pressures that restore colonialism in even more aggressive and sophisticated forms. Aid to development, therefore, is something which concerns everyone, conditions rapid economic recovery from the crisis we are facing and makes possible the establishment of real peace in relations among all peoples.

99. Many of those who have spoken before me have already called attention at this rostrum to the natural link between disarmament and development, and in particular to the need for disarmament as a means of promoting development using the resources thus released. Now, however, I should like to stress the converse relationship, and to point out that the establishment of a new, more just and more balanced economic order can bring about a favourable international climate for better understanding among peoples. Rarely have all the countries in the world felt as they do today the pressing need to establish true solidarity based on a new economic order which would make possible the recovery of the world economy on a global scale.

100. In order to maintain international peace and security, therefore, there is an urgent need to rearrange priorities, taking into account the fact that patience and the efforts necessary to achieve a disarmament agreement, albeit limited in scope, should not mean stopping development. If that happened the efforts aimed at finding a solution could be undermined through the economy. But I think we are all conscious of the fact that a sizeable reduction in expenditure on armaments, accepted in good faith and efficiently controlled, would make available resources and international capabilities, channelled from death and oppression to support life and liberty. More clearly than in the past, conditions now make it possible for us to recognize the necessity of significantly reducing military expenditure so as to utilize the maximum available resources productively and finance, directly or indirectly, a fund for the benefit of the countries with the most serious development problems.

101. Especially in Europe, the present process of securing arms control through negotiations at successive levels is based on a realistic assessment of the present situation. The accumulated destructive might and the threat of latent aggression must perforce lead to a flexible guarantee of equilibrium. Reduction of tension, which is a part of psychological disarmament and a measure of real disarmament, cannot lead to suicidal attitudes. The limitation of arms, theoretically as well as in the practice of international relations, must be the result of verifiable efforts and multilateral responsibility.

102. Nevertheless, we know that the international community is not adequately equipped with bodies and institutions that would enable it to cope effectively with such complex problems. In the opinion of Portugal, therefore, the central role in regard to these measures, which cover a vast field, from the conclusion of treaties to the monitoring of their implementation and the systematic exchange of information, should fall principally by the United Nations. Without underestimating the contributions of the specialized bodies and temporary conferences, we feel that the United Nations nevertheless remains the sole body with almost universal representation. We should like to see its capabilities and its authority strengthened.

103. Among the conditions of effective disarmament is respect for human dignity, which can be translated as acceptance of and respect for human rights. No State that commits violence against its own citizens in violation of freely sanctioned agreements and treaties can hope that its pacific declarations will ever be taken as sincere. On the contrary, the small nations question the seriousness of disarmament proposals that are accompanied by acts of destabilization and by the proliferation of arms in certain regions of the world, which seriously compromise progress towards the disarmament objectives of the United Nations. And although it is true that under opposing and irreconcilable ideologies divergent views are held regarding human dignity, to sacrifice humanism and liberty would be to deny them.

104. With the independence of the Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa, Portugal has reoriented its position in the world in consonance with its historical identity, thus reinforcing its legitimate right to participate in this debate. The principles which now prevail—those of democracy, freedom and justice, both social and individual—demand from us frank and open co-operation in all initiatives that may lead to détente and genuine and consistent disarmament. These principles require us to show our firm determination to co-operate with all peoples and States that defend their independence and that, in an integrated system of defence, will know how to adopt a global or regional policy capable of containing any threat or geo-political offensive aimed at domination through military aggression.

105. The peoples of the vital strategic areas, more than any other, must modernize and strengthen their defensive capacity until a formal guarantee of disarmament is possible and a political practice of co-operation and peace is achieved.

106. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank His Excellency the President of the Portuguese Republic for the important statement he has just made.

*Mr. Ulrichsen (Denmark), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

107. Mr. AL-SAFFAR (Bahrain) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation is pleased to extend its most heartfelt congratulations to Mr. Mojsov on his election as President of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. We are very pleased to see him presiding over the work of this historic session devoted to disarmament. His election as its President is of great importance because of the effective role which he has played in international forums in defence of the principle of disarmament. We should also like to state that his country, Yugoslavia, under President Tito's leadership, was one of the founders of the non-aligned movement which took the initiative of convening this special session. Mr. Mojsov's election as President of this special session is a sincere acknowledgement of his own personal role and the role of his country in the field of disarmament.

108. I am pleased to pay tribute also to the Secretary-General for his sincere efforts to consolidate peace and security in the world as well as for the very serious studies and constructive proposals which he has submitted to us in the field of disarmament.

109. On this occasion I should also like very warmly to thank the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, which worked under the chairmanship of Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, Ambassador of Argentina, for the studies prepared for this session. Mr. Ortiz de Rozas's election as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for this session is also a demonstration of the trust placed in him by the General Assembly.

110. The idea of establishing an international body devoted to disarmament is not a new one. Since the end of the nineteenth century many States have dealt with this issue, particularly at the Hague Peace Conferences, in 1899 and in 1907. Despite the fact that the most important achievements of those Conferences involved the preparation of laws and regulations for war rather than the peaceful solution of international disputes, their main objective was to achieve arms limitation. The League of Nations in 1932 also convened the Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments. But, after preparing the necessary reports and documents, that Conference ended in failure in 1935 because of the deterioration of the situation in Europe at that time, and we are all aware of the outcome; hence the great importance attached by the world to disarmament.

111. This session is characterized by the fact that it is the first session gathering together such a great number of States to discuss the question of disarmament, upon the initiative of the developing and the non-aligned countries. It reflects the concern and the fear that prevails throughout

the world at the present stage, because of the dangers the destructive power of nuclear weapons represents for mankind. This is the case not only because these weapons are disseminated in other States, in particular States whose systems are based on racist ideology, but also because the arms race has reached a level unparalleled in the history of mankind. This has led to a squandering of vast sums which are devoted to the arms race. It is absolutely illogical that such vast amounts of human and material resources should be devoted to weaponry at a time when they could be used constructively in the developing countries.

112. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bahrain stated these dangers when he said:

“The arms race is one of the most important problems facing the world today, particularly the developing world. The huge arsenals of conventional, nuclear, chemical and biological weapons which some States build cause increasing concern because they threaten the existence of humanity on our small planet and stimulate the outbreak of wars among States. It is indeed regrettable that huge amounts of money should every year be dissipated on the development of destructive conventional and strategic weapons instead of being spent on development projects and on alleviating the burden of indebtedness of the poor countries.

“ . . .

“Obviously the reduction of arms of all kinds and the non-development of new weapons would provide huge financial resources that could be used for development projects, in particular to raise the standard of living of the people of the developing countries.”<sup>3</sup>

113. In 1973 the United Nations General Assembly adopted a certain number of resolutions concerning the reduction of military budgets. It also invited the permanent Members of the Security Council to reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent and to devote the sums thus released to assistance for the developing countries. In 1975 the General Assembly appealed [*resolution 3463 (XXX)*] to all States to reduce their military budgets, and it also appealed to the two super-Powers—which account for approximately one third of world expenditure on armaments—to proceed to a reduction of their military budgets. We are convinced that a reduction of military budgets under the appropriate auspices of the United Nations would, *inter alia*, halt the arms race in the world.

114. Many years have passed since those resolutions were adopted, but no progress whatsoever has yet been achieved in respect of reduction of military budgets or in respect of human and material resources now squandered in weaponry and their transfer to the field of development where there is such an urgent need. On the contrary, military budgets in the world have increased in recent years, so that sums devoted to armaments have reached \$400 thousand million per year. It is truly shameful that such enormous sums should be devoted to weapons production at a time when millions of human beings are living in a state of

poverty, ignorance and disease. In fact, this is a flagrant violation of the unanimous decision of States Members of this Organization to work towards raising the standard of living of peoples throughout the world and towards an improvement of economic and social conditions.

115. The overwhelming majority of the Members of the Organization attach absolute priority to nuclear disarmament, but this does not mean that sophisticated conventional weapons should be disregarded, because this type of weapon also causes disasters and destruction. Chemical weapons and new destructive weapons are next in line to the nuclear weapons in seriousness. For example, napalm bombs and other bombs used by Israel recently against refugee camps and against Lebanese cities and towns during the invasion of southern Lebanon took the lives of a great number of innocent civilians.

116. Rivalry in overkill capacity in armaments is a demonstration of the distrust among States. In order to eliminate that fear and concern, it is essential to put an end to the arms race, because the continuance of stockpiling of weapons, and in particular nuclear weapons, promotes the spread of fear and distrust among States. That in turn leads to destabilization and to rivalry among States. If effective measures are not adopted to halt the arms race, the dangers resulting from the stockpiling of these weapons will only increase, because it is impossible to achieve peaceful coexistence in any region of the world while such vast quantities of weapons and means of destruction exist. In fact, genuine peace can only be based on total disarmament and on understanding and co-operation among all peoples. That is the only way to put an end to fear in all regions.

117. A certain number of States, putting forward reasons of security, accumulate weapons to be used for aggressive purposes and in expansionist policies. Experience has taught us that stockpiling of weapons in a certain number of States leads to destabilization, to declarations of war and to persistent acts of aggression. None the less, information transmitted by certain media indicates that the obtaining by Israel of certain sophisticated weapons would guarantee and help to maintain stability in the Middle East. That information, I maintain, is not in keeping with the facts in the region. The stockpiling of weapons by Israel, and in particular of modern destructive weapons, has helped it not only to continue its occupation of Arab territories in defiance of United Nations resolutions and to obstruct all efforts towards the establishment of peace, but has helped it also to perpetrate constant acts of aggression against its neighbours, the latest of which was the invasion of southern Lebanon.

118. Just as the stockpiling of weapons by the Government of South Africa, which implements the same kind of expansionist policy as Israel, has helped that Government to strengthen its racist régime, which contradicts the most elementary principles of mankind, thus violating United Nations resolutions and running counter to world public opinion, so the stockpiling of weapons has also encouraged that Government to perpetrate constant acts of aggression against its neighbours in Africa, the latest of which was its act of aggression against Angola.

<sup>3</sup>Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 18th meeting, paras. 159 and 161.

119. A considerable number of delegations in past sessions of the General Assembly have warned against the policies of some States in furnishing military equipment and weaponry to Israel and to South Africa because this has encouraged those two States to defy United Nations resolutions and to continue their acts of aggression against neighbouring States.

120. The provision of sophisticated weaponry to Israel can in no way and has in no way helped to create an atmosphere conducive to a solution of the Middle East crisis. If effective measures are not adopted to curb the arms race, the dangers stemming from a stockpiling of weapons will only increase.

121. Rivalry among the major States has also led to a worsening of the arms race, under the pretext of maintaining the balance of power. This contest is limitless, but, despite the rivalry between the major Powers, they have not vied with each other directly on their own territories; in one way or another, they have waged their many wars outside. Since the end of the Second World War—up to the present day—a great many wars have been waged in many regions throughout the world. While some of them have been very limited they have also been highly destructive. They have resulted from rivalry for spheres of influence throughout the world and have been used for experimentation and innovation in the weaponry produced by the military industries of the major Powers. The arms race between the major Powers has led to an arms race between the peoples of the third world, because it is they who pay the price, materially and in human terms, of the rivalry between the major Powers. We regret that certain States, which in the past have been, and are still, innovative in the fields of civilization and world development, are also innovative when it comes to the production of weapons of mass destruction.

122. In our opinion, when the major Powers, particularly the two super-Powers, feel a need to reach agreement on a specific limitation of, and a substantial reduction in, their strategic nuclear weaponry, an important step will have been taken towards disarmament. We hope that the current negotiations on this matter will have meaningful results.

123. The question of disarmament is related directly to the question of national and international security. We believe that any preliminary measure to limit and control the arms race can only have a positive impact on security in general if the role of the United Nations is strengthened and if its capacity to preserve world peace and to find peaceful solutions to international disputes is enhanced. During the past few years the General Assembly has adopted a considerable number of resolutions aimed at strengthening and consolidating the Organization's role in these two fields. However, up to the present it has not been able to play an effective role in preserving peace and security in the world.

124. Because of the heightened rivalry among the major Powers in the development of nuclear weapons and in stockpiling great quantities of them, and because of the possibility of their dissemination, the States of the third

world feel that it is necessary to save themselves from the dangers of nuclear war. They have therefore invited the States of the Middle East, Africa, and South-east Asia to consider, within the framework of the United Nations, making their respective regions nuclear-weapon-free zones. The coastal States of the Indian Ocean have also asked that that ocean be proclaimed a region of peace and permanent security, but this has not yet been accomplished. In the Middle East there are more and more indications that Israel has acquired nuclear weapons, at a time when it refuses to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It has not approved the special resolution concerning the declaration of the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon-free zone [resolution 3263 (XXIX)]. Likewise, the Government of South Africa is continuing its efforts to obtain nuclear weapons. This contradicts the desire of the peoples of Africa that their continent should become a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

125. We invite all States, particularly the major Powers and the non-nuclear Powers which are capable of producing nuclear weapons, to put an end to their assistance to Israel and to the Government of South Africa, to stop all transfers of nuclear weapons, fissionable material or nuclear technology, and to see to it that such weapons are not provided to Israel or South Africa through other countries.

126. The coastal States of the Indian Ocean have asked that that ocean and its extension be considered a zone of security, peace and co-operation. Despite that, the major Powers work unceasingly to intensify and consolidate their military presence in the area.

127. As regards the question of security in our own region, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bahrain stated during the last session of the General Assembly that contacts are under way between States in the region, with a view to preserving its security and removing it from the field of rivalry between the major Powers.<sup>4</sup> When I say our own region, I am speaking of the Gulf region.

128. Security guarantees for States which do not have nuclear weapons and do not intend to obtain them should be collective and should involve the adoption of regulations by the United Nations.

129. This is the case, *inter alia*, of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It is clear that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones would be more effective in guaranteeing the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. If urgent measures are not taken, at the regional and world levels, to implement the relevant resolutions regarding the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in those areas, there will be a real danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons there.

130. We hope that the recommendations which emerge from this special session will lead to agreement on a reduction in arms and will reduce tension throughout the world, particularly in areas where international peace and security are unceasingly threatened by conflicts still being waged.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, para. 163.

131. My delegation hopes and expects that this session will lead to positive results after the many years which have been devoted to attempting to curb the arms race under the auspices of the United Nations. We feel that it is impossible to achieve international peace and security unless all States, whether large or small, agree not to resort to the use of force in international relations.

132. Emphasis on the need to achieve disarmament—in particular, nuclear disarmament—and an invitation to States to adopt decisive measures to put an end to the arms race are, we are convinced, the proper starting-point for general and complete disarmament.

133. Every year which passes without effective measures being taken in this field is a year in which the tempo of the arms race becomes heightened in the world and stockpiling increases, with additional States attempting to obtain nuclear weapons, following the example of other States. Perhaps in the future, on the international scene, we shall see an adventurous leader who will cause a third world war to be unleashed. History has taught us that from time to time such a leader does appear, because history is fraught with examples of this type. May this session be a decisive turning point in putting an end to the arms race, and in particular, the nuclear arms race, and may effective measures be adopted to overcome the dangers stemming from the arms race and to progress towards total disarmament.

134. The General Assembly is now, more than ever, being called upon to adopt such measures in order to attain the objectives to which all mankind aspires.

135. Mr. VAYRYNEN (Finland): Disarmament is one of the central pursuits of Finnish foreign policy. As a small country with a relatively low level of armaments, Finland relies primarily on political means for its security. In this respect we are in the same position as the vast majority of the States Members of the United Nations which stand outside military alliances. For these States, progress in disarmament is important for their own security interest. We, therefore, have a natural interest in a more peaceful and rational world order as provided for by the collective security system of the United Nations.

136. In the view of Finland, its involvement in the promotion of disarmament is thus a field where its national interests and those of the international community coincide.

137. On the basis of its policy of active neutrality, Finland has through the years been able to render service to the international community in the field of peace-keeping as well as in the field of disarmament. We have had the satisfaction of seeing our country chosen for the site of important arms control negotiations, such as the strategic arms limitation talks, negotiations on conventional arms transfers and, most recently, negotiations on military satellites.

138. Our own efforts in support of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and nuclear-weapon-free zones in general, our participation in the highly technical work on the control of chemical weapons

and the seismological monitoring of a comprehensive test ban are known to this Assembly and particularly to the Members that are equally occupied with these problems. In general, we have, on the basis of our resources and priorities, approached the question of disarmament in a very pragmatic way. Frankly, we have done so because we feel that at times it may be more useful to think what one can do oneself for the cause of disarmament rather than say what others should do.

139. Obviously, disarmament cannot be viewed in isolation. It is an integral part of the process of international politics and, as such, subject to the same forces and influences as international politics in general. Particularly in the intricate and sensitive relationships between the major nuclear Powers, talks on arms control and arms limitation have assumed a crucial role. All the major agreements so far achieved have been born out of political necessity and after hard and protracted bargaining. It is a commonplace to say that progress in disarmament is only possible in conditions of détente. The continuation of that process, again, is contingent on progress in disarmament. This interaction between disarmament and détente does not, however, imply that measures towards disarmament would effortlessly ensue from a political relaxation of tension.

140. The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe signed at Helsinki should become a vital, dynamic element in the development of relations on the European continent. It is continuously providing new impetus, by its implementation, to the relations of all participating States and, I trust, to the countries outside Europe. In spite of some doubt expressed, the significance of the process of the Conference as a whole has not diminished; on the contrary, its significance can be fully appreciated only in the course of years to come. Problems of disarmament in the strict sense of the word were deliberately left out of the Helsinki Final Act for fear of sinking into a morass of endless controversy. Nor was the meeting at Belgrade able to agree that experts from all countries taking part in the Conference would have assembled to discuss confidence-building measures in the military field as well as general arms control and disarmament measures in the European region. That failure is very much to be deplored. Against that background the Finnish Government will study with interest the proposal recently made by the Government of France on the possibility of a European disarmament conference [3rd meeting].

141. We all recognize that the problems of disarmament are global; but that should not overshadow the regional aspects. In Europe, a small region in global terms, there are some 10,000 nuclear warheads at the ready, in addition to the quantities of conventional weapons. While keeping in mind the global aspects of disarmament, the regional perspective should not be overlooked. In many cases that perspective would make the negotiations more substantive and productive.

142. In the view of the Finnish Government, developments in military technology over the past few years have affected the situation in the region where we are situated. That has given added importance to the regional perspec-

tive in arms control. Nuclear weapons—both warheads and means for their delivery—as well as the accuracy and the manoeuvrability of weapons systems have been developed with the possibility in mind that one could actually wage limited nuclear war instead of the dreaded general war. But it is important to recognize the political trend behind the theories of limited nuclear warfare. A limited nuclear war could in plain language mean the Europeanization of nuclear war; and no one anywhere in Europe would be immune from the effects of such strategies.

143. On the weight of arguments I have just adduced, and departing from an idea which he put forth as early as 1963 concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Northern Europe, the President of Finland, Mr. Kekkonen, recently developed this idea further. In the light of the new technological developments in the field of nuclear weapons which may affect the security of the Nordic countries, he proposed a Nordic arms control agreement. The purpose of the arrangement would be to isolate the Nordic countries as completely as possible from the effects of nuclear strategy in general and new nuclear weapons technology in particular.

144. I have dealt with but one particular case of how the development of military technology has accelerated the qualitative arms race in a frightening way and extended itself to ever new areas. The modern arms build-up forges ahead at a faster and faster pace. Moderating and bringing it under control brooks no delay. Disarmament negotiations today are a race against time.

145. A break-through that would halt and reverse the arms build-up is long overdue. Yet a number of important partial measures have been achieved. While not constituting disarmament measures in themselves, they have, at a minimum, sealed off some directions from new arms races. The results to date do demonstrate that, if the international community wants to act in concert, meaningful achievements are possible even in the control of the arms that pose the greatest threat to humanity—nuclear weapons. While we all agree that steps taken so far are insufficient, it would be both historically and politically erroneous to deny their value.

146. Attaching dates or deadlines for the conclusion of negotiations under way may well prove futile, but it is only appropriate that priorities be set and focal areas be identified.

147. There is overwhelming agreement that the cessation of the nuclear arms race is the greatest challenge. Reducing reliance on nuclear weapons should continue to be the prime target of arms limitation efforts. Here, the limitation and reduction of strategic arsenals, agreement on a comprehensive test ban and efforts to check the proliferation of nuclear weapons or equivalent nuclear explosives should be the greatest concerns.

148. In view of the increasing pace of development in the field of arms technology—at times dwarfing efforts to control it—higher priority than hitherto must be given to the goal of halting the development of new, ever more

dangerous weapons, such as the neutron weapon and other weapons of mass destruction.

149. Indeed, no new nuclear weapons should be developed or deployed by anyone. At the same time, nuclear weapons should not be introduced into or deployed in areas where they have not existed. Nuclear-weapon-free zones are the best means to guard against that. From the point of view of the non-nuclear-weapon countries it would be reasonable to expect of the nuclear-weapon States that they would give assurances not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against States committed to nuclear-weapon-free status. Furthermore, nuclear weapons should not come into the possession of more States, and indeed an instrument to combat proliferation—the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons—is already in existence, but measures to strengthen the non-proliferation régime further are urgently called for.

150. The prohibition and the cessation of the development of other weapons of mass destruction stands out as another challenge. With good reason, the prohibition of chemical weapons has been a priority item on the agenda of disarmament talks for years, and it may not be unwarranted optimism to look forward to results in the near future.

151. In parallel, in view of the destruction wrought by conventional wars, the control of conventional weapons and the reduction of armed forces and armaments should be pursued at the regional level. In the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and in some other regional arms control measures success has been achieved, but efforts to reduce existing arms and to check the inflow of weapons on a regional basis, which so far have proved largely fruitless, should be given new impetus.

152. Progress towards the main objectives of disarmament would be greatly enhanced by a variety of concomitant measures including, among others, peaceful settlement of disputes, non-use of force, military confidence-building measures and reduction of military expenditures.

153. In the view of the Finnish delegation, there are two basic considerations underlying the efforts that we are devoting to the issues before this Assembly. First, arms control and disarmament are an imperative for the security of nations. The quest for security by means of arms is a hopeless endeavour. Disarmament can and should be sought with security for all and danger for none. Secondly, disarmament is necessary for social and economic development. The goal of a new international economic order will be jeopardized if the massive diversion of the earth's resources to the arms build-up continues, with all the ecological consequences that entails.

154. A great number of valuable ideas and observations have been and will be presented in the course of this session. In practical terms, their value will depend on how those ideas will be embodied in the final document. My Government deems it essential that this session should reach its conclusions by consensus; any other outcome would not enhance the cause of disarmament.

155. There is broad agreement that a follow-up of the special session is essential. That should be properly reflected in its work. The more successful the special session is, the more likely it is to give rise to a further special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In particular, this applies to the convening of a world disarmament conference, which we continue to support under requisite conditions. Whatever the mode of the subsequent review, the widest possible participation and involvement of the world community in it is of great importance, just as it is to all disarmament efforts.

156. Mr. MKAPA (United Republic of Tanzania): It is with great pleasure that I associate myself with the tribute paid to Mr. Mojsov on his election to the presidency of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. His election is a recognition of his personal abilities and skills as an outstanding diplomat; it is also a tribute to Yugoslavia, his country, which has championed the cause of the non-aligned countries as well as being instrumental in the convening of this session.

157. The first resolution adopted by the General Assembly, in 1946, was addressed to the subject of disarmament. That signified the crucial role that arms and armaments had played in the devastation and misery that had been inflicted on humanity in the course of two world wars. As the wreckage of those wars was still smoking and the world was lamenting in untold sorrow, the representatives of nations signed the Charter by which war, as a means of settling international disputes, was condemned and outlawed, and military weapons as the apparatus of human destruction were singled out as a priority target to be controlled and finally to be eliminated altogether. The United Nations was created first and foremost to prevent war and to that end to disarm the world and create conditions for peace, security and prosperity.

158. At that time the bulk of the weapons in existence were of the conventional kind—now far outdated. Only one nation had invented the atomic bomb, then already grotesque, but nothing compared to what is in the arsenals today. Hope burned then that existing stocks of weapons would be destroyed and, together with wars, for ever forgotten.

159. Today, 33 years later, we have found it necessary to convene for the first time a special session devoted to the problem of disarmament—no longer merely to deal with the prevention of massive destruction of life and property, but to save the very existence of life on this planet. For what the interim has witnessed is a massive escalation of the arms race. No longer have we to cope with one or two nuclear-weapon Powers with a few atomic bombs, but five Powers with unknown arsenals of nuclear-weapon systems. The conventional weapons, though dwarfing those in existence in 1945 in quantity and destructive capacity, are no longer an immediate target in disarmament—except to the extent that they affect economic and social development. Indeed, to some, what disarmament meant in 1945 is no longer the same today. Then it meant elimination of at least the most destructive of the weapons; today, some would want us to believe that

it is mere regulation and control of armaments. Yet the requirements of the circumstances are the exact opposite, for even to achieve the very minimum of security we have many times more to destroy now than we had 33 years ago. The objective reality is that disarmament has not taken place—in fact, it has not even started.

160. This session should therefore first tell the world the dire facts, that whatever efforts have been exerted on the problem have been by far overtaken by an escalating arms race and arms build-up resulting in an ever greater threat to peace and human survival. Secondly, it should enable us to re-examine our attitudes, approaches and methods in dealing with this problem. And, thirdly, it should serve to mobilize all concerned in response to the common desire for survival, security and peace, and adopt an effective programme for immediate general and complete disarmament.

161. In taking an overview of the field of disarmament what, so far, have we really achieved?

162. Since the first resolution on disarmament, many other resolutions have been adopted by the General Assembly and other United Nations organs. The record of agreements on disarmament is impressive, but for the most part they are declarations of intent. A closer look at them cannot fail to reveal the flaws which have rendered the agreements themselves of mere token value. They are half-hearted, piecemeal and superficial; they do not deal with serious areas of disarmament.

163. The partial test-ban treaty,<sup>5</sup> for example, was considered a break-through, and most of us signed it. In reality what it achieved was merely to transfer nuclear testing by three nuclear-weapon Powers, which were parties to the treaty, from three environments to underground. After the conclusion of the partial test-ban treaty one would have expected, as the logical follow-up, at least the banning of underground tests. Yet, again, the treaty on nuclear weapons that followed skirted that problem to deal with an evil that did not threaten to come into existence for many years. It sought to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to those who did not even have the capacity to develop them.

164. The apprehensions we had in connexion with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons have been confirmed by events. While emphasis has continued to be given to horizontal proliferation, vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons has continued unabated. What that Treaty has managed to do is the very contrary of what was intended by the many signatories to it: it has legalized the maintenance of nuclear weapons and the nuclear arms race among the club of nuclear-weapon States, while posing as an achievement worth a sense of complacency and some degree of mental peace. It tends to create the illusion that the world is safer in spite of the nuclear-weapon stockpiles, provided that those stockpiles are limited to those few nations that have them.

<sup>5</sup>Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43).

165. Similarly, a treaty was concluded prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and ocean floor. The value of that treaty is in doubt. For while the remote sea-bed is apparently spared these weapons, naval vessels carrying the same arms roam the seas. A lot could also be said to similar effect about the other agreements.

166. A further illustration of shortcomings in disarmament endeavours is the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The General Assembly has expressed its desire to establish such zones in Africa, the Middle East and South Asia. The non-aligned nations have echoed this desire, as have the heads of State of the Organization of African Unity in respect of Africa. Regrettably, intentions have not been followed by action, the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa [resolution 2033(XX)] has not been respected. Some of the Western countries which have supported it have at the same time either engaged in or allowed for active nuclear collaboration with the *apartheid* régime in South Africa. As a result, South Africa today is on the threshold of acquiring nuclear weapons, something that will have ominous consequences for international peace and security.

167. But my delegation would like to see our continent more than just free of nuclear weapons. We want to see it free of external militarily-enforced claims regarding zones of interest, influence and domination. We have heard recently of such claims and of the attendant so-called right to intervene in Africa in their defence.

168. The peddling of these arrogant neo-colonial claims poses a serious danger to our continent as a whole and to some countries on the continent in particular. We call upon these external claimants of special interest and influence to desist from these insulting pretensions. We call on them to respect not just the political sovereignty of our countries but also our sovereignty over our natural resources.

169. The question of the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is for us of utmost importance. Along with other littoral and hinterland States, the United Republic of Tanzania has expressed opposition to the presence of great Powers in the Indian Ocean. We condemn attempts by great Powers to transfer their rivalry to our region. We oppose the establishment of military bases in the Indian Ocean and the use of this region as a battleground for great-Power competition. Efforts by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean to involve major Powers in consultations on establishing the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, have been frustrated. While expressing sympathy with the idea, these great Powers have refused to enter into meaningful dialogue. We call upon them to respect and to implement the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [resolution 2992(XXVII)].

170. While working for the creation of nuclear-free-zones and zones of peace, we should not lose sight of the paramount concern, that is, the very existence in the world of such highly devastating weapons. For if a nuclear war erupts, what guarantee is there that the status of these zones will be respected?

171. One of the reasons advanced for nuclear and conventional weapons escalation is national defence. It is rightly pointed out that each State has a right to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity. It is further argued that mutual deterrence and terror lead to mutual restraint. But what is overlooked is, first, the fact that the existing arsenals of nuclear weapons are sufficient to destroy all life on earth several times over. Under the circumstances, can it be said that any one nation or side can win a global nuclear war? Even a limited nuclear war could only lead to a Pyrrhic victory. Faced with these realities, there is no justification whatsoever for the continued competition to improve these nuclear weapons both in quality and quantity.

172. And secondly, so long as even one nation possesses these weapons, the security of other States is threatened and this in turn forces them to build up similar defensive systems. It makes absurd logic to argue that development of certain types of weapons by one nation will not necessarily set an example for others to follow suit.

173. But although nuclear weapons may potentially pose the greatest threat to mankind, conventional armaments are no less lethal. Whereas no nuclear weapons have been used since the last war, hundreds of wars have been fought in which conventional armaments claimed millions of lives. And as if the deadly capacity of conventional armaments had not reached the maximum, nations continue acquiring them beyond the limits of legitimate needs for national defence.

174. As a corollary of deficient and inadequate disarmament measures, we continue to witness the gobbling up in the production of weaponry of staggering resources, both human and material. Relevant statistics have been provided by the United Nations, by experts in disarmament and by informed non-governmental sources. I need not repeat them. Suffice it to say that these statistics are enough proof of the fact that if sense were to prevail and the arms race were to be halted, the resources thereby released would be adequate to improve the lot of the poor in the developed world as well as in the developing countries.

175. It is against this background that the developing countries have called for a new international economic order. We demand a complete overhaul and restructuring of international economic relations in such a manner as to redress the imbalance of wasteful expenditure in chasing the phantom of nuclear and arms superiority.

176. In view of the aforementioned sorry record, my delegation hopes that this special session will demonstrate resolute determination and maturity to agree on a programme of action which will open up new avenues for meaningful and concrete steps towards genuine disarmament. Such steps should include the creation of proper and satisfactory machinery for disarmament negotiations. The United Republic of Tanzania believes that it is not enough to appeal for confidence-building and good faith. It is not enough to talk of international détente. We need to follow this up with the establishment of a structure which is responsible for the urgent task of disarmament.

177. Unfortunately, so far, negotiations have been held in a non-representative framework. Negotiations must be based on principles which recognize that disarmament is a matter and responsibility for all States.

178. My delegation is aware of the importance of negotiating machinery which reflects the aspirations of the majority of the international community. If the present negotiating machinery has failed to produce tangible results in disarmament, then it should either be modified or overhauled altogether so as to meet the international requirements. Thus, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should have a link with the United Nations and it should also be democratized through universally representative membership. Such changes will ensure the participation of all nuclear Powers, whose participation is necessary if meaningful negotiations are to be undertaken. In turn, the negotiating machinery should keep the international community informed of progress or the lack of it. This could be done through the First Committee of the General Assembly.

179. Good intentions, however noble, will not solve the predicament we face today because of the unrestricted armaments race. Nor will an improvement in the climate of international relations. While these elements are helpful, they are not decisive in the disarmament crusade. What is needed is a commitment to disarm. This may even necessitate unilateral measures by the nuclear Powers. Let each of these Powers renounce the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. Let each of them declare that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons anywhere in the world. For with this commitment and assurance, it would then follow that no nation would ever use nuclear weapons against another.

*Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) resumed the Chair.*

180. But, above all, the crucial and decisive move is the prohibition of the production, stockpiling and deployment of nuclear weapons. This prohibition should be followed up by the destruction of such existing weapons. Only by moves of this kind can we ensure the realization of the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament.

181. We should not be diverted into peripheral and secondary issues such as the question of accepting existing international agreements on disarmament. These partial agreements are not a substitute for comprehensive disarmament. They should not be used as an excuse for stalling over-all action on disarmament. Thus, for example, on the issue of nuclear testing what is needed is a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Equally, concerning non-proliferation, we should not speak in terms of lateral or of upward proliferation. We should speak in terms of total prohibition for all.

182. We live in an era which represents the high-water mark of mankind's endeavours in history to make life better and happier. In unprecedented strides man is applying his genius to develop scientific and technological knowledge, and the results of the application of this knowledge to a better life are certainly a matter of great satisfaction and encouragement. At no time in history have we wit-

nessed a civilization so rich. In spite of the unequal distribution of this wealth and amenities in the world, no part of the world is too remote from them. Liberation of peoples from colonialism is progressing with great success. The negotiations and struggle for a new international economic order are in full swing and not without a basis for hope. There are efforts to increase and improve the equality of food for all, encouraging efforts to improve health and longevity, efforts to harness natural resources and the forces of nature to serve humanity. The world is engaged in the most energetic efforts to make life for ourselves and future generations more and more fulfilling, more and more worth living. Man is at his creative best. There is therefore a great deal at stake at this session, and we must not fail. The challenge of disarmament is an unprecedented and noble one, for it is a challenge to ensure that what man has so gloriously created, no man shall destroy.

183. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly decision 32/423 B of 12 December 1977, I now call on the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Mr. Sigvard Eklund.

184. Mr. EKLUND (International Atomic Energy Agency): It is a great honour to be here on this important occasion, and I should like to thank the delegations here present for the opportunity which they have given me to address the General Assembly.

185. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) was established 21 years ago and was given the twin aims of promoting peaceful uses of nuclear energy and seeking to prevent its military use through the application of international safeguards. The Agency came into being as an autonomous intergovernmental organization. However, by virtue of its statute and the United Nations-International Atomic Energy Agency Relationship Agreement, IAEA became closely tied to the United Nations. Accordingly, the Agency reports on its work annually to the plenary General Assembly. I should like to emphasize that the Agency values highly the opportunity offered by these ties, as they afford an exchange of ideas and valuable recommendations and advice from the Assembly.

186. This special session, among other important things, will discuss a principal question facing the human race—that is, whether it has the wisdom and self-restraint to survive the atomic weapons it has created.

187. These weapons have been created during the lifetime of one generation, and for more than 30 years attempts have been made to master them. Achievements, as we all know, have thus far been modest. However, there is at least one exception, as I shall endeavour to show, and that is in the field of peaceful nuclear technology—specifically, the prevention of the rapidly spreading peaceful nuclear technology as the basis for weapons production. This is a major “success story” in arms control measures during the last two decades, and it is remarkable how little it is known or appreciated.

188. Let us first look at the weapons side—the spread of nuclear weapons, or horizontal proliferation.

189. During the period 1945 to 1954 three nations became nuclear-weapon States. During the next 10 years—1955 to 1964—a further two nations joined this group. During the next 10 years—1965 to 1974—one further nation demonstrated that it had the capacity of exploding a nuclear device.

190. Now, let us look at this trend, in other words, at this diminishing rate of horizontal proliferation, against the development of peaceful nuclear power.

191. In 1954 the first 5-megawatt nuclear-power plant began operation. By 1968, 9,000 megawatts of nuclear power were in operation. By the end of last year—1977—the figure had risen to 100,000 in 19 countries. The likelihood is that by 1985 peaceful nuclear power capacity will have doubled.

192. From these figures alone, it is quite obvious that there is no direct correlation whatsoever between the growth of civil nuclear power and the spread of nuclear weapons. I should like to emphasize this point which is the clearest possible refutation of the arguments that are frequently advanced that nuclear power inevitably leads to nuclear weapons.

193. This point can be illustrated in another way. In 1945 only two or three nations had the technological capacity—the know-how—to make atomic bombs. Today this number is much larger. Yet, only six have demonstrated this capability.

194. How have we been able to achieve this fortunate result, this retardation of the process of horizontal proliferation?

195. In the first place, I believe that credit is due to the political wisdom of the statesmen of the world, and especially of the statesmen of the non-nuclear-weapon States that have exercised restraint, often in the face of strong internal or external pressure, and agreed to elaborate and accept the first international safeguards system. This is a most remarkable achievement. For the first time in history, nation States—in fact, the great majority of the nations of this world—have explicitly agreed to sacrifice a significant element of that which they hold most dear, their national sovereignty, and to permit international inspection of the entire range of a particularly sensitive branch of their national industry and national research.

196. The first manifestation of this willingness to accept a self-denying ordinance in the nuclear field was the Statute of the Agency, which was approved in this hall in 1956. Article II of the Statute is worth recalling. It reads:

“The Agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. It shall ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control, is not used in such a way as to further any military purposes.”

Other articles of the Statute outline the basic elements of the safeguards that the Agency is to apply to prevent the

diversion of nuclear energy to military purposes. Those safeguards were first applied in Japan in 1960.

197. In the succeeding years, the Agency's safeguards system was successively extended to cover larger research reactors and small power plants, then power reactors of all sizes and then re-processing and fuel-fabrication plants. At the same time, IAEA began the gradual build-up of its Safeguards Department and its team of inspectors.

198. By the end of 1966, the Agency's safeguards system covered all except the most sensitive type of plant—namely, the enrichment plant, which was still regarded as a military secret and confined to five countries. Fifty-four reactors of a total thermal capacity of about 2,500 MW were under safeguards, and considerable experience had been gained in the practical application of safeguards.

199. In 1968, when the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was finalized and commended to all nations by the General Assembly, the international community recognized the value of the tool that IAEA safeguards had placed in its hands. Accordingly, article III of the Treaty requires each non-nuclear-weapon State party to it to conclude an agreement with IAEA for application of IAEA safeguards to the entire peaceful nuclear programme of the country concerned. The Treaty thus marked the transition from the earlier safeguards system designed essentially to apply safeguards to individual nuclear plants. The new Treaty system envisaged what are now called “full-scale safeguards”, covering the entire nuclear industry of the country and aimed at safeguarding the flow of nuclear materials through that system.

200. Where does the Treaty stand today, 10 years after the General Assembly commended it? One hundred and four nations are now parties to the Treaty, and three of them are nuclear-weapon States. A fourth nuclear-weapon State, namely, France, has indicated that it will act, and it has indeed acted, as if it were a party.

201. The parties to the Treaty now include all but one of the major industrial countries of Western and Eastern Europe, the Far East and North America. The 104 parties also include 66 developing countries in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America.

202. Although the full implementation of the Treaty by the non-nuclear-weapon States of the European Community has not yet been achieved, we have come a very long way since 1968. We have come much further, perhaps, than we could have expected a few years ago when ratification of the Treaty by many industrial countries was by no means assured, but we are still some distance from a world-wide non-proliferation régime. Thirteen non-nuclear-weapon States that now have reactors or other facilities are still outside the Treaty. Eight of those countries all nuclear plants of importance are at present under IAEA safeguards, but there is no legal restriction on those eight countries that would prevent them from acquiring unsafeguarded plants. Moreover, in five of those countries there are unsafeguarded plants. Finally, in three of those five there are unsafeguarded nuclear facilities capable of producing materials for nuclear weapons.

203. Therefore the task which the General Assembly began in 1968 of outlawing, in the strict legal sense of the term, the further spread of nuclear weapons is not yet fully accomplished. It seems to me that by far the highest priority must be to finish this job, in other words, to consolidate and universalize the Treaty, strengthen IAEA safeguards so as to further enhance their credibility as a means of prompt detection of any infraction and, finally, make more rigorous the political and economic consequences that any country would suffer by breaching the Treaty and its safeguards obligations.

204. It also seems to me obvious that this remains the objective of overriding importance which must have priority over any other complementary non-proliferation measures. The strength of the non-proliferation régime depends in the last resort on the political consensus on which it is based, and not on technological restraints.

205. One manifestation of this consensus is the support that Member States give to the IAEA safeguards programme. This year the safeguards budget amounts to about \$11 million and supports a team of about 90 inspectors and a considerable back-up operation at headquarters. In 1979, the safeguards budget is expected to rise to about \$15 million and the inspectorate to about 130 professionals. The number of facilities and amount of material under safeguards is growing rapidly. By the end of 1977, IAEA was inspecting 100 power reactors and 169 research reactors. The amount of plutonium under safeguards, almost all in the form of irradiated fuel, rose from 3 metric tons in 1972 to 36 metric tons in 1977.

206. A booklet on this subject has been distributed in the Agency's four official languages.<sup>6</sup> It was published a month ago, but already there is some updating to be done, concerning increased participation in the non-proliferation Treaty and the conclusion of a number of safeguards agreements, among other things.

207. It is now 35 years since the demonstration of the self-sustaining nuclear fission reaction took place. It is 24 years since the first power reactor, based on that reaction, started operation. Since then nuclear energy has become a large industry. It is now reaching a level of development which makes additional demands on the IAEA safeguards system. New types of facilities, such as reprocessing plants and plutonium and uranium enriched fuel-fabrication plants, are coming into use in many countries. IAEA is beginning to apply safeguards to the next generation of nuclear power plants, namely fast-breeder reactors. The development of new isotope separation technology is making it possible for smaller countries to develop their own enrichment plants.

208. In IAEA we are deeply conscious of the situation and for this reason have advocated for many years that full-scope safeguards be an unconditional and irrevocable requirement of all supply agreements. I do not propose, of course, the unilateral abrogation of existing commitments,

but rather that we should work towards universal full-scope safeguards. This should be done either through the extension of the non-proliferation Treaty or through important regional agreements, such as the Treaty of Tlatelolco,<sup>7</sup> which offers the promise that at least one major area of the world will bind itself to remain free from the contagion of nuclear weapons.

209. Concern about the risks of proliferation of small and uneconomic reprocessing plants also led IAEA to make, and conclude last year, a comprehensive study of the ways of establishing regional or multinational fuel cycle centres. May I point out in this connexion that three full-scale commercial reprocessing plants would probably be sufficient to take care of the whole world's present needs for the reprocessing of spent fuel. This is surely a compelling argument for limiting and concentrating such facilities.

210. As part of this reappraisal, studies are now under way on the initiative of the United States to seek more proliferation-resistant solutions and structures for a nuclear fuel cycle. The results of this study, the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation, should be available within a year or two. IAEA is also pursuing studies in other means to supplement the non-proliferation treaty régime, such as the international management of separated plutonium to prevent national stockpiling and to ensure that plutonium is only distributed to meet legitimate energy or research requirements.

211. A particularly sensitive question is the transfer of nuclear technology. Reactions to proposals for restraint on such transfer dominated the Conference on this topic organized in Iran in April 1977. It was also a major issue at the IAEA Conference on Nuclear Energy and Its Fuel Cycle, held at Salzburg in May 1977. That Conference also showed how rapidly nuclear technology had spread with some 15 to 20 countries technologically capable of engaging in reprocessing and nearly a dozen having mastered the more complex and hitherto highly secret technology of enrichment.

212. Technology transfer was also an important theme at the tenth session of the World Energy Conference, held at Istanbul in September 1977, and at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. It is easy to predict that it will be a major issue at the second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons—which is due to take place at Geneva in 1980. The issue goes right to the very roots of co-operation between the industrial countries and the third world. The industrial development of the developing countries is predicated on the free and full transfer of advanced technology. This is also in a sense a bargain struck in the non-proliferation Treaty; in return for accepting full-scope safeguards, the non-nuclear-weapon States were assured of access to peaceful nuclear technology. The fact remains that one should not lose sight of the two major objectives, namely, adequate energy supplies and non-proliferation to which I have referred. This is the reason the Agency is

<sup>6</sup>*Non-Proliferation and International Safeguards*, International Atomic Energy Agency, 1978.

<sup>7</sup>Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326).

planning to hold another conference at Salzburg in 1981 that will afford policy makers, energy planners and economists, as well as technologists and scientists, a comprehensive discussion of the nuclear fuel cycle options. By that time the results of the International Fuel Cycle Evaluation as well as the conclusions of the second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons will be known and will be taken into account. Also, the planned 1981 Salzburg conference could serve the intent of General Assembly resolution 32/50, which referred to a possible international conference or conferences for this purpose.

213. Let me conclude on this point by expressing my personal conviction that in the long term, policies aimed at restraining and denying the transfer of nuclear or any other technology cannot be successful and could in the end prove to be counter-productive. The nuclear record of the last 33 years is an ample demonstration of this point.

214. The consensus that we have partly achieved and that we must seek by all means to consolidate is that technology transfer will take place within the framework of comprehensive and effective safeguards against misuse. The safeguards procedures that the international community has evolved represent a completely new pattern in international relationships. If the States of the world so wish, these safeguards can and will be improved. I am personally convinced that as nuclear power expands to meet the world's needs, we shall be able to ensure and to demonstrate to the world community that it is not being misused for military purposes. The same vast ingenuity that has gone into the development of nuclear power can also be deployed to prevent its misuse.

215. We must also consider the problems of proliferation in their wider perspective. The non-proliferation treaty has had a large measure of success in preventing horizontal proliferation. However, since the treaty came into force in 1970, even more ingenious nuclear weapons have been developed.

216. The non-proliferation treaty is in the interest of all countries, nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States alike. The latter, however, accept international safeguards across their entire nuclear industries and a binding restraint on their future freedom of action. A comprehensive test ban would not only directly help to outlaw any further proliferation, vertical or horizontal, of nuclear explosives but it would also be an expression of good faith of the nuclear-weapon States in discharging the obligations they have accepted under article VI of the non-proliferation treaty. It is not my task to deal with the disarmament questions before this Assembly, but it is clear that a complete test-ban treaty would be one step that would provide a major reinforcement to a world-wide non-proliferation régime.

217. Finally, let me recall that the treaty contains a binding commitment by all parties to promote the peaceful development of nuclear power. It is crucial that this development should not be artificially hampered. The nations that suffer most would be the developing countries. They would suffer directly because of obstruction of their own

nuclear power programmes which in a dozen or so cases already represent their main long-term energy targets. They would suffer even more indirectly. For a majority of the developing countries—for instance, most countries in Africa—oil remains the only viable major source of energy, probably for the remainder of this century. They are, therefore, in direct competition with the industrial world for access to oil resources. Each new nuclear power plant in an industrial country eases this competition and leaves some more oil at the disposal of the developing countries. It should be realized that a standard nuclear power plant saves not less than 1.5 million metric tons of oil per year.

218. The developed countries will obviously also suffer if the promise of nuclear power continues to be frustrated. I need not dwell on the problems that they are already experiencing in finding alternative sources of energy supply. It is for this reason that many of them perceive the development of breeder reactors as indispensable for meeting their energy needs in the next century. This is also a factor that would help in due time to release the world's limited uranium resources for greater use by the developing countries.

219. In conclusion, let me recapitulate the three main points that I have tried to make, points that this General Assembly may wish to stress. The first is the need to universalize the non-proliferation régime and to strengthen the safeguards that verify its observance. My second point is the urgent need for a complete ban on testing of nuclear explosives in all environments. My third point is the need to create conditions for the effective transfer of nuclear technology to those developing and industrial countries where economic conditions justify its introduction into their energy balances.

220. It is 10 years since the General Assembly commended the non-proliferation treaty for adoption and, as I have said, 104 States are today parties to that treaty. The implementation of the treaty has not captured headlines but its far-reaching measures for disarmament should not be lost sight of. There is all the more reason, therefore, that everything should be done to strengthen it and nothing to undermine the international non-proliferation régime as a step on the long and difficult path to achieving nuclear and other disarmament under strict and effective international control.

221. The PRESIDENT: Two representatives have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply. First, I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

222. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia): I have been scanning this hall to see whether Mr. Herzog is present, but it is good to find that there is a representative of Israel seated here. Where is Mr. Herzog? I do not find him in this hall. Is he hiding under the proverbial bush referred to in the Old Testament? It is Moses' bush, and Moses—I am paraphrasing—raised his staff and it turned into a serpent, and then he looked around and the bush caught fire and God spake from behind the bush to Moses.

223. Quoting from the prophet Isaiah, Mr. Herzog called

that prophet "a son of my people". If Mr. Herzog is a fundamentalist in religion, there is nothing wrong with that. Everyone is entitled to his belief or approach to any religion, for that matter. But I think it is going a little too far for Mr. Herzog to call the prophet Isaiah "a son of my people". His people? No doubt—and I hope he is a good Jew—Mr. Herzog is a fundamentalist, at least he gives us that impression. But where does he come from? Is he, or are his ancestors from our area, from Palestine? Look at him. He is a Khazar, descended from those who embraced Judaism eight centuries after Christ, and he has the temerity to call Isaiah, who lived in my part of the world, a son of his people. Mr. Herzog belongs to the hierarchy, which started with Herzl, that launched the idea of a State for the Jews because they allegedly were persecuted in Europe. That was after the Dreyfus affair. Their ancestors had never laid eyes on Palestine.

224. None other than Mr. Eban—who, I believe, is descended from the Khazars—from this very podium told us time and again "God gave us Palestine". I was patient with this repetition until my patience was spent and I had to ask him, "Since when has God been in the real estate business, Mr. Eban, to give you Palestine?". "We are the chosen people of God". And since when has God been a discriminator, when we are fighting discrimination? Has he forgotten what King David said? We call him in Arabic the prophet David. King David said: "For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof".

225. Then if you are a fundamentalist, Mr. Herzog, I have brought this Holy Bible, which contains the Old Testament and the New Testament, but I shall not quote anything from the New Testament because it may not be relevant to your argumentation. If you are a fundamentalist you will be judged by the text of the Old Testament, of which I am a humble student, with all due regard to your Jewishness. I shall quote three verses from Exodus:

"Thou shalt neither vex a stranger, nor oppress him: for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.

"Ye shall not afflict any widow, or fatherless child.

"If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto me, I will surely hear their cry;" [*Exodus 22:21-23*].

226. How did you treat the stranger, Mr. Herzog, and those who came before you in the 1920s, and later, in Palestine? Did you treat them, as a fundamentalist, as God prescribes?

227. Then we turn to Micah, one of my favourite prophets of the Old Testament. Although Micah is called a minor prophet, he has the truth in what he says, and I am quoting from the Old Testament:

"Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old?" [*Micah 6:6*].

Parenthetically, this is what the ancients did to propitiate the gods, even before the idea of a single God.

"Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" [*Ibid. 7*].

That is what Abraham tried to do, and before Abraham the Canaanites and others, who tried to propitiate the gods sometimes by killing their first born, so that the gods might send them rain when there was drought. The quotation continues:

"He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" [*Ibid. 8*].

Have those Eastern and Central European Khazars, who were converted to Judaism, acted in the spirit of Micah? Have they acted according to the letter of the Bible? What have they done with the stranger? Have they treated him well? In their case the stranger is none other than the Palestinian. Many Palestinians were Jews, and some, having become disenchanted with the Pharisees, the fundamentalists of those days, followed the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth and became Christians. Then, during the Byzantine era, they became disenchanted with Byzantium, where religion, Christian religion, was used as a means to a political end.

228. In the seventh century a new religion—Islam—came into that part of the world, and they embraced it. Many of them are the original Jews of the area.

229. Here comes Mr. Herzog, whose ancestors hail from the northern tier of Asia and who calls Isaiah a son of his people. What has he left for us in the area? What a travesty of the truth.

230. But that is not all. I come to Moses who I, as a student of the Bible, submit was a Hammite. He was from Egypt. It was none other than he who said "Thou shalt not kill" and "Thou shalt not steal". Kill? Those Khazars killed the Palestinians who originally were Jews. Steal? They robbed the Palestinians of their homeland. Moses also said "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour". "And if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot." Did those fundamentalists follow the Mosaic law recently when 37 or so poor Jews were killed by disgruntled Palestinians from Lebanon whose acts neither I nor anyone else would attempt to justify? They were frustrated and went into Palestine. Did the Jews take a tooth for a tooth? Most of those who suffered were probably Khazars but, whatever they were, they were human beings. In Lebanon, the Jews even used certain bombs that killed everybody.

231. A tooth for a tooth? Mr. Herzog, for every tooth you took perhaps 500 teeth, for every eye perhaps 500 eyes, and for every life perhaps 200 lives. I do not know the exact figures, I am not a statistician. Are you a fundamentalist? Not even as a fundamentalist have you been living up to the tenets of the noble religion of Judaism. Do not fool yourself; you cannot fool us. I feel sorry for you because I still think you are a human being. Perhaps you are a father.

232. Here we are striving to avoid wars, but you impose on us vigilance and armaments. Why? Because God gave you Palestine? What about the people who lived there? It was their land. Some of them were Jews. The Canaanites were there before the Jews. Our Jews came from Ur of the Chaldees, which is western Mesopotamia, Iraq today. When there was a dearth of crops or something like that they marched down to the land of Canaan. I do not want to encumber the Assembly with the details of chapter 34 of Genesis which records that the sons of Jacob slew all the people in a little town because, as alleged in the Bible, the son of the King had defiled their sister Dinah. The King said, "My son... is in love with Dinah. Come, let us settle it among ourselves". Those sons of Jacob did not tell him. They were not all bad—maybe a few of them were—even if they sold their brother Joseph and then took his shirt, smeared it with blood, and told poor Jacob that his son had been eaten by a wolf or something. In fact, they had sold him into slavery.

233. People are people whether they are our Jews, our Canaanites, our Amorites or you Khazars. But we are living in a century when we can no longer afford platitudes, slogans and the use of religion for a political end, as has been done since the days of the Crusades. Urban II said to the people in 1087, when there was a dearth of crops in Europe and when what you would call nationalism was surging in the breasts of the people there: "Why are you here fighting one another? Go to the Holy Land and wrest the Holy Sepulchre"—meaning the grave of Christ—"from the hands of the infidel". Who was the infidel? Was it the people of Palestine who believed in Christ, whether Moslem or Christian? In the Koran, Christ is of the spirit of God. Then, in fairness to the Christians, when the Moslems gained supremacy, some of the Arab caliphs, being human, wanted to spread their supremacy over those Moslems who were not Semitic. They tried and they failed, and now it is the turn of the Khazars of Eastern Europe, whose ancestors never saw Palestine. They say that God gave them Palestine and that they are the chosen people of God. They say that they lost 6 million people during the war. What about Hiroshima and Nagasaki? The killing of either Jews or gentiles is deplorable, but war is war and at least Hitler did not kill people wholesale, as in the cases of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, nor as in Dresden when it was destroyed overnight. The Germans and the Russians do not cry any more. We cried with the Jews when they lost their people in Europe. After all, they were human beings. We do not look at a man's religion or his ethnic origin, and that applies even more so here in the United Nations. But you throw mud at us because we are trying to be prepared to defend ourselves.

234. Many of you have written or said that if the Zionists are cornered they will repeat what happened in Massada: they will commit suicide and bring the world down with them. Is that a sane way to solve problems? But when you say that, and you toy with the idea of having atomic bombs; you ask us to be placid and not be concerned that a great Power is behind you—not out of love for your Jewish eyes but because it thinks it can use you in the area as an excuse to interfere.

235. The major Powers have no business to create

spheres of influence, but they still do. I shall have occasion to speak on this subject on 7 June, so I do not want to give you a preview of what I will say, although I have been talking on disarmament here for the last 30 years or so.

236. Therefore, for heaven's sake, Mr. Herzog, we do not hate you; we do not malign you; we do not curse you; we do not say you are a liar. If you are a true fundamentalist, we do not judge you. You will be judged by that book from which I read a few excerpts.

237. Mr. Herzog, wherever you may be, "Walk humbly with thy Lord", as Micah said. Love mercy and do justice, and do not exact 100 teeth for one tooth, or 100 lives for one life. It is sad that you should act like that.

238. We are, against our will, expending money for self-defence. I happened not to be here when you delivered your speech, Mr. Herzog: I was busy with a gentleman whom I have known for a long time, none other than Lord Noel-Baker, when you were speaking, but I did have an opportunity to read a copy of your speech later. In it you insinuated that we are preparing in order to destroy you. Why should we destroy you? You will destroy yourselves. Do you want to live in Palestine, truly imbued with religious sentiment? As I have been telling the Zionists since the 1930s—and I was on speaking terms with them until 1944—: "If you want to live imbued with religious sentiment, the Palestinians will open the doors of Palestine to you, because it is a land of pilgrimage and a land of tourism."

239. No, you wanted to wrest it from the indigenous people of Palestine. Remember that Jerusalem—Uru Salim—existed 1,000 years before Joshua stormed Jericho. They are all Semitic people—tribal people. They killed one another. This book is full of tragedies; it reflects how people behaved. But now we are behaving worse than in the days of the Old Testament.

240. Do not fool yourself, Mr. Herzog: there is no future for you and the people who believe that they are the chosen people of God, unless you adapt and adjust yourselves to the customs and traditions. If you are Semites, the people with whom you are living are Semites. There is no such thing as "Jewish blood", no such thing as "Arab blood". There is no such thing as "Moslem blood" or "Christian blood". There are cultures, traditions and customs. I have known many Jews who were as English or as French as any Englishman or Frenchman. You want to gather them in Palestine to create a people out of religion. This was tried and it did not work. We are living in the twentieth century. We may destroy ourselves if we allow religion or ideology to be used as a motivation for political ends.

241. Awake if you want to survive. If you want to bring down the world with you, you cannot do that. And you throw mud at Saudi Arabia because it is buying some defensive arms? Why do you not curse from this podium the country that is selling it the arms? Do you not dare, or is it Khazar duplicity? Tell us. You go and connive there in Washington and everywhere else, and your lobbyists

brainwash and sometimes purchase some—what shall I call them?—senators or congressmen, or whoever they are. Seventy-two at one time, two years ago, toed the line of Israel. But the people are awakening; they are saying: "Good Lord, let Israel live, but we want to live too. We are being taxed in this country"—meaning the host country, the United States. "They want aid, aid, aid." At least, we pay for those arms with which to defend ourselves.

242. Why are you impoverishing your people? I feel sorry for the Jews. The Jews are human beings, like everybody else. Who am I to pump wisdom into you? What are you doing? You cannot go on like that.

243. I do not want to abuse the time of this Assembly. All I want to say to the Jews is that I do not consider them enemies. I consider them, like anybody else, brothers in humanity. For heaven's sake, you Zionists, wake up. You cannot win in the long run; you will be assimilated. What is wrong with assimilation? If not assimilated, you will keep the tension going on. But people will get fed up finally. Even the Americans will get fed up. I think they are already starting to get fed up with you. And I do not want you to become a scapegoat as you did in Europe. I will be the first to defend you if you do become a scapegoat, because, as I said, you are brothers in humanity. Save yourselves and save the world, and believe not in any "-ism" except humanism, the brotherhood of man.

244. Mr. BADAWI (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I am not speaking to exercise my traditional right of reply, as nothing that the representative of Israel said is worthy of objective response, and I will not allow myself to sink to the level of engaging in personal quarrels. However, there are certain things that must be made clear.

245. First of all, lies cannot defeat the truth. The truth is that, in spite of the fact that the representative of Israel has constantly denied that his country is co-operating with South Africa in military matters and above all in the field of nuclear weapons, it suffices for me to refer to the reports of the Special Committee Against *Apartheid*, to numerous United Nations documents and to the General Assembly resolutions that have been adopted condemning that co-operation, branding it as a threat to international peace and security.

246. Secondly, Israel has the largest military arsenal in the Middle East. It has established an enormous arms industry and has even become a weapons-exporting country.

247. Thirdly, Israel claims that it accepts the idea of the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. That is in contradiction with its position of the past few years, because it is the only country that has not approved the resolution on this matter; and proof of its negative position is its refusal to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. That means that it refuses control over its institutions and national activities.

248. Fourthly, the region needs to concentrate all its resources on development. However, the situation prevailing in the region and the threat from Israel facing the countries of the region leads those countries to arm themselves.

249. Fifthly, and lastly, we do not change our policies; we do not change our principles. We are endeavouring to reach a just peace, and that can be done by putting an end to aggression and restoring their rights to the Palestinian people.

*The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.*