

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TENTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



17th
PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 5 June 1978,
at 4.05 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

*Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the
expenses of the United Nations (concluded)*

1. The PRESIDENT: Members will recall that at the first plenary meeting on 23 May 1978, I invited the attention of the General Assembly to the information provided by the Secretary-General regarding the Member States that were in arrears in the payment of their financial contributions to the United Nations within the terms of Article 19 of the Charter. I have now been informed by the Secretary-General that a remittance in the necessary amount has been made by one additional Member. The Secretary-General's letter has been circulated in document A/S-10/16/Add.1

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (continued)*

2. The PRESIDENT: This afternoon the General Assembly will first hear an address by the President of the Republic of Senegal.

[The speaker continued in English.]

3. I have the honour to welcome His Excellency Mr. Léopold Sédar Senghor and to invite him to address the General Assembly.

4. Mr. SENGHOR (*interpretation from French*): In deciding to convene this special session of the General Assembly devoted to the distressing problem of disarmament, the United Nations has clearly confirmed its mission as the main instrument in the fight for the restoration and maintenance of peace in the world.

5. To be sure, since the League of Nations mankind, which has experienced the terror of two of the greatest catastrophes ever known to the world, the First and Second World Wars, has been raising the question of the future of human civilization, so fearful, paradoxically, are the achievements of the human intellect and, for that matter, of man himself. It is no accident that the third-world countries have been calling for more than 10 years now for a discussion of the problem here.

6. Despite the delay in convening this session, it constitutes for the 4 billion men and women of the world a hope for the future, a future which will only be possible if peace and friendship exist among peoples. That presupposes reciprocal aid and support among all countries, which is the natural result of the interdependence of nations.

* Resumed from the 1st meeting.

7. Mr. President, the fact that a citizen of your country is the President of this session is no coincidence. Indeed, since the end of the Second World War, Yugoslavia has presented to the world the image of a peace-loving people devoted to freedom and of a militant supporter of universal peace and justice. This stand taken by Yugoslavia is illustrated by its dynamic membership of the non-aligned movement, which has ever since its creation been fighting for peace and the independence of peoples.

8. I should like to seize this opportunity to pay a tribute to your country and to Marshal Tito, President of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia, for their constant efforts in the cause of the triumph of the ideals of peace, friendship and international co-operation.

9. I should also like to pay my respects to Mr. Waldheim, Secretary-General of the United Nations. Sensitive to the problems of the third world, it is his sense of humanity combined with his lucidity which makes him so effective.

10. This special session should be the opportunity for the United Nations to examine ways and means of defining an active policy of disarmament, peace and co-operation among nations.

11. That is at least the wish of my country, Senegal, which, ever since it became a sovereign nation, has been pursuing a policy of international relations based on co-operation with all peoples which, whatever their ideology, are fighting for peace among nations.

12. Our foreign policy is, in the final analysis, only the reflection of our domestic policy, based as it is on democracy and socialism; it is a policy which aims at establishing within the Senegalese nation a régime of freedom and social justice. My country, in spite of its scanty resources, those of a developing country, is thus combining its efforts with those of the international community in order to settle armed conflicts. We consider peace as the *sine qua non* of development.

13. That is why today I wish to draw the attention of this august Assembly to the dangers posed to human civilization by the arms race at a time when we are witnessing a decline year after year in the very inadequate efforts of the developed countries to support the action of the proletarian peoples towards their economic and social development.

14. The comparison I am about to make of military expenditures with development assistance should help to draw the attention of the Assembly to the dangers of the

competition between the developed nations for the acquisition and sale of the most sophisticated and deadly weapons. I shall refer to figures provided by the specialized agencies of the United Nations, particularly the World Bank, which have undertaken studies on this particular question.

15. The third world, which today is the theatre of conflicts between the highly industrialized countries and has been since the Second World War, has a keen appreciation of the danger represented by the continuous swelling of military budgets of developed countries in contrast with the equally continuous reduction of the resources which they devote to development assistance to the third world.

16. This threat is something which my country has realized ever since it became independent. That is why military appropriations in our budget have barely amounted to 15 per cent of our total budgetary expenditure, while we devote 30 per cent to education, instruction and culture, that is to say, to the training of men capable of taking responsibility for the development of our people. This does not prevent us from having a good army, as is illustrated by the request for Senegalese soldiers to undertake peace missions addressed to us three times by the Secretary-General.

17. If we take 1976 as the base year, the industrialized countries allocated to assistance to developing countries \$13.7 thousand million and \$249,105 million to education, while in the same period the seven largest Powers in the world allocated \$272 thousand million to their armed forces. These figures speak for themselves.

18. And that, despite discussions on disarmament, amounts to methodical and persevering preparations for a third world war, which would succeed in annihilating human civilization by the holocaust that it would bring in its train. *Homo sapiens* in this context emerges as his own worst enemy and the effective agent of his own destruction.

19. As members are aware, the United Nations—in the general sense of the term—asked the developed countries several years ago to devote 1 per cent of their gross national product to development assistance to the third world. In the face of the reluctance of these Powers, this percentage was lowered to 0.70 per cent. Specialized international bodies, like the World Bank and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and also the conference of the North-South dialogue, have noted that this target of 0.70 per cent was very far from having been attained.

20. They noted, together with all the developing countries, that this assistance was in fact tending to decline. Indeed, it went from 0.36 per cent of the gross national product to 0.33 per cent between 1975 and 1976, while the gross national product of the countries members of the Committee for Aid to Development went up in the same period of time by about 9 per cent. In the course of this time, the super-Powers—the United States of America and the USSR, whose military expenditures represent 85 per cent of the world total—have been devoting to devel-

opment assistance 0.25 per cent and 0.04 per cent of their gross national products respectively.

21. It is therefore apparent from the above that arms expenditures are continuously increasing while development assistance is just as consistently going down. In the final analysis, military expenditures in the world represent today about \$400 thousand million a year, while development assistance amounts to less than \$14 thousand million. The amounts devoted to armaments are twice as high as those allocated to education and health.

22. Along with the enormous responsibilities of the industrial countries, the paradox is that the third-world countries themselves are promoting and maintaining the arms race instead of meeting the needs of their peoples by using their scanty resources for development. In the West African subregion, to which my country belongs, States, with just a few exceptions including Senegal, are earmarking from 20 to 33 per cent of their budgets to preparing for war.

23. Hence one often sees countries considered among the poorest in the world acquiring sophisticated weapons which cost far too much in comparison with what they can afford. This causes them to switch from priority tasks such as implementation of an agricultural policy consistent with the food needs of their populations. One country will have rockets while its peasants do not even have the chance to use selected seeds or proper ploughs and have barely enough mineral fertilizers. Another will have modern fighter planes, while its people are decimated by everyday diseases because the most common medicines are lacking or because there are too few doctors.

24. Naturally, frequent reference is made to the need to defend oneself against external aggression, when it is not a case indeed of having to face an internal situation of chronic instability. It is true that a careful examination of the problem does reveal that the paradoxical progress of the developing countries often enough derives from causes which lie outside the sovereignty of the States concerned. They have, indeed, to face up to armed conflicts often created, encouraged and maintained by Powers outside the continent concerned, and this is a way of involving the whole of mankind in the arms race.

25. This special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has aroused throughout the world a mixture of hope and distress, particularly on the African continent where, since 1975, seven wars have broken out, on that continent which for the three and a half centuries of the slave trade saw the greatest act of genocide in history.

26. Indeed, some three thousand millions of people in the third world are hoping that this session will produce practical decisions which will confirm the will of the international community, and first and foremost of the industrial Powers, to do everything possible to establish peace among nations by general gradual and controlled disarmament. The vast expenditures which have hitherto been allocated to armaments should finally be devoted to financing the development of the poorest peoples.

27. The distress of the third-world countries lies in the fact that in the area of war and peace, and particularly that of armaments, they have so little influence. They would like to be able to contribute to the successful conclusion of a general agreement to ensure global, methodical and controlled disarmament of our planet which so rightly yearns for peace and co-operation.

28. As stated by the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim:

“This unprecedented special session of the General Assembly is the largest, most representative meeting ever convened to consider the problem of disarmament. [1st meeting, para. 36.]

29. Members will have noted for several years now that many agreements, bilateral and multilateral, have been concluded on arms control, but those agreements have not made it possible to curb the insensate arms race, so that mankind every day sees that it is hanging by a thread, because it can be destroyed as a result of the slightest technical error which may bring about a holocaust.

30. I shall cite a few more figures, in order better to bring home the danger. More than 400,000 scientists and research workers are being used in the war industry. For lack of other techniques to fuel so-called civilian nuclear reactors, the production of plutonium will be enough by the year 2000 to make possible each year the manufacture of several thousand bombs.

31. The most recent invention in the armaments field, the neutron bomb, constitutes for peace in the world one further reason why we must define new relations among all nations for the sake of our survival.

32. Hence we—the third-world countries—must in turn make constructive proposals for general, progressive and controlled disarmament. I myself shall make three such proposals.

33. The first is that, after an in-depth but rapid study, the United Nations should declare certain countries and parts of the world non-nuclear zones. These would be developing countries which are relevant in terms of assistance to the third world. The whole of Africa would therefore be non-nuclear, including the South African Republic, which would then itself be de-nuclearized, for it possesses the secret of the atomic bomb and with its *apartheid* régime it constitutes precisely a nuclear threat in itself.

34. My second proposal concerns control. We have to create a specialized agency of the United Nations with the task of monitoring, along with stockpiles, the manufacture of weapons of all kinds not only on our planet earth, but also in space. That control and monitoring would be carried out by satellites and by all other appropriate means.

35. My third and last proposal, but by no means the least important, seeks to establish a tax on armaments which would affect all States without exception or, more precisely, a tax on their budgets for war, for equipment and operations, no matter what they call it. That tax would

amount to 5 per cent of the budget and would be paid to the United Nations to be used solely for assistance to developing countries. If my calculations are correct, it would be in the order of \$20 thousand million a year.

36. I should like to say in conclusion that this special session is a wager on the future of the world. Indeed, it constitutes for mankind the opportunity we have all hoped for, to examine finally, with objectivity and the necessary attention, the tragic problem of the arms race throughout the world.

37. While evaluating the insensate expenditures devoted to armaments, we must also compare them with the pitances devoted to development assistance to the third world, in spite of the two Development Decades which have been declared by the United Nations.

38. It is in the light of that comparison that the international community will come to understand in all its dimensions the paradox which has afflicted it for so many years. Some countries, developed or poor, make it their primary task to arm themselves, when this option requires colossal resources, to the detriment of the work of satisfying the elementary needs of the peoples, which are left out of account.

39. My country, faithful to its democratic traditions of peace and justice, remains convinced that mankind is still capable of saving itself. But for that, after having come to understand the constant threat overhanging it, mankind must determine ways and means most likely to be effective in bringing about general, progressive and controlled disarmament. That is the only way open to it, if it wishes to prepare for a more human future. Because, as Karl Marx said, generic activity, that is to say the most human of human activities, consists not in destruction or in killing, but in bringing into being through the creation of works of beauty.

40. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the General Assembly, I thank His Excellency the President of the Republic of Senegal for the important statement that he has just made.

[*The speaker continued in English.*]

41. The next speaker is the Prime Minister of Greece. I have great pleasure in welcoming His Excellency Mr. Constantine Karamanlis, and in inviting him to address the General Assembly.

42. Mr. KARAMANLIS (Greece)¹: Mr. President, I should like to say how happy I am to see you, a distinguished statesman from a country linked with Greece by traditional ties of friendship, presiding over this special session of the General Assembly. I am also glad to have this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Secretary-General, Mr. Waldheim, both for the way he is carrying out his high duties and for the successful preparation of the present session.

¹ Mr. Karamanlis spoke in Greek. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

43. We decided to convene this special session to discuss the question of disarmament, a question closely related to the two major problems that mankind is confronted with: the safeguarding of peace and the fight against human misery. For it is well known that the arms race not only unavoidably leads to international conflicts but also deprives humanity of the material means to conquer hunger and disease the world over.

44. Though international statistics cannot give the full picture, it is certain that humanity spends each year about \$400 thousand million on armaments. This means that if we managed to reduce the expenditure on weapons progressively by 10 per cent or 15 per cent a year, the world would have at its disposal \$40 to \$60 thousand million annually to cure the wounds which plague mankind, and the developing nations in particular.

45. No nation, free from unhealthy influences, desires war. This is natural because, as Herodotus said, in war parents bury their children, while in peace children bury their parents. In spite of the above, and contrary to common sense, it has not been possible to ostracize war from international life. On the morrow of the last war—a war, as it was said, to end all wars—a discussion was initiated aimed at the adoption of measures which would prevent a new disaster. Disarmament was considered the first and foremost of these measures. Thirty-two years have passed since then, and not only has there been no reduction but, on the contrary, armaments have increased tenfold.

46. It is necessary, therefore, to admit frankly that our endeavours in this field have not met with success. With the same frankness we must seek the reasons for this failure. Only if we are fully aware of the deeper causes of our failure shall we have some hope of arriving some day at a positive result.

47. It is, however, obvious that our failure is due to the lack of good faith and sometimes to mutual distrust. But it is also due to the fact that man's political thought, in contrast to science and technology, has remained static. Reading Thucydides, one has a full picture of the present international situation, and reading Plato, one may have an over-all view of the political problems every country faces today. We must, therefore, at some point conceive these problems in a new way related to the conditions of our times, if we really intend to solve them.

48. It is said that in the League of Nations, Briand, speaking on the subject of disarmament and security, said that the difficulty lay in distinguishing between cause and effect.

49. My personal opinion is that security comes first—because it is certain that no one decides to disarm unless he first has a feeling of security, just as it is also certain that peace cannot be safeguarded solely by the restriction of armaments, for war can be waged with either many or few weapons. Therefore, if we want to arrive some day at the solution of the problem of disarmament, we must first come to a much more advanced form of organization of the international community, a form of organization that alone can rid us of fear, mistrust and prejudice, which constitute the main obstacles to general disarmament.

50. For us to arrive at such an advanced organization of international society we must ensure the following indispensable prerequisites: first, respect from all for the principles of the Charter and for the decisions of the United Nations; and, secondly, the capacity of the Organization to enforce those decisions through sanctions.

51. That is why we should strengthen the means and the powers of the United Nations. That is all the more necessary as, in recent years, we have been witnessing a regression in observance of the rules of international behaviour. The erosion of the rules that we ourselves have set, the cynical disregard of the resolutions of the Organization and the violence and arbitrariness inspired by a sickly chauvinism give a picture of international incoherence and lead to the conclusion that without bold measures we cannot expect the betterment of international life. Consequently, only within the framework of an international community which is inspired by the lofty principles of the Charter and which applies them can we consolidate the feeling of security, promote disarmament and ensure peace, thus fulfilling the permanent quest of our peoples.

52. For all those reasons we must, at the very least, make a determined effort during the present special session of the General Assembly to set the foundations of a new start. It is certainly not realistic to expect the radical changes in institutions and mentality which could instantly produce the developments previously described. None the less we must undertake the effort needed to promote the objectives of the special session in a serious and responsible way.

53. At this session the Assembly already has before it many documents on which to work. Without wishing at this stage to enter into details, I should like to state in general terms the position that my country will take during this special session.

54. First, with regard to the principles, we firmly support general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. Such disarmament must be universal and include both nuclear and conventional weapons. It must also be carried out everywhere at the same time.

55. With that objective in mind, we must begin by awarding priority to the limitation of the arms race, both nuclear and conventional; it is, as I have repeatedly stressed, a race which increases the existing imbalance of forces and constitutes a senseless waste of the economic resources of the world.

56. Of course the procedures to be applied must not imperil the security of any particular country, and the legitimate right of self-defence of each and every nation should not be put in jeopardy. For a serious discussion on disarmament to be initiated it is absolutely necessary for the peoples of the world to gain full confidence in the system of collective security. That means that we must have the particular kind of political will that would allow us to guide international relations in the path of international legality.

57. Greece, firmly devoted to the principles and ideals of

the Charter which constitute the foundation of its foreign policy, believes in the need for strengthening international procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes not only in regard to disarmament but also to the maintenance of international peace and security. Consequently, Greece will support all proposals aimed at strengthening international judicial procedures for the settlement of disputes, as well as those aimed at the activation of all the provisions of the Charter, including those of Chapter VII.

58. Secondly, as for the programme of action, the measures to be adopted must be specific and effective so that we can attain the final goal of disarmament in stages but without delays and in a balanced way.

59. It is well known that the pace of the arms race is set by the production of the most advanced weapons which, in the present case, are the nuclear ones. None the less, we believe that the issue of conventional weapons must be examined simultaneously—for the more the balance of terror makes a nuclear conflict unlikely, the more a war with conventional weapons becomes probable. That is shown by the fact that since the end of the Second World War dozens of local wars have taken place, among them the invasion of Cyprus, whose tragedy unfortunately still continues—and it continues because the resolutions of this Organization have repeatedly not been enforced.

60. Needless to say, the efforts for the termination of the nuclear arms race and the initiation of the procedures for the limitation of those arms must be speeded up. In this spirit we hope that the United States and the Soviet Union will be able to conclude a comprehensive agreement on the limitation of strategic arms as soon as possible. We hope also for an early conclusion of an agreement on a total ban on nuclear arms.

61. Further, we support the accession by all States to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII)*, *annex*], because that constitutes a basic precondition for a more extended reduction of armaments. But it is essential that the nuclear States should give adequate guarantees to the non-nuclear ones—not only for the safety of the latter but also for non-nuclear States to be able to have access to the technology which is necessary for the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. This is very important for the economies of all countries and especially of the developing ones, which lack other sources of energy. We interpret the non-proliferation Treaty, to which we are a party, in the light of such considerations.

62. It is natural that within such a context of disarmament efforts, strict and effective control of disarmament constitutes a fundamental element guaranteeing that States will faithfully carry out the obligations which they have undertaken.

63. Thirdly, with reference to the mechanism of disarmament, we believe that the United Nations must play a more important and active role in the efforts to find solutions to the problem and to create a framework within which the international community will discuss, negotiate and carry out the decisions concerning disarmament.

64. In spite of the worthy efforts of existing institutions, and especially of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, these institutions do not seem entirely to meet the challenge, considering the magnitude and the importance that the problem has now assumed. We must, therefore, approach with great care the suggestions on the mechanisms to which the thoughts and proposals of the President of the French Republic [*3rd meeting*] offer an extremely useful framework. Our objective must be to ensure the co-operation of all States in this matter in order to extend the basis on which the discussions will take place as much as possible. Later we must examine whether we shall proceed further to other special sessions of the General Assembly or to a world conference on disarmament, as has been suggested.

65. Special care must also be given to the study of the methods by which the resources which are saved by arms limitations will be collected and channelled wherever the most pressing human needs exist, especially in developing countries. On this question too the proposals submitted by France should receive our undivided attention.

66. At this historic moment of the universal effort for disarmament, my country will follow these general principles which will define its attitude during the work of this session. They are principles consistent with our general approach to international problems. Devoted to the Charter of the United Nations and to the peaceful procedures for the settlement of international disputes, we would wish to see the international community make a leap forward at this special session. Doubtless, disarmament is one of the main goals of the United Nations. Now that the United Nations is nearing the end of the great effort for the abolition of colonialism, the new important goals appearing before us and towards which we must turn our full attention are the strengthening of international peace and security and the progress of peoples within the framework of a new economic order. Progress in disarmament unquestionably means progress in both the other two important fields. To this endeavour my country will contribute with all its strength.

67. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of Greece for the important statement he has just made.

Mr. Anwar Sani (Indonesia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

68. Mr. MEDANI (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We are grateful once again to see Mr. Mojsov guiding the affairs of this extremely important special session devoted to disarmament. His outstanding performance during the thirty-second session of the General Assembly last year, the skill and dedication he demonstrated through the two special sessions on Namibia and Lebanon, his wealth of experience in international affairs and the affairs of the United Nations convince us that he will guide our present deliberations with the same high distinction and sense of responsibility and wisdom.

69. We meet here at this special session to consider one of the most serious problems confronting the contemporary

world today, a problem which constitutes a direct threat to the very survival of mankind and which poses an immediate menace to the international peace and security of the whole world. Despite the deep concern shown by the international community during the last three decades at the acuteness of the problem of the arms race, the situation remains grave and is indeed darker and gloomier than before.

70. In the past the super-Powers competed in stockpiling traditional and crude nuclear weapons of low operational efficiency. Now the race is mainly for the development and production of new sophisticated nuclear weapons with high military operational capabilities. The international community is left with the fear that any serious armed conflict involving the super-Powers would inevitably lead to a nuclear holocaust and subsequently to the complete destruction of life on our planet.

71. The elimination of the threat of wars and armed conflicts is the main and most urgent task facing the world today. The only guarantee of the implementation of that task is the achievement of general and complete disarmament. That is why we believe that this special session devoted to disarmament can be a major step towards freeing the world from the threat of war and the burden of armaments.

72. This is the first time in the history of the United Nations that a world-wide special session has been convened to cope with this crucial problem of disarmament and my delegation looks to its outcome with great hope and expectations. It is our duty to make it clear that we are not interested in "stockpiling" resolutions. We must see to it that whatever agreement emerges from this special session must be effective and extensively implemented.

73. As reflected in the working paper submitted by the non-aligned group of countries to the Preparatory Committee of this special session [A/S. 10/1, vol. IV, document A/AC.1187/55/Add.1], the outlawing of nuclear war, the reversing of the nuclear-arms race and the progressive reduction of nuclear weapons until they are totally eliminated have highest priority among such measures. High priority must also be given to disarmament measures relating to all types of weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons and incendiary and other conventional weapons with especially inhuman effects.

74. My delegation strongly believes in the dissolution of military blocs and great-Power alliances and pacts, the dismantling of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of military forces from foreign countries. We also believe in the absolute necessity for the creation of zones of peace and, where appropriate, of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

75. In this respect the Sudan has repeatedly announced its firm support of all resolutions adopted by the United Nations and the non-aligned countries which call for the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We have also stressed the need for the immediate establishment of a zone of peace in Africa, an action that would, above all, lead to the elimination of all foreign influence in the area and thus reduce the tension and the threat of war

on that continent. Sudan has spared no effort, in co-ordination with all other parties genuinely interested in the stability of the region, in crystallizing the concept of Red Sea security. In line with the need to keep the Red Sea as a lake of peace, the Sudan has always acted in such a way as to secure the elimination and eradication of all great-Power rivalry and foreign strategical competition in the area. Furthermore, the Sudan considers that international peace and security and the settlement of international conflicts without resort to force are of crucial importance for our endeavours to achieve the economic and social development of our area. Therefore it is quite natural that the peoples of this area should condemn and reject any interference in their affairs.

76. All of us here are aware of the simple fact that the problems of the arms race and disarmament can in no way be separated from the problems of international development, the uneven distribution and allocation of international resources, the unfair economic relations between the rich and the poor and the need to achieve a new and fair international economic order. We are also aware of the simple fact that there is an urgent and immediate need to divert the resources now utilized for the acceleration of the arms race to socio-economic development, especially among the developing countries of the third world. Since 1945 over 100 wars, civil and international, have erupted, some with casualties exceeding 2 million people. Yet beyond this violence there is a tragedy of even greater extent and dimensions—it arises out of the violence of starvation and malnutrition, which accounts for the death of at least 20 million people annually.

77. I cannot fail to compare this with the fact that for a number of years now the world has been diverting about \$400 thousand million annually for armaments; at least 5 or 6 per cent of the total world output of goods and services is diverted to military ends; about 70 per cent of all arms purchases are accounted for by the third-world countries. A considerable number of those countries spend more on military activities than they spend on agricultural investments. This happens despite the fact that millions of people in the third world subsist on diets far below minimal needs, that the physical and mental development of a large proportion of infants is inhibited and that severe famine and floods occur annually in certain regions, creating serious crises for mankind.

78. In only a few years from now the world will be facing a very dangerous and merciless problem related to the food crisis, in view of the expected shortage of food resources as compared to the disproportionate increase in the size of the world population. If we listened to the voice of reason and our consciences and allocated only a small proportion of our expenditure on armaments and the accumulation of weapons to investment in countries with great agricultural and livestock potential we would spare our world the agony of sacrificing millions as victims of starvation and malnutrition.

79. That is why my delegation strongly believes that serious action must be taken to combat the problem of the arms race for, while the concept of the new international economic order stresses the need for more justice as be-

tween rich and poor, enormous quantities of human and material resources are still diverted from development to military purposes.

80. Before I conclude, I must say again that we are not interested only in the adoption of resolutions; what is imperative is the genuine and effective implementation of those resolutions. We are glad that all of us here recognize the fact that our world is confronted with an unprecedented threat of self-destruction because of the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced on earth, and that it is our responsibility to put an end to that horrifying nightmare. In shouldering such a heavy and urgent responsibility we must ensure that appropriate machinery for the supervision, follow-up and implementation of resolutions is set up and is sufficiently strong and efficient to operate effectively.

81. In this respect we believe in the necessity of establishing a comprehensive programme of disarmament measures which would lead eventually to the attainment of general and complete disarmament. All States must observe strictly the principle of the non-use of force or the threat of force against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of other States. Here my delegation expresses the absolute bitterness it feels at the terrible fact that racist and aggressive countries such as Israel and South Africa have gained access to nuclear weapons, since this constitutes the utmost threat to the peace and security of the whole world. In this connexion, we believe also that the implementation of disarmament measures should be facilitated by the speeding up of the resolution of outstanding problems and disputes—such as the questions of South Africa, Zimbabwe, Namibia and the Middle East—using all possible and appropriate means, including the application of the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter.

82. The problem under consideration is of a most complicated nature and most serious and acute dimensions. Let us spare no effort to cope effectively with it.

83. Mr. MOTEE'A (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The meeting of the special session devoted to disarmament under the wise leadership of Mr. Mojsov has a very special meaning, for the call for the convening of this special session emanated from the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Belgrade in 1961. Yugoslavia is one of the founders of the non-aligned movement. It was also among the first voices raised calling for a halt to the arms race which obstructs the march of mankind towards progress and prosperity.

84. Ever since the emergence of States, war has been a constant feature of the history of mankind. So much so, that it can be said that conditions of peace were no more than intermittent periods of peace amid a long history of armed conflicts which inflicted destruction and havoc. Moreover, technical and economic advances in all fields have led to the further development of the war machines of all States. The sophistication of weapons systems has now reached such proportions that it threatens the very existence of mankind itself. Thus, the multiplication of modern

conventional weapons, their increased accuracy and the advent of atomic and nuclear armaments of all types have become a threat to all peoples and all countries, including those States which produce these destructive nuclear weapons.

85. In the face of this great development in the arms industry and in the means of nuclear destruction, two options are open to mankind: either total destruction for all, or peaceful coexistence and peaceful opposition, confidence-building and the non-use of force for the settlement of disputes. Peaceful coexistence can only be strengthened by a serious commitment to observe the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, to respect international custom and law, to ensure the right of all peoples to freedom and independence, and to respect the right of all States to full national sovereignty.

86. While peaceful coexistence is the prerequisite for avoiding the risk of war and destruction and for reducing the tensions that prevailed during the cold war period, the policy of international détente which is constantly called for by the Soviet Union is also an important step on the road to confidence-building and co-operation among all nations in order to achieve disarmament and to solve its complex problems. International détente, which must be strengthened and deepened to cover all the regions of the world and to go beyond a narrow military framework, has opened wide prospects for a constructive dialogue between the major nuclear Powers and has led directly to the reduction of tension in Europe. It has also enabled the current negotiations on the limitation and codification of the nuclear arms race to be conducted. Despite the fact that the production of new weapons in the arms race such as radiological weapons and fragmentation and cluster weapons, has not come to a halt, the policy of détente has acquired a new dimension with the reduction of tension and the creation of a more favourable climate for the continuation of negotiations and consultations. This special session is clear evidence of the interest of all peoples and the participation of all countries in working together in order to create confidence and to eliminate all the obstacles that impede the convening of an international disarmament conference at which to achieve our lofty objective, namely general and complete disarmament and a lasting peace.

87. However, there are important factors impeding progress towards the strengthening and deepening of détente and the achievement of disarmament. Those factors are the very same ones that have always led to a policy of war and threatened international peace and security. What are those factors?

88. First, the imperialist policy which was the cause of the First and Second World Wars still continues, though in different forms. It is a policy based on force and leads inevitably to an arms race. The continuation of that policy is clear from open, colonialist intervention in the affairs of many developing countries, especially countries in Africa, and from the feverish imperialist and colonialist action to reverse the movement of history by resisting national liberation movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The same policy is also evident from the hopeless efforts being

made to deny the right of peoples to self-determination, independence and national sovereignty.

89. Secondly, the world imperialist system, led by the United States, which is constantly losing ground with the elimination of the traditional forms of imperialism, has become today more ferocious and aggressive. With diminishing markets and sources of raw material which are the mainstay of the world capitalist system, the large capitalist companies have turned their activities towards the production of arms and the arms industry. Their vital interests are closely linked with those activities. Thus those reactionary circles work hand in hand to kindle international tension, to create false security problems and to try to rekindle the cold war. The same sort of activity is evident again in Pentagon circles and among warmongers. Those circles continue war as a means of protecting their own economic interests. Such an attitude cannot but obstruct efforts made towards the achievement of disarmament and the strengthening of international peace and security.

90. Thirdly, pockets of tension in the world, especially in the Middle East and in South Africa, increase the risk of war through the conventional and nuclear arms race. The two racist régimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria have accumulated huge military arsenals. In addition to acquiring and manufacturing conventional weapons, they seek to acquire nuclear weapons and to threaten the peace and security of the nations of the region. Through their bilateral co-operation and the support of imperialist circles, the military industry in Israel has become the backbone of the Israeli economy, an economy which is based on a policy of war, of aggression and the arms race.

91. Fourthly, while the arms race constitutes a threat to peace and security and increases the risk of war, the wide gap which separates the developing countries from the industrial capitalist countries is also a reason for concern. The same gap increases the risk of war. History shows that wide economic disparities, whether inside a nation or between nations, usually lead to conflict and war.

92. Therefore, our efforts at achieving disarmament and destroying arms stockpiles should go hand in hand with our efforts at creating a new international economic order that guarantees equality among States and that could lead ultimately to the narrowing of that economic gap and to prosperity for all.

93. The Government and people of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen supports all current negotiations and all practical steps directed towards nuclear disarmament. We hope that these negotiations will go beyond the presentation of mere proposals on limiting the increase and the sophistication of weapons and nuclear warheads. It is imperative that objective steps be taken to ensure the adherence of all to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Serious efforts should also be undertaken to prohibit the manufacture and use of chemical, bacteriological and other weapons of mass destruction, in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

94. All these aspects require bold political decisions to

be taken, in spite of the voices of the warmongers and reactionaries, who exercise pressures and buy votes in order to push the world to the very brink.

95. The victory of the heroic people of Viet Nam over American imperialism has led to changes in the methods used by the imperialists in order to protect their interests and to fight progressive régimes. Instead of open intervention, which is condemned by world public opinion, imperialism has resorted lately to using its agents in what is usually called the third world. Sometimes the imperialists push this or that State to interfere militarily in the domestic affairs of another country on their behalf, but this intervention takes place under their supervision with their financing and their weapons. These intermediaries employed by the imperialists use their arms in order to fight the progressive régimes and to interfere in their domestic affairs.

96. Talk about nuclear disarmament should not lead us to disregard the major risks resulting from the improvement in conventional weapons, whether quantitative or qualitative. These conventional weapons find their way to some developing countries and are used against national liberation movements and against States that follow a policy against imperialism, reaction and exploitation. The imperialist policy by proxy is the same imperialist policy as before, except that the form is different. We condemn this policy, whatever may be its form.

97. Therefore, we support all resolutions calling for the creation of demilitarized zones. We should dismantle all aggressive bases whose existence threatens security and peace. Accordingly, we attach special importance to the creation of a zone of peace and a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Indian Ocean. We also hold that the Indian Ocean region should be free of any military bases, whether American or of their agents in the region. We condemn the presence of such military bases as that of Diego García, as well as any other military bases in the Indian Ocean and in the Arabian Gulf.

98. Finally, we hope that the work of this session will be successful and that prospects will be strengthened for the convening of an international conference on disarmament in which all States can participate on an equal footing.

99. Mr. KANTE (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): Everyone will remember that it was the movement of non-aligned countries which first proposed the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, at a time when the world was on the brink of total war. That bold initiative was the object of one of the major resolutions adopted at the first Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in 1961 at Belgrade, the capital of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, worthily represented here by Mr. Mojssov.

100. It was an impossible dream at the time. We were in the midst of the cold war and just on the eve of a serious crisis in the Caribbean.

101. The recommendation, however, was to be taken up and formally proposed 15 years later at the Fifth Confer-

ence of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries which was held in August 1976 at Colombo. The General Assembly, at its thirty-second session, endorsed this idea on 21 December 1976 by adopting resolution 31/189 B, pursuant to which this international body in which we are meeting now was convened to discuss world disarmament.

102. The brilliant election of Mr. Mojsov to the presidency of this tenth special session of the General Assembly does honour to all the member States of our movement. By this choice, the international community has wished to pay a tribute to his merits and his exceptional qualities, which were demonstrated during the thirty-second regular session of the General Assembly and during the eighth and ninth special sessions over which he presided with such distinction and such competence. It is the pleasant duty of my delegation on this happy occasion to offer its warm congratulations to him.

103. Disarmament was the focus of concern in the international community well before the Second World War because of the development of weapons of mass destruction. The late League of Nations attacked the problem without success. The stockpiling of weapons could not fail to involve mankind in the most murderous and most cruel war in history. The United Nations, which was established on the smouldering embers of that tragic conflagration, could not but learn a lesson from the serious shortcomings of the late League of Nations, which had led the world to the very brink. That is why it has made the preservation and maintenance of international peace and security one of its principal objectives.

104. The United Nations has not been content with simply stating a principle. As a primary task it expressly attributed to the General Assembly, in Article 11, paragraph 1, of the Charter, its main deliberating and decision-taking organ, the study of "the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments".

105. Article 47, paragraph 1, of the Charter further stresses the link between disarmament on the one hand and the maintenance of international peace and security on the other.

106. It is clear that the coming of the nuclear era, the development and deployment of weapons of mass destruction, have introduced a new dimension into disarmament which has become an essential factor in the maintenance and preservation of peace in the world.

107. The lengthy crusade of the United Nations against the arms race has been marked by two major stages. The first, which we may regard as the preparatory or organizational period, was begun by the unanimous adoption on 24 January 1946 by the General Assembly of the resolution establishing a committee responsible for making recommendations on the prohibition of atomic weapons and weapons of mass destruction. That decision was one of the earliest steps taken by the main deliberating body of the

United Nations. The second stage, in our view, was represented by the adoption on 20 November 1959 by the General Assembly of resolution 1378 (XIV), which warns Governments of Member States about the arms race and invites them actively to co-operate in general and complete disarmament. The mid-point was marked by the proclamation on 16 December 1969 at the twenty-fourth session of the Disarmament Decade [*resolution 2602 E (XXIV)*]. That is the operational period which is still in force today.

108. As we can see, the convening of the tenth special session of the General Assembly which has brought us together at this time is the outcome of a long series of events. It is the result of more than 30 years of sustained effort. We owe it above all to the pressure brought to bear by peoples who finally realized the serious threat to mankind constituted by the development, stockpiling and deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

109. The tenth special session devoted to disarmament is being held less than 18 months before the end of the United Nations Disarmament Decade. It could not come at a better time for evaluating what has already been done by the international community in its crusade against the development and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, during this special session we must take stock of our joint action towards disarmament and possibly contemplate a readjustment or a rebalancing of our strategy.

110. In striving to make an assessment of the situation throughout the world 33 years after the adoption of the first resolution of the General Assembly, which was the beginning of the international campaign for disarmament, we note that throughout the period under consideration the development and proliferation of weapons has been mind-boggling.

111. Indeed new generations of weapons have been developed and deployed. Their destructive capacity follows the upward curve of their development. Rockets with multiple independently targetable nuclear warheads together with missiles that are hard to intercept have joined the arsenal. The neutron bomb or the "N bomb", a fearsome weapon which can destroy all human life within a two-kilometre radius, has just been developed. The development of vectors, conventional weapons of mass destruction and chemical biological and radiological weapons has escalated both in quantity and quality and such development is frenetically pursued. In the name of the so-called "forward defence" doctrine atomic submarines and warships stand guard, if not prowl, around continents, a long way from their States' frontiers. The post-neutron era of weaponry is already envisaged. Studies have been undertaken to develop the reduced residual radiation bomb, the "RRR bomb" whose accuracy of aim is about 10 metres after a trajectory of 13,000 kilometres. Research on multiple independently targetable nuclear warheads, whose course can be changed at the end of their flight, is fairly advanced.

112. After the development of anti-satellite satellites, which is at a fairly advanced stage, space warfare will soon be within the realm of man's possibilities.

113. The miniaturization of nuclear payloads is going on at the same time, which led one man of science reputed throughout the world to say that before the year 2000 a nuclear bomb capable of destroying a whole city will be able to be carried on a man's back or be put in a luggage locker.

114. Meteorological and "apocalyptic" wars from now on are no longer mere visions. In economic terms, world military expenditure in 1977 amounted to \$400 thousand million, in other words 30 times the total amount of official assistance to the developing countries. This has more than doubled during the disarmament Decade, and therein lies the paradox! The armaments industry employs over 50 million people all over the world. The amounts set aside for military research are four times higher than those for medical research; throughout the world one scientist in four is engaged in such research.

115. One can assess the enormous wastage involved from the fact that the eradication of smallpox throughout the world cost the World Health Organization \$83 million, in other words, less than the cost of a strategic bomber, and that its malaria control campaign, whose estimated cost was \$450 million or the third of the cost of a nuclear submarine, cannot get off the ground because of a lack of funds.

116. The enormous human and material resources attributed to the arms race are a loss to the world economy. The development and proliferation of weapons are to the detriment of the welfare of humanity. The link between disarmament and development is therefore unquestionable. The United Nations affirmed this from the beginning, and quite rightly so, in Article 26 of the Charter, its fundamental code of law.

117. As we have just seen despite détente, the arms race has accelerated over the last 30 years. The nuclear club has grown. In this respect the acquiring by racist South Africa and Israel of nuclear capacity through their co-operation with some NATO Powers is a serious threat for Africa and the Middle East, regions which the United Nations is preparing to proclaim denuclearized zones.

118. The first of these, in other words the racist State of South Africa, was caught out in August 1977 while preparing for a nuclear test in the Kalahari Desert in Namibia, a territory under United Nations trusteeship. The second, Israel, according to reliable sources already has nuclear weapons. And you will certainly understand that the overwhelming assumptions hanging over that State since the disappearance in 1968 from Babcock and Wilcox's plant at Apollo, in the United States, of more than half a ton of enriched uranium are not likely to reassure us.

119. With regard to vertical proliferation, it is now so highly refined that it is increasingly difficult even for specialists to draw the dividing line between tactical and strategic weapons.

120. Mankind is living on a powder keg, haunted by the spectre of self-destruction. May we know against which

possible enemies these monstrous arsenals, which can destroy our world three or four times over, have been established by the major nuclear Powers? Therein lies the absurdity of the arms race. Indeed, the defence of national territory and the safeguarding of States' security could in no way justify this over-arming. Only a race for military supremacy can explain it, supremacy which in any case can be no more than highly precarious because of the law of going one better, which the nuclear Powers have established as the rule of the game.

121. That is precisely why the arms race has accelerated, wiping out at the same time the effects of the limited arrangements and agreements concluded to check this unfortunate trend. I am thinking now in particular of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the agreements on the banning of nuclear tests in some environments, the Convention on the Prohibition on Developing, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and the two series of negotiations on strategic arms limitation.

122. Despite their merits, we must recognize that they deal more with a limitation of arms rather than disarmament as such. These agreements and arrangements in fact are merely partial measures designed only to stabilize the balance of forces between the two blocs, in other words, management of "the balance of terror".

123. Such an approach, in the final analysis, can only, in the end, lead to the maintenance of the *status quo*, while the nuclear arsenals deployed throughout the world can, as I said, annihilate mankind three or four times over. These partial limitations do not free the world from the risk of total war.

124. When two thirds of mankind are suffering from hunger and disease, when the world economy is undergoing an unprecedented recession, when unemployment is rampant throughout the world and when desperate actions caused by frustration are spreading, disarmament is an imperative. The enormous material and human resources which disarmament would release would allow us to rid society of the scourges from which it suffers and to establish the new international economic order as the basis for the world of peace, justice and progress to which we all aspire.

125. Disarmament by stages is surely the most realistic approach. We must not deceive ourselves, for a world without weapons, which is our ultimate objective, will not come to pass tomorrow, by reason of the fact that a situation of uncertainty will continue to prevail for some time on our planet. We must begin by freeing the world and mankind of the nightmare of self-destruction by putting an end to the nuclear arms race, that is to say, the development, manufacture and improvement of nuclear weapons. This has already been recommended in article VI of the non-proliferation Treaty.

126. It goes without saying that such a commitment means the cessation of all nuclear tests in all environments and respect for denuclearized zones. These preliminary

measures must be supplemented by the prohibition of chemical and incendiary weapons. The reduction and then the dismantling of nuclear arsenals would be contemplated as the second stage.

127. However, effective disarmament can be conceived only in a climate of security and confidence. Hence we must work towards healthier international relations in a spirit of collective responsibility. This implies, first, scrupulous respect for the sovereignty of States, including their right to take their own decisions and to choose their allies; secondly, non-interference in the internal affairs of States; thirdly, renouncing outdated doctrines of "strategic frontiers", "forward defence" and "protective screens" and the dismantling of death-dealing foreign military bases located throughout the world; fourthly, recourse to peaceful means for the settlement of disputes which may arise between States and renouncing the use or threat of force in international relations; fifthly, the just settlement of armed conflicts threatening peace throughout the world—and I am thinking here in particular of Israeli aggression against the Arab nation and the racial wars persisting in southern Africa because of the existence of the minority racist régime of Pretoria and the rebel Salisbury régime; and, sixthly, the consolidation and development of détente. In a word, what is asked of us is to go back to the source—the ethics prescribed in the United Nations Charter.

128. True peace is incompatible with the survival of colonialism and racism. It will above all be necessary for us not to create and manage crises but to eliminate them by a just settlement. In this respect my delegation cannot but state here its concerns, in view of attempts made by Powers outside Africa "to rid Africa of bloc rivalries". Such initiatives would, in our opinion, run the risk of plunging this continent into a second cold war—a cold war that has already begun—and make it the stake in that war. That is why His Excellency President Moussa Traore, the Head of State of Mali, on 24 May last stated at Bamako: "The problems of security in Africa cannot and must not be dealt with otherwise than in a bilateral framework or in an exclusively African framework." Only strict respect for the principle of "Africa for the Africans" can save the continent from confrontation and disturbances.

129. After this slight digression, which has its own importance because its purpose concerns peace and international security, I should like to come back to the subject before us to say that the promotion of disarmament requires the establishment of a deliberative organ and of negotiating machinery.

130. Since disarmament is the business of all States, the General Assembly of the United Nations is the body most fitted to assume the role of the deliberative organ. It would thus be informed of developments in all bilateral and multilateral negotiations held outside the United Nations. The negotiating machinery, that is, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, must come under it. It is of course understood that the structure and the procedures of this body should be revised, made more democratic and adapted to developments throughout the world in order to permit the active participation in its work of all nuclear Powers.

131. In conclusion, the whole of mankind is looking towards this historic tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Let us hope that the unanimity in condemning the arms race voiced in the general statements will be reflected in the major decisions which we are to take at the conclusion of our work.

132. We would thus be responding to the legitimate aspirations of our peoples and thereby contributing to the establishment in the world of true peace based on collective responsibility.

133. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply.

134. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia): At the 13th meeting, the Ethiopian Minister for Foreign Affairs spoke of aggression that he attributed to others, including my own country. In the question to which he referred, Ethiopia is the real aggressor.

135. The notion that the Somali liberation forces are the aggressors, as alleged by Ethiopia, is quite fantastic. The Front is seeking to liberate its own territory and not to infringe on the territorial integrity of metropolitan Ethiopia and it has no objectives with regard to the sovereignty or political independence of Ethiopia.

136. There are no grounds for even implying Somali aggression. A person cannot claim theft unless he was in lawful possession of the object which he alleges was taken from him. In like manner, to claim aggression is possible only for a group whose lawful possession of territory has come under attack. In the Somali territory colonized by Ethiopia, only the indigenous Somalis are the lawful possessors. The Ethiopian presence, coupled over the years with the ruthless suppression of all political, economic, social and cultural activities and with increasing violations of the internationally guaranteed human rights both individual and collective of the indigenous inhabitants, in particular the suppression of the right to self-determination, should indeed be viewed as a cumulative act of aggression against the people of the territory.

137. Significantly, the General Assembly's resolution 3314 (XXIX) on the definition of aggression, in its preamble, reaffirms the provisions of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States and the provisions of the Charter [*resolution 2625 (XXV), annex*], thus incorporating by reference the right to self-determination. In addition, that preamble reaffirms the duty of States not to use armed force to deprive peoples of their right to self-determination, freedom and independence or to disrupt territorial integrity.

138. Article 7 of the Definition of Aggression states:

"Nothing in this Definition, and in particular article 3, could in any way prejudice the right to self-determination, freedom and independence, as derived from the Charter, of peoples forcibly deprived of that right and referred to in the Declaration on Principles of

International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter. . . , particularly peoples under colonial and racist régimes or other forms of alien domination; nor the right of these peoples to struggle to that end and to seek and receive support, in accordance with the principles of the Charter. . . .

This article is particularly ecumenical in its conception of the kind of subjugation that violates the right to self-determination—namely, subjugation by “colonial and racist régimes or other forms of alien domination”. Ethiopia fulfils all three conditions.

139. In the circumstances, the inhabitants have risen up in a war of self-determination and national liberation against the colonial aggressor and, having done so, they have the right to seek help from the international community.

140. Among others, the Somali Democratic Republic renders assistance to the Liberation Front not only because of its international obligations but also because, as everyone with human feelings understands, of the very special and inextricable relationship between the Somalis of the Republic and those of western Somalia or the Ogaden. Not only have they blood and family ties, but their economy, way of life, culture and sentiments are absolutely identical. The truth is that everything which happens to the people of the Ogaden directly affects the life of those in the Republic, a fact that everyone appreciates, Ethiopia above all. This stems from a situation described by Lord Rennel of Rodd in his war-time account of the British military administration of occupied territories in Africa:

“The country and the population of Somalis (Italian Somaliland) together with Ogaden and British Somaliland are more a geographical and ethnological whole than any other large areas in Africa. The boundaries of British Somaliland with Somalia proper and with the Ogaden, and the boundary which formally existed between Somalia and the Ogaden, are entirely artificial: they bear no relation to geography or ethnology. The Somali tribes in the course of their seasonal migrations habitually range across their boundaries which, in the last fifty years, have caused them political trouble and economic hardship.”²

141. As the imaginary provisional administrative line constituting the *de facto* border has no bearing on the life of the inhabitants on either side, the fact that Ethiopia claims illegal sovereignty and keeps military garrisons in the territory has no legal effect under international law. Another fundamental aspect of the Somali case, and which is utterly unique in the context of African politics, is the absence of legal borders between Ethiopia and Somalia.

142. In the exercise of their internationally recognized right, the Liberation Front wages a just struggle against the colonial oppressors and asks for outside assistance. Need-

less to say, the Somali Democratic Republic is in duty bound to render them moral, political and material assistance. Therefore it is a gross violation of language and the basic conceptions of international law to conceive of indigenous people, fighting in their own territory against the alien who colonizes them, as “aggressors”. It is, of course, the alien who is the aggressor and the indigenous people who are engaged in lawful self-defence and self-determination. It is equally preposterous to call the Somali assistance to the Somalis under Ethiopian rule an “aggression, spurred . . . by an array of imperialist and reactionary forces and spearheaded by expansionist Somalia”. [A/S-10/PV.13, para. 44.]

143. Indeed, it is an irony that Ethiopia should accuse others of imperialism and expansionism. Of course, everybody knows that one of the characteristic features of a colonial Power is to look for scapegoats, in an attempt to evade the issue when confronted with situations of liberation struggle. Understandably in the case of Western Somalia, the Somali Democratic Republic is the obvious choice of a scapegoat.

144. But how about Eritrea? Who is the scapegoat aggressor there? The Liberation Movement, or the United Nations? Of course not. The real aggressors are the Ethiopians and their allies. The only culprit here is Ethiopia, whose expansionist policy is on a collision course with international law and human decency. It was by a decision of this General Assembly [resolution 390 (V)] that Eritrea was federated to Ethiopia which accepted the federation, supposedly in good faith. Unfortunately, Ethiopia, faithful to its own peculiarly colonial ambitions and with utter disregard of the world Organization and its Charter and of its own solemn undertaking, as well as the fundamental rights of the Eritrean people, proceeded to dismiss the legal Eritrean Government, dissolve the Parliament, imprison its leaders and forcefully annex the territory whose inhabitants had no other alternative but to resort to armed struggle. In all honesty, the United Nations should assume full responsibility for that territory, just as it did in the case of Namibia, for both Ethiopia and South Africa are illegally occupying African territories associated to them by acts of the international community in good faith and trust.

145. The same bad faith on the part of Ethiopia is also manifested in the case of Western Somalia. Though not binding on the Somali people, who were the only ones affected by that agreement, none the less the colonial agreement which Ethiopia concluded with Britain assured respect for the Somalis who, in Menelik's own words: “... shall be well treated and have orderly government ... and are thus not losers by this transfer of sovereignty.”

146. The Anglo-Ethiopian agreement of 1954, in which the last vestige of Somali territory was transferred to Ethiopia, reaffirmed that agreement. In addition, it provided for the continued functioning in the areas to be given to Ethiopia of tribal authorities and tribal police as “set up and recognized by the British Government” and “the tribal organization shall have the responsibility of maintaining law and order among the tribes.”

² *British Military Administration of Occupied Territories in Africa*, London, Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1948, p. 150.

147. Ethiopia did not comply with those provisions to the satisfaction of its treaty partners, but the British Government formally completed them a year later, in 1955. On 17 November 1955, the Secretary of State for Colonial Affairs said in the House of Commons: "Many of the actions of the Ethiopian authorities proved to be neither in accord with the letter nor the spirit of the agreement." Britain even tried to buy back those territories for the Somalis, but Haile Selassie refused.

148. In an effort to suppress the legitimate struggle of the Liberation Movement in the territories under its colonial domination, Ethiopia has called in foreign troops. But I am afraid that in the process Ethiopia itself has lost its independence. Only an independent and democratic Ethiopia could appreciate the fundamental rights of peoples to self-determination and independence. The present régime is vigorously engaged in the suppression of those rights, not only in the occupied territories but also in Ethiopia itself.

149. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): I very much regret having to speak once again today. It was not the desire of my delegation to waste the time of this Assembly by engaging in sterile polemics with the Somali delegation. However, much as my delegation would like to avoid it, we are dragged into it again.

150. The main problem between Somalia and its neighbours revolves around one point, and that is the lust of the Somali Government for other people's land. That lust has not only blinded it to reality and to the obligations it had assumed under the Charter, but it has also, as one writer put it, "led Somali leaders to suffer from a group fantasy, a complex that is incompatible with reality". It is that malady, I am afraid—the irrational pursuit of an irrational end—which fortunately is properly understood today by the world community and which constitutes the major reason for tension in the Horn of Africa.

151. The root cause of the problem between Somalia and its neighbours is none other than the expansionist ambition of successive Somali Governments. The crux of the problem is therefore not the presence or absence of foreign military personnel in the region, but rather Somalia's obsession with territorial aggrandizement at the expense of its neighbours. What else can it be? For many years, Somali representatives from this rostrum have declared time and again how deeply indebted they were and how proud they were to have founded a deep and sincere friendship, among others, with the peoples and Governments of Cuba and the USSR. Cuba and the Soviet Union would have been praised by Somalia today had they complied with their obsession for "Greater Somalia" and its blatant aggression. Since they did not, it now labels them enemies of the African continent.

152. For Somalia, there seems to be no friendship, no gratitude. There is only its dream of Greater Somalia. We are perplexed to hear the Somali representative state that the presence of foreign troops constitutes an obstacle to a peaceful solution to the problem of the Horn as sought by the Organization of African Unity (OAU). When will Somalia stop paying lip service to the principles of the char-

ters of the OAU and the United Nations? If nothing else, Somalia should be honest with itself.

153. As everyone knows it was Somalia that decided to solve its problems outside the context of the charters of the OAU and the United Nations and to launch aggression. The OAU tried to persuade Somali leaders to abide by the charters and to give up war as a means of solving problems. Somalia rejected those appeals, violated the cardinal principles of the charters of both the OAU and the United Nations, trampled underfoot General Assembly decisions which, *inter alia*, prohibit States using force against the territorial integrity and political independence of other States, and attempted in vain to annex part of an independent territory. For the benefit of the Somali delegation, I reiterate that Ethiopia is a nation unequivocally committed to respect the principles enshrined in the charters of both the OAU and the United Nations.

154. The Somali delegation has, as is usual for it, referred to a matter falling within Ethiopia's sovereign prerogatives, and has delved into the question of Eritrea and the Ogaden. Suffice it to say that Eritrea is not only an integral part of Ethiopia but is the cradle of its civilization. We advise the Somali delegation to take some time to read the history of Ethiopia and the records of the United Nations. Perhaps it will then make some sense in exercising its right of reply in future.

155. As for the question of the Ogaden, the Somali delegation should bear in mind one thing—that the people of the Ogaden did not sell their land sitting under acacia trees in forms A and B, but rather fought side by side with their brethren from other parts of Ethiopia when their freedom and independence were put in jeopardy. It is this blood, shed in common with that of fellow Ethiopians for freedom and independence, that sets the people of the Ogaden apart from the people of Somalia.

156. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia): I wish to confine myself to points of relevance and of use to the Assembly. So that all may benefit from a better understanding, I think that it is proper to present a few facts.

157. Ethiopia occupies Western Somalia through a secret agreement it entered into with the Europeans and through conquest. The Europeans, especially the British, transferred the territory to Ethiopia, despite protectorate agreements between the representatives of Somalia and Britain prohibiting the transfer of such territories. The particular agreement of relevance is that which Britain concluded with the people of the Ogaden in 1896. A year later Britain concluded a treaty with Ethiopia ceding large portions of Somali territory to Ethiopia. Both Ethiopia and Britain agreed that the Somali people who came under their respective areas of influence would be well treated. The Ethiopian history in the territory is well known. Somalis could not divine what had happened. They did not know about the secret agreements. As Mr. I. M. Lewis wrote in his treatise *The Modern History of Somaliland*:

"It was not until 1934, when an Anglo-Ethiopian boundary commission attempted to demarcate the boundary, that British-protected Somalia became aware of what had happened, and expressed their sense of out-

rage in disturbances which cost one of the commissioners his life."³

A year later Italy, together with Abyssinia, occupied the Ogaden and, as a natural course of action, put the Ogaden under the administration of its Somaliland. And when it briefly occupied British Somaliland during the Second World War, it put that territory under the same administration.

158. After Italy's defeat, Britain naturally did the same, and even long after it restored Haile Selassie's throne in metropolitan Abyssinia it kept the Ogaden and the British and Italian Somalilands under one administration. In an effort to redress the injustice done, Britain proposed to the Council of Ministers of the Paris Peace Conference of 1946 a union of the Somalis. The British Foreign Secretary said:

"In the latter part of the last century, the Horn of Africa was divided between Great Britain, France and Italy. At about the same time as we occupied our parts, the Ethiopians occupied an inland area... In all innocence, therefore, we proposed that British Somaliland, Italian Somaliland and the adjacent part of Ethiopia, if Ethiopia agreed, should be lumped together as a Trust territory, so that the nomads should lead their frugal existence with the least possible hindrance, and there might be a real chance of a decent economic life, as understood in that territory."

159. The political exigencies of the time were different. We were approaching the Cold War. The proposal failed. Britain retained its protectorate and Italy went back to its Somaliland as a Trustee. In 1948 and 1954 Britain handed over the Ogaden to Ethiopia. The Ethiopian entry into the territory occasioned violence and destruction. As *The Times* of London wrote at the time: "Individual tribesmen have been brutally treated (it is not possible to describe the intensely painful and humiliating torture) and Ethiopian police have subsequently attacked the tribal women. Young Somali men were castrated; that was an old Ethiopian practice."

160. As a matter of law and fact, all these colonial agreements are null and void, because they presumed an authority which the Somalis had never given to any Government. In so far as these agreements are null and void, Ethiopia's colonial claim has no legal basis. The Somalis never gave any agreement.

161. Mr. X's title to property which he has purchased from Mr. Y is only as good as Mr. Y's title to that property. Mr. Y's title, in turn, is only as good as the title of Mr. Z, from whom he acquired it. The territory always belonged to the people, and in a colonial situation the only way to dispose of a territory is through the process of self-determination. There is no other way.

162. The 1948 and 1954 transfers of Western Somalia, effected after the adoption of the United Nations Charter and the proclamation of the doctrine of the right to self-determination as a key international norm, were clearly unlawful and immoral. The law on this matter is very clear. The colonial agreements on which Ethiopia purports to base its title over Western Somalia are invalid and not binding on the Somalis. The continued Ethiopian presence in the territory is a violation of their human rights.

163. The fundamental question here is whether human beings historically tied to their land are to be viewed as no more than property to be bought or transferred at will by some more powerful State, or whether those human beings are to be accepted as agents of their own destiny. The international legal answer to that question is utterly and unequivocally clear: the right to decolonization and self-determination is a peremptory and fundamental norm in contemporary international law. Of course the international political answer has been more equivocal, often reflecting the short-term interests of the more powerful States of the world.

164. This God-given right to self-determination is available to all peoples, regardless of their colour or creed.

165. Resolution 1514 (XV), adopted by the General Assembly in 1960, takes a very functional and practical approach to the problem; it speaks of colonialism in "all its forms and manifestations". It does not make any distinction on grounds of who is the subjugated or the subjugator.

166. An important factor, explicitly stated in resolution 1541 (XV) adopted on the next day and which identifies for the international community what constitutes a Non-Self-Governing Territory, is that: "*Prima facie* there is an obligation to transmit information in respect of a territory which is geographically separate and is distinct ethnically and/or culturally from the country administering it." In the case of Western Somalia, their country is geographically distinct from Ethiopia. They do not speak the same language; they do not have the same ideals. They are ethnically different, they are culturally different and they are linguistically different. In the circumstances, the Territory certainly falls within the category of territories designated in Article 73 of the Charter. Ethiopia therefore has an obligation to decolonize the country and to provide information to the international community about it.

167. The Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations takes the same approach to the problem. It refers to alien subjugation, as follows: "and bearing in mind that subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a violation of the principle, as well as a denial of . . . human rights, and is contrary to the Charter." That right is that of the Somali people. Theirs is functionally a colonial situation: they are geographically and ethnically distinct; it is very clear that they are distinct from the people of metropolitan Ethiopia.

168. The representative of Ethiopia spoke of Somalia's

³ *The Modern History of Somaliland*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, p. 61.

praising the Soviet Union and Cuba. Yes, indeed, we had the most wonderful and intimate relations with the Soviet Union and Cuba. But at that time the Soviet Union and Cuba were not bent on subjugating African peoples. They were not bent on military adventurism. They were not embarked on subjugating other peoples. They were on the right side then. Of course it is not Somalia which has changed; it is those countries that saw fit to change their policies. Ours is a question of principle. At that time did the Soviet Union or Cuba occupy any African territory? Did they kill any African population? No, not at the time when we were good friends.

169. The representative of Ethiopia speaks of the Somali dream and of Somalia's territorial ambition. I should like to challenge him to come to this rostrum and tell the Assembly how the Ethiopians acquired the territory. Was it because the people wanted them to do so? No. Was it because the international community sanctioned it? No. It

was done through colonial arrangements. They are not the people of Ethiopia; they are not Ethiopians. Ethiopia cannot subjugate them for ever; it can only delay the process.

170. Somalia will always render all possible assistance to the liberation fronts in the world, and first and foremost to the liberation front of Somalia.

171. I should like to conclude by saying: let us hope that Ethiopia will come to its senses, that it will come to negotiate in a way consistent with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Organization of African Unity, with a view to solving the problem by peaceful means and permitting the people to exercise their God-given right as human beings.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.