



President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. KUSUMAATMADJA (Indonesia): It was in 1961, during the first conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade, that the first initiative was taken towards convening a special session of the General Assembly devoted to the problems of disarmament. It is, therefore, a happy coincidence that this special session has now entrusted to you, Mr. President, the task of guiding us in our present deliberations. Your election to this important and at the same time difficult office is indeed a source of great satisfaction to my delegation. We are confident that under your wise and experienced leadership this historic session will achieve the aims for which it was convened.

2. The role of the non-aligned movement, to which Indonesia belongs, is undoubtedly one of great importance in this special session. Not only has it been instrumental in bringing about this meeting, but it has also contributed significantly to its preparation. My delegation wishes to express its support for the ideas and proposals contained in the non-aligned working paper [A/S-10/1, vol. IV, document A/AC.187/55/Add.1]

3. For the first time in its history, the General Assembly has been convened to carry out a comprehensive evaluation of the question of disarmament, a question which, in the view of the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, "lies at the heart of the problem of international order". It is true that the United Nations has, practically since its inception, tried to deal with the problem of disarmament and arms control. However, the discussions have mostly been related to peripheral aspects of the disarmament question and the results achieved have little or insufficient practical effect. More substantive negotiations have taken place outside the United Nations or under its merely formal auspices. This special session has returned the disarmament issues to their appropriate forum and Indonesia heartily welcomes this highly significant development. It is the sincere hope of my delegation that our deliberations will not turn out to be another round of political confrontation. They should be the focal point for our endeavour to achieve broadly acceptable agreements in an atmosphere of constructive co-operation. My delegation would like to assure the Assembly of its full co-operation in the efforts to achieve that aim.

4. One of the tasks that we have set ourselves in this special session is to:

"Review and [evaluate] the present international situation in the light of the pressing need to achieve substantial progress in the field of disarmament, the continuation of the arms race and the close interrelationship between disarmament, international peace and security and economic development." [*Ibid.*, vol. I, para. 17.]

5. The present international situation is characterized, regrettably but undeniably so, by a continuing arms race. The annual world military expenditure has reached almost \$400 thousand million and the result is the accumulation of stockpiles with an unprecedented destructive capacity. The number of nuclear warheads in the possession of the principal nuclear Powers has risen from 3,700 in 1970 to some 12,000, and their explosive power is equal to that of 1.3 million bombs of the type dropped on Hiroshima. The number of so-called tactical nuclear weapons is almost four times larger. The constant qualitative development of weapons and equipment, characteristic of the arms race in recent years, stimulates vicious competition, especially in nuclear weapons and delivery systems. It is very important to note that no less than 10 per cent of the total outlay in military expenditures goes to research and development for the purpose of increasing the destructive capability of existing arms and the development of new and more powerful weapon systems. If this process is allowed to continue, it will have disastrous effects upon disarmament.

6. Efforts have been undertaken to stem the arms race, as a result of which a number of agreements have been reached for the limitation and control of armaments. During the last 20 years a number of bilateral and multilateral agreements have been concluded with the aim of reducing the risk of inadvertent nuclear attack.

7. Indonesia does not in any way deny the importance of the results achieved so far, as these agreements have in some way contributed to the creation of a better climate of understanding. They have, however, not succeeded in slowing down the arms race. They have failed to generate concrete measures aimed at genuine disarmament in areas of vital military significance.

8. Total disarmament would be possible in a perfect world. As we are living in a less-than-perfect world it is necessary to lower our sights and to be content with the second-best solution. Bared to its essentials, the problem of disarmament or the arms race comprises three fundamental aspects: first, the spiritual, cultural or motivational

aspects, secondly, the physical or mechanical aspects, and, thirdly, the spatial aspects of the problem.

9. It is striking, if not symbolic of the limitation of our role as statesmen and diplomats, that this special session is concerned mainly, if not only, with the physical and spatial aspects of the problems, leaving the examination of the real causes of human conflict unattended. We are thus in a way skirting the real or fundamental issues of the resolution of human conflicts.

10. If we examine the various international instruments or agreements dealing with the easing of international tension and conflict, the Helsinki Agreement¹ appears to be the only one dealing also with the non-physical aspects of the problem.

11. Our task being restricted, first, to the reduction of arms or the physical means of conflict and, secondly, to the spatial aspects of disarmament, let us take stock of these problems and the various ways we have dealt with them.

12. In our present efforts the highest priority must of necessity be given to nuclear disarmament. If limitation of conventional arms is not given the emphasis it perhaps deserves, the matter is, given the recognition of the legitimate right of self-defence, not as pressing as the case of nuclear disarmament, simply because of the immense destructive power of nuclear arms.

13. With regard to nuclear weapons, maximum efforts should be made to reach agreements on measures leading to halting the production of such weapons and the progressive reduction of existing arsenals, including delivery vehicles, until total nuclear disarmament has been achieved. There is no denying that the strategic arms limitation talks constitute an important undertaking within the framework of nuclear disarmament. We realize, however, that under the 1972 agreements,² the super-Powers set high ceilings on the deployment of launchers and sites, which have been rapidly increasing and are now approaching the agreed ceilings. While the agreements have had some positive effects, it is important not to forget their serious inadequacies with regard to the limitation and reduction of strategic arms. The agreements as a whole, therefore, have had no discernible impact on the efforts at meaningful arms reduction measures, as the ceilings set in those agreements have tended to become floors at the same time.

14. Another question which deserves our serious attention is the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, since continuation of such tests constitutes a major threat to the future of mankind. The willingness of the nuclear Powers to halt nuclear-weapon tests will be proof of the sincerity of their commitment to the cause of disarmament. Although such an agreement should include all nuclear-weapon States and all other nations, this should not be permitted to become

an insurmountable obstacle. In this regard, Indonesia welcomes the statements of some nuclear-weapon States to the effect that they are now ready unilaterally to impose upon themselves a moratorium on nuclear-weapon testing as a step towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

15. The Government of Indonesia attaches great importance to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII)*, *annex*] and has submitted it to the Indonesian Parliament for ratification. In doing so it is our sincere hope that the nuclear Powers will comply with their obligations under article IV of the Treaty, dealing with peaceful uses of nuclear energy. It is even more urgent that the nuclear-weapon States comply with the provisions of article VI and achieve progress in nuclear disarmament. Although Indonesia recognizes the need to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, this should not in any way limit the transfer of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes that will provide the opportunity for the great majority of countries to make use of this technology for economic development.

16. As I have emphasized earlier in my intervention, it is the qualitative nuclear arms race that has a number of important consequences because of the danger it generates and because it dims the prospects for disarmament. In this context, the international community should exert every effort to reverse the arms race before it engulfs the entire globe. There is an urgent need for an agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, as called for in several resolutions of the General Assembly.

17. My delegation is aware that such an agreement is not easy to achieve. We must, however, persist, as each year of failure to achieve effective measures of nuclear arms control will result in the further development and deployment of new weapons and weapons systems, making it much more difficult to halt the arms race.

18. In the light of these developments, it is necessary to explore frankly the dangers of the continuation of the arms race and to dispel illusions that lasting peace and security can coexist with huge accumulations of means of destruction, or that economic development can go side by side with an accelerated arms race. The adoption and implementation of resolute measures for disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, have become imperative.

19. Referring now to the spatial aspect of the disarmament effort, we firmly believe that pending disarmament on a global scale, the establishment of regional zones of denuclearization or peace could be a real and significant contribution towards the attainment of the ultimate goal.

20. In this respect the results achieved so far by the countries of Latin America with the Treaty of Tlatelolco³ and their efforts to establish a regional arrangement for the limitation of conventional arms are notable achievements worthy of emulation.

¹ Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed on 1 August 1975.

² Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures with respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms.

³ Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326).

21. The continuing efforts to secure the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [resolution 2832 (XXVI)] represent another important regional initiative. It is only in recent years, in particular after the energy crisis, that the strategic importance of the Indian Ocean has come to the attention of the international community. In an area beset by manifold problems, the escalation of the military presence of the big Powers in the region can only intensify existing and potential conflicts and instability. On their part, the big military Powers should exercise the utmost restraint.

22. We fully realize that questions of regional stability and security are not entirely dependent upon the military presence or absence of the big Powers. In our view, such questions depend first and foremost on the States in the region concerned. If they can exert concerted efforts to generate a climate of co-operation and devise institutions for the peaceful resolution of disputes, the stability and security of the region will be strengthened.

23. In this context, the efforts of the Association of South-East Asian Nations may serve to illustrate the contribution which regional associations are trying to make to the achievement of these goals. The Association has been able to attain a degree of cohesion among its members by simultaneously pursuing the goals of preventing interference by external powers and containing intra-regional differences.

24. Regional disarmament is of special importance for the security of archipelagic countries like Indonesia, consisting of thousands of islands surrounded by sea, with innumerable straits and sea lanes and situated at the crossroads between two oceans and two continents. Indonesia wishes to maintain its sea for fraternal and mutually beneficial relations between all nations and for the strengthening of global peace and security. Indonesia would like, within the limits of its ability, to prevent its waters and those of the region from becoming an arena of rivalry and possible confrontation between the navies of the major military Powers in the pursuit of what they consider to be their global interests.

25. Disarmament and development are by far the most urgent problems facing the world community. It is for this reason that the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies have repeatedly stressed their importance. In the view of my delegation, success in one field will reinforce efforts in the other. Unfortunately, the partial measures of arms limitation agreed so far have not led to arms reductions or to savings in military budgets of a kind which can have significant economic implications. Proposals for actual reductions in military budgets have been adopted by the Assembly but, as we all know, they also remain to be implemented. Despite these discouraging trends, it is the duty of States to promote the attainment of both goals and to let progress towards disarmament facilitate achievement of development.

26. Failure to act in these fields may complicate and seriously worsen a number of problems currently faced by the international community. Unrestrained and continued mili-

tary expenditures on the present scale absorb resources which are necessary for development and thus divert them to non-productive purposes. Such a trend increases the already-large gap between developed and developing countries, intensifies inflationary tendencies and augments the balance-of-payments difficulties of all countries. In this manner, the huge military expenditures adversely affect the political and economic situation and thereby create an atmosphere of insecurity and instability.

27. In view of those considerations, a major breakthrough in disarmament might well facilitate development progress by releasing vast financial and human resources for development purposes and enhance the prospect of greatly increased economic assistance to developing countries, and ultimately the achievement of the new international economic order.

28. The United Nations has so far failed to play an effective role in the field of disarmament as envisaged in the Charter, owing mainly to the lack of political will on the part of its Members when it comes to the implementation of the relevant resolutions. The Organization should and could play a greater role in the effective examination of these problems and in arriving at solutions acceptable to all. In order for the United Nations to fulfil its responsibilities with regard to disarmament, my delegation is of the view that the functioning of existing organs entrusted with disarmament and their relationships to the United Nations should reflect present needs and realities. In any case, all efforts should be brought back under the aegis and responsibility of the United Nations.

29. My delegation is open-minded as to what specific organs should be revitalized, restructured or established as long as they lead to the strengthening and increased effectiveness of the United Nations role in disarmament.

30. My delegation considers that the proposal made by the President of Sri Lanka for the establishment of a world disarmament authority merits our serious attention [see 4th meeting]. Likewise, my delegation finds the ideas in the statement by the President of France [3rd meeting] to be of great interest, particularly as they would result in the increased effectiveness and democratization of the organs entrusted with disarmament, with the participation of all, under the supervision of all and to the benefit of all. In this context, my delegation would like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. If this organ is to be maintained, then its structure and relationship to the United Nations must be thoroughly reviewed in order to ensure its effectiveness. My delegation is open to the possibility of substituting another body for the Conference if that can improve the effectiveness of our efforts to achieve disarmament.

31. We have arrived at a crucial point in our efforts to reach agreements in the field of disarmament and arms control. The United Nations must be the focal point of all our endeavours in this field. As far as Indonesia is concerned, it will examine all proposals with an open mind and evaluate them on the basis of whether they are likely to overcome the existing impasse. Indonesia hopes that the

members of the international community will earnestly endeavour to fulfil the aims of the Disarmament Decade through effective actions, not only by formulating a strategy for disarmament but by implementing it as well.

32. Let us hope that this special session will be able to translate the expressions of good intentions to which we have listened into agreements that are concrete and constructive, yet sufficiently realistic so that they will indeed be implemented.

33. Mr. KAMEL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure, at the outset, to congratulate you on your election to preside over this special session devoted to disarmament. Your election will provide us with the opportunity to benefit from your wisdom and wide experience and will make a positive contribution towards the achievement of our common goals. The practical results that will emanate from this special session have to do with important and basic issues which will determine the future of mankind and lead humanity to peace or war, prosperity or want, progress or underdevelopment. Your election to the presidency of the current session is also a special tribute to Yugoslavia, a pioneer in the non-aligned movement, and to the constructive and leading role it has always played in international endeavours aimed at peace, justice and progress. I take this opportunity also to express Egypt's esteem for our great friend President Tito and the friendly Yugoslav people.

34. The historic challenge to mankind inherent in the issue of war and peace makes disarmament and the halting of the arms race a basic goal in the present phase of world evolution. For this reason, the group of non-aligned countries has consistently called for general and complete disarmament and stressed the necessity of dedicating all efforts and international action—within the framework of the United Nations and in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter—to the elimination of the serious threats confronting us, threats that have arisen because the fruits of our civilization and the achievements of science and technology are being used to convert the world into an arsenal of weapons of mass destruction capable of annihilating all signs of life. All this has created a serious situation whereby the world lives at present in a state of fragile peace, fraught with danger, tension, pessimism and arms competition.

35. The non-aligned countries, headed by Egypt as a pioneer, called for a primary role to be assumed by the United Nations in the maintenance of world peace and the achievement of general and complete disarmament. This was a reflection of the philosophy and basic principles of non-alignment, principles which were crystallized and matured during an era of nuclear terror, super-Power confrontation, awesome competition in the production and development of weapons of mass destruction, extensive use of force and violation of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations—all of which contributed to the creation of unjust conditions, the continuation of which constitutes a serious threat to world peace and security.

36. The initiative of the non-aligned countries to convene the current special session stems from the unavoidable ne-

cessity of undertaking a comprehensive re-evaluation of international efforts in the field of disarmament in light of what proved to be organizational and practical shortcomings. On the one hand, the Charter of the United Nations was drafted before the world witnessed the first use of nuclear weapons. Thus, disarmament, according to the Charter concepts, was linked to the system of collective security, a system that was conceived on the assumption of co-operation on the part of the big Powers, and not on their competition and confrontation.

37. On the other hand, experience has shown that certain Powers having the most powerful means of destruction are the least active in honouring their international commitments in the field of disarmament. The limited success achieved by the United Nations disarmament machinery is an additional cause for deep concern. As a result, international efforts have been wasted on marginal issues whose scope did not involve dealing with the essence and core of the problems. Consequently, it was imperative to convene this special session.

38. The selective bilateral relaxation of tension between the two super-Powers that came to be known as *détente* is a significant feature of the 1970s. *Détente* would be meaningless if it were not translated into concrete results benefiting mankind, and if it were not to trigger international action designed to achieve what was unattainable during the "cold war". The continuation of the arms race can only endanger world peace and security. It creates a situation that makes us, the non-aligned countries, determined to exercise our legitimate right to defend our survival independently of the requirements of bilateral relations between the two super-Powers. It also makes us resolve to claim the role of a partner in the relaxation of world tension, the promotion of justice and the rule of law. Hence, our insistence that disarmament efforts take place within the framework of the United Nations, whose Charter provides the basic rules and regulations governing the behaviour of the international community.

39. In the Final Communiqué issued by the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, which met recently at Havana,⁴ those countries called for the deepening and broadening of the scope of *détente* so that it may cover all aspects of international relations in all parts of the world and thus contribute to the solution of all existing international problems with the participation of all States. This, in our opinion, would substantially contribute to the success of international efforts directed towards disarmament.

40. Foremost among the questions that consistently command attention in the field of disarmament is that of nuclear disarmament, a subject to which we attach the greatest importance. The prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the halting of their production and development, as well as the destruction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons, should be the ultimate goal of the general and complete disarmament programme to be drawn up during this session. Although a limited success was achieved when the community of nations concluded the Treaty on the Non-

⁴ See document A/33/118 of 7 June 1978.

Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, it is now high time to strive to give it universality, ensure its implementation and develop its concepts. Furthermore, we hope that a comprehensive test ban treaty, as well as a treaty on the comprehensive ban on the production and development of new types of weapons of mass destruction will soon be completed. A credible system of verification and safeguards to ensure the fulfilment of the commitments emanating from the agreements and treaties concluded should be strengthened. In the urgent fulfilment of their obligations and commitments, the nuclear-weapon States should seek to limit vertical proliferation in conformity with article VI of the non-proliferation treaty. In this context, we are following closely the negotiations on strategic arms limitation between the Soviet Union and the United States. We welcome the assurances of their desire to reach a new agreement to follow the first agreements of 1972. As a matter of fact, the success of the non-proliferation treaty in halting horizontal proliferation is organically linked to the degree of success achieved by the nuclear-weapon States in halting vertical proliferation.

41. In the light of the limited scope of security assurances contained in Security Council resolution 255 (1968), it is necessary to concert our efforts in order to provide more credible and far-reaching security assurances for countries that pledge to renounce the nuclear option. The definition of the scope of such security assurances would have to take into consideration the security requirements of and the conditions prevailing in each region. With respect to certain countries, security could be ensured by an undertaking not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States, which has come to be called the "negative guarantee". However, such a guarantee must not be considered as the maximum possible security guarantee that could be offered to non-nuclear-weapon States. The maintenance of international peace and security necessitates full consideration of the precarious situation prevailing in certain regions. To spare the international community any sudden nuclear escalation that would put a final end to all non-proliferation efforts, it is imperative that the real sources of danger be uprooted in time.

42. Egypt was one of the first countries to call for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones pursuant to article VII of the non-proliferation treaty, bearing in mind the special local conditions in each region. The setting up of nuclear-weapon-free zones should be coupled with assurances from nuclear-weapon States to respect the status of such zones, to refrain from introducing nuclear weapons into them and from using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against such zones. Furthermore, nuclear-weapon States should recognize the inalienable right of States belonging to such zones to have access to advanced technology under an adequate system of controls and safeguards. On this basis, Egypt welcomed the Treaty of Tlatelolco as the first to achieve the goal of creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone. We consider the pledge of nuclear-weapon States not to supply any nuclear arms to Latin America, or to use them against any country party to that Treaty, a constructive and encouraging step towards the establishment of other nuclear-weapon-free zones.

43. While the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin Amer-

ica could be considered a model for the establishment of similar zones elsewhere, and a significant step forward in the field of disarmament, we must admit that the existing situation in Africa and in the Middle East is totally different. The convergence of the goals pursued by South Africa and Israel make their nuclear collusion a direct threat to peace and security in those two regions and, indeed, in the whole world. Both countries are practising policies of flagrant aggression and are repeatedly violating the Charter and the rules of international law, thus posing serious challenges to the international community.

44. Together with sister African countries, we have consistently sought to enforce the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa [*resolution 2033 (XX)*]. This endeavour enjoys the full support of the international community. However, the determination of the racist régime in South Africa to pursue its efforts to acquire nuclear weapons in order to consolidate its policy of aggression and racism has prevented the practical implementation of that Declaration.

45. As a result of its strategic position, whatever takes place in the Middle East affects world peace and security. This is a reality of which Egypt is fully aware. For this reason our policy is aimed at the establishment of just and equitable conditions in the region. We are fully convinced that the outcome of any confrontation could be that of leading the world to the brink of a third world war. There is no doubt that the wars from which our region has suffered, and which were triggered by the expansionist designs of Israel, have made the community of nations appreciate the tremendous advantages to be derived from conditions conducive to a just and lasting peace in the region and ultimately to the conversion of that region into a zone of peace. That was the rationale behind the initiative taken by Iran and Egypt four years ago to declare the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone.⁵ That initiative was acclaimed as a positive contribution to disarmament efforts and to the maintenance of international peace and security.

46. We are determined to pursue that aim in order to realize the internationally supported aspirations of the region. However, the voice of Israel has sounded a lone discordant note amid the international unanimity expressed during the consideration of this subject by the General Assembly in the last four years. To date, Israel refuses to accede to the non-proliferation treaty and to subject all its nuclear activities to the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

47. Allow me to declare from this rostrum that Egypt's objective is to keep the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Should Israel continue to hamper the attainment of that goal in order to achieve its designs and ambitions, in co-operation with South Africa, the international community, represented by the United Nations, is in duty bound to take the necessary measures in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter to prevent such a grave threat to world peace and security. Such irresponsible policies should be promptly dealt with, bearing in mind the letter and the spirit of Security Council resolution 255 (1968).

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Annexes, agenda item 101, document A/9693/Add.1-3.*

48. We therefore call for the urgent adoption of a security guarantee, free from the restrictions and limitations that would prevent the Security Council from discharging its responsibilities; a security guarantee that would enable the Council to take the effective preventive measures before, and not after, the occurrence of a nuclear threat. It is obvious that in certain critical areas, fraught with tension, the possible acquisition of advanced nuclear capability, in the absence of effective international safeguards, by a country such as Israel or South Africa, whose policies of aggression have time and again been condemned by the United Nations, would be sufficient to invoke such a security guarantee.

49. Those are some general thoughts casting light on the nature of the security guarantee required by the present situation in Africa and the Middle East. We do hope that our views will enjoy the support of all the countries sharing our objectives and principles and striving with us to promote world peace on the basis of law and justice.

50. The fear of nuclear-weapon proliferation should not dissuade us from using nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, particularly as a source of energy in our progressing world, under effective international safeguards. Such peaceful uses should be encouraged by all nuclear States so that all countries may benefit, especially the developing countries which have insufficient sources of energy to meet their urgent development needs.

51. It is relevant to recall in this connexion that President Eisenhower, in his famous speech to the General Assembly in 1953 on the theme "Atoms for peace",⁶ paved the way for an era of peaceful nuclear co-operation and for the establishment in 1957 of the International Atomic Energy Agency, upon the insistent request of the non-nuclear countries. In response to the determination of the non-nuclear-weapon States, the non-proliferation treaty reaffirmed in its article IV the inalienable right of all States to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

52. In its efforts to achieve the desired progress in science and technology, Egypt has concluded agreements on nuclear co-operation for peaceful purposes with a number of countries. Egypt hopes that those agreements will be put into effect in the near future to serve its development.

53. If nuclear weapons constitute the most serious threat to our international community, there exist other weapons with no less lethal consequences. I refer to chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and those which cause unnecessary suffering or which may have indiscriminate effects.

54. It is a matter of record that certain efforts have been made to limit the use of such weapons, as exemplified by the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction [*resolution 2826 (XXVI) annex*] and the 1977 Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of

Environmental Modification Techniques [*resolution 31/72*]. However, these efforts are not sufficient in view of the existence of huge stockpiles of such weapons and their possible use, particularly in limited wars, as was the case in the Middle East when Israel used napalm and cluster bombs against civilian targets.

Mr. Conteh (Sierra Leone), Vice-President, took the Chair.

55. We emphatically call for further efforts to halt the acquisition, development and use of such weapons under binding agreements. Similarly, we attach great importance to the conclusion of the treaty for the complete ban on the use and development of all chemical weapons and for their destruction as soon as possible.

56. At its thirty-second session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 32/152 on the convening of a preparatory conference devoted to the prohibition of the use of specific conventional weapons which might be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. That resolution was the fruit of many years of effort on the part of several countries, including Egypt. We hope that the participating countries will co-operate in good faith to ensure the success of that conference.

57. The non-aligned countries have called for the prohibition of the production and development of new types of conventional weapons; they have advocated their limitation and gradual reduction, according to specific priorities within the framework of general and complete disarmament measures. We are convinced that the gradual reduction of conventional weapons and the halting of the arms race should be linked to the measures designed to promote international security, in conformity with the philosophy and the contents of the Charter of the United Nations. Those activities should proceed simultaneously with the search for just and equitable solutions to the political problems endangering world peace and security.

58. The existence of an unjust situation emanating from the use of force to impose a fait accompli incompatible with the principles of the Charter and the rules of law and justice has compelled non-nuclear-weapon countries, particularly those of the third world, to bear the burden of arming for self-defence.

59. In this respect, I should like to recall what President Sadat said in his speech before the National Press Club in Washington on 6 February 1978:

"We are anxious to stop the arms race. We are looking forward to the day when our acquisition of arms is minimal.

"We would even like to see the entire region demilitarized. We were the first to call for making the Middle East a nuclear-free zone. But that cannot be a unilateral act on our part. If we are to de-emphasize armament, the other party must do the same. We are concerned with our security too. We have more reasons to feel that way, with part of our land still occupied."

⁶ *Ibid.*, Eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 470th meeting.

60. Similar problems arise in Africa as a result of foreign intervention in the internal affairs of that continent; and as long as such policies and designs continue to play havoc with the destiny of our continent, world peace and security are likely to be endangered. However, should such interference cease and the serious situation in southern Africa be eliminated, a significant step would have been taken. As a result the burden of armament would be alleviated and a positive contribution would be made to the allocation of all resources to the achievement of development and progress in Africa.

61. Once justice and equity prevail in the Middle East and Africa and once their peoples have regained their national legitimate rights and secured their independence and sovereignty, Egypt will earnestly endeavour to channel the available resources towards development and progress. The impact of the flagrant imbalance between military expenditures and development spending is felt in the serious challenges we all face as a result of the continued encroachment of military requirements upon the natural, human and financial resources so much needed for social and economic development.

62. We have before us valuable proposals and studies, prepared by the United Nations and other institutions, relating to the resources that could be released as a result of the reduction of military budgets, as well as the possible reallocation of funds for the establishment of the new international economic order. We sincerely hope that they will receive the attention they deserve. In this respect, we have listened with keen interest to the valuable proposal submitted by the Secretary-General to appoint an advisory board of experts and to allocate a certain percentage of expenditures on armaments to national and international disarmament efforts [*1st meeting*].

63. Disarmament is no longer the exclusive concern of a few. It has become one of the basic preoccupations of the entire international community—hence the importance of the United Nations as the representative of the will of that community in the discharge of the responsibility for disarmament under effective international control.

64. For that reason Egypt believes that this special session of the General Assembly should ensure the United Nations role. It is imperative that all stages of disarmament deliberations—whether discussions, the exchange of views, negotiations, the drafting of conventions and agreements, or the follow-up and monitoring of implementation—should be undertaken by United Nations organs.

65. On the basis of that premise, the convening of the United Nations Disarmament Commission may, in view of the representative character of that body, contribute to the preparation of a programme for general and complete disarmament, as well as to the follow-up of the results of the current special session of the General Assembly.

66. As for the negotiating machinery, we hope that the existing link between the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the United Nations will be confirmed and strengthened so as to enable the Conference to carry

on its work with efficiency and seriousness. We support the measures needed to develop and improve that organ, in particular a change in its system of co-chairmanship.

67. For the past 30 years the United Nations has only been able to assume its role in the maintenance of international peace and security when its Member States had the political will to implement its decisions. If in certain cases it was unable to do so, it was because of the failure of some of its Members to honour their obligations under the Charter.

68. We are aware that disarmament and its problems are not amenable to immediate solutions at one single session; that is due to the complexity and ramifications of the problems. However, that fact should not weaken our resolve to persevere and co-operate in maintaining the momentum already acquired, a momentum that should lead to the attainment of the hopes of all peoples that the day will come when general and complete disarmament will become a reality in a world ruled by law and justice—for law and justice are the real and solid basis for peace, security and prosperity.

69. All the oppressed peoples which are subjected to aggression expect the international community to create the conditions conducive to the restoration of their rights so that they may devote their energies, not to destruction, but to construction and prosperity.

70. Mr. ZAITON (Malaysia): I should like, first of all, to express the deep regret of my Foreign Minister, Mr. Tengku Ahmad Rithauddeen, for his inability to attend this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Much as he would have desired to be here today, in view of the importance that Malaysia attaches to this historic special session, he is unfortunately unable to leave Kuala Lumpur, owing to pressing matters at home. It is, therefore, my honour and privilege to represent my Government today.

71. It is indeed gratifying to my delegation that Mr. Lazar Mojsov was elected to preside over the deliberations of this historic special session on disarmament. We regard his presidency as most appropriate, for it was at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, in September 1961, that the heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries, at their first conference, recommended the idea of convening a special session of the General Assembly to tackle this most important question. That the special session should take place now under his distinguished presidency is a fitting tribute to his country, which has played a pivotal role in focusing world attention on the need to set the disarmament process in motion. We hope that, under his skilful guidance, positive results will be achieved in attaining the goal of a more secure and peaceful world for mankind.

72. The special session indeed provides a unique opportunity for the States Members of the United Nations to deliberate on the important question of the survival of mankind posed by the threat of the spiralling arms race. That we have agreed to meet reflects a recognition of the urgent need to eliminate this threat to our very existence. Our de-

liberations will, no doubt, have symbolic and historic significance. However, mere symbolism will only reflect empty dreams if it is not accompanied by political goodwill and a commitment to make the session a turning-point in the disarmament process. My delegation therefore feels that it is incumbent on us to seize this momentum and to proceed with determined efforts towards finding solutions which will make it possible to achieve decisive progress towards genuine disarmament.

73. Much has already been said about the dangers of the spiralling arms race. My delegation feels that the accumulation of such lethal weapons in the world today is basically the result of a deep sense of insecurity arising out of threats to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, out of a lack of real progress in achieving international détente and mutual trust in the relationships among States and, lastly, out of the fact that international peace and security are maintained only by the precarious balance of mutual deterrence, which guarantees neither permanent peace nor the continued survival of mankind.

74. It is an illusion to believe that security can be attained through the accumulation of weaponry. Instead, the acquisition of modern military technology, compounded sometimes by the militarization of political power, has increased the tempo of the arms race, bringing with it all the attendant problems of intensified political rivalry and tension. The impact of this arms race is phenomenal. It has increased military expenditure in parallel with the state of advanced military technology. In comparative terms, the 1976 world military budget of \$334 thousand million equalled the total annual income of the 2 thousand million people who make up the poorer half of the world population. An estimated \$60 thousand million is spent each year on military research and development by all Governments engaged in that, and \$25 thousand million of it is devoted to the development of new weapons. In another respect the increase in the arms trade is a destabilizing factor in many regions of the world. It is currently estimated that the annual value of this trade exceeds \$20 thousand million.

75. We can draw some very pessimistic conclusions from this dangerous phenomenon of our times. The spiralling arms race is a source of insecurity and a threat to the survival of mankind. The probability of nuclear warfare is ever on the increase. What is more disturbing is its unfavourable economic impact on our societies. The critical problems which the world is facing today, problems such as those of resource allocation, the shortage of energy and raw materials, food production, the population explosion, and the protection of the global environment, are not given sufficient attention. A large portion of scarce financial and human resources is devoted to military expenditure which could otherwise be applied to accelerating the social and economic development of developing countries.

76. The international community should not be deaf to the call for a halt to this wasteful arms race. Indeed, this special session provides the opportunity for us seriously to take stock of the situation and to work out a programme of priorities and measures. In our opinion, its immediate task is to pave the way for negotiations to achieve effective

progress in nuclear disarmament, leading ultimately to the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons. Much remains to be done in order to reach a consensus to bring this about. My delegation recognizes the complexity of this difficult question and appreciates the realities of a rational and balanced approach, based on mutual agreement, on the part of the leading nuclear-weapon States, but these should not in any way be used as an excuse for the lack of substantial progress so far in this field.

77. The non-aligned countries have already made it very clear that they would like to see the start of negotiations for a halt to the build-up of nuclear arsenals, a balanced reduction in the stockpile of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, and cessation of the development, production and deployment of new types of nuclear weapons. All these measures constitute indispensable steps towards averting the danger of a nuclear war.

78. As an immediate measure, it is desirable that the leading nuclear-weapon States undertake a renunciation of the use, or the threat of the use, of nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear States, so as to assure them of their security. It would be appropriate, in this context, to conclude immediately a convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons. My delegation fully supports this proposal of the non-aligned countries.

79. Additionally, the negotiations of the United States of America and the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitation must go beyond the mere limitation of their nuclear delivery and guidance systems. Efforts should be exerted substantially to reduce their stockpile of nuclear weapons as part of a balanced approach towards achieving ultimately the goals of nuclear disarmament. We would urge the two leading nuclear Powers to continue their efforts with greater determination and political goodwill.

80. A matter of concern to my delegation is the continuing testing of nuclear weapons which, in our view, tends to escalate the vertical proliferation of more sophisticated and deadly nuclear weapons. The conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty would be an important step towards preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We hope the trilateral talks undertaken by the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the USSR will soon result in the conclusion of such a treaty as an integral part of the efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race.

81. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world on the basis of arrangements among States in the region concerned constitutes, in the opinion of my delegation, an effective non-proliferation measure. My delegation fully supports all efforts to facilitate the creation of such zones.

82. While giving priority to nuclear disarmament, my delegation does not wish to diminish the urgency of concurrent measures to reduce the conventional arms race. It cannot be denied that conventional weapons account for four fifths of the world's military budget. The accumulation of such weapons, particularly in conflict regions where antagonism exists among States, increases tension

and tends to heighten the escalation towards armed conflicts which could assume serious proportions when compounded by big-Power involvement. It cannot be denied also that States in such conflict areas invariably become pawns in the rivalry of the big Powers for spheres of influence, because of their dependence on the major Powers for their supply of arms. This type of situation creates conditions of instability and insecurity in the regions concerned and accounts, in large part, for the spiralling conventional arms race. Measures to curb the level of conventional armaments necessitate mutual agreement on the need for a more stabilized military relationship and this in turn must be accompanied by other measures to create the necessary conditions conducive to bring about the relaxation of tension and the restoration of mutual trust and confidence. The realization of these measures would induce the right political climate for a halt in the conventional arms race.

83. The concept of zones of peace envisages the establishment of conditions which would be conducive to promoting peace, friendship, mutual trust and co-operation among States within the region. It is our belief that the creation of such zones constitutes a constructive and positive effort towards eliminating big-Power rivalry for spheres of influence and domination, preventing potential regional conflicts, reducing tension among States, and promoting regional co-operation for the economic and social development of countries in the region.

84. My Government has, in this context, consistently supported efforts toward the creation of zones of peace in various regions of the world. The goal of the United Nations of establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean offers prospects of increased stability and security for the countries in the region concerned. My Government fully supports all efforts by the United Nations to bring about an early realization of this proposal. We note that bilateral talks between the United States and the USSR have already begun to reduce their military activities in the Indian Ocean. This is a positive development. It is our hope that these talks will soon result in agreement by the two great Powers to withdraw their military presence from the region as an important contribution towards fulfilling the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

85. In the region of South-east Asia, my Government, together with Indonesia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, has proposed the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. While the concept seeks on the one hand to deny outside Powers the opportunities of interfering in the political and military affairs of States in the region, it seeks on the other to establish a framework for peaceful relations among the States concerned so that they can devote their attention to the urgent problems of economic and social development.

86. The proposal, however, is not intended to curtail the rights of outside Powers to pursue their legitimate political and economic relations with the zonal States. Indeed, in economic relations, mutually profitable collaboration and flourishing trade between outside Powers and the zonal States would contribute greatly to the progress and prosperity of States in the region.

87. The ultimate goal of our zonal concept is the attainment of peace, security and stability for South-east Asia, and we are deeply committed to its realization. However, we do recognize that this would depend on the agreement of all the countries in the region. It is for this reason that my Government recognizes the need to undertake consultations with the other countries concerned to clarify the proposal and to gain their understanding of and respect for the proposal and eventually their agreement to it. Officials of the five countries concerned met recently in Kuala Lumpur to consider and explore further the steps to be taken to this end.

88. Let me next turn to the programme of action and the machinery for disarmament negotiations. It is imperative that the special session agree on a series of priorities and measures to enable negotiations to start in a balanced and integrated manner, leading ultimately to the goals of achieving general and complete disarmament under effective international control. While we agree that it would be realistic to concentrate on those specific measures where there is already sufficient agreement to make possible their implementation in the short term, we must not lose sight of the importance of according the highest priority to nuclear disarmament. A comprehensive programme of disarmament measures should be drawn up and, if necessary, a second special session could be convened to adopt this programme, whose implementation in an agreed sequence by stages would lead to the attainment of our ultimate goal. However, the proposal of a second special session, which my delegation supports, should not in any way prejudice the urgency of steps to be taken by this special session to begin the process of disarmament negotiations. A second special session would necessarily have to review the progress of such negotiations.

89. Agreement on the priorities and measures on disarmament in the programme of action would, for the first time, constitute a co-ordinated approach by the United Nations to dealing with the problem. The importance of the programme requires that we have an effective and efficient international machinery that would ensure its full implementation. It is our view that the existing disarmament machinery in this regard is inadequate. Apart from the fact that this machinery has not been reviewed for a number of years, there is also dissatisfaction with the disarmament negotiations which have so far been conducted through this machinery because of their narrow basis, their restricted forum, and their selection of issues of concern only to a few interested countries with, so far, limited or partial results.

90. We agree, therefore, that the existing disarmament machinery should be improved to enable the United Nations to play a more central role in the disarmament process. Proposals have been submitted regarding improving the structure and working procedure in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, relating in particular to the question of rotating the chairmanship on a monthly basis and improving its geographical and political representation so as to permit wider participation, especially by other nuclear-weapon States. My delegation supports the non-aligned position on this question [A/S-10/1, vol. VI,

document A/AC.187/107]. We are also of the view that if the Conference is to become the main body for multinational negotiations on disarmament, it should be responsible to the General Assembly, which has the ultimate responsibility for ensuring the implementation and observance of disarmament measures embodied in the programme of action.

91. The negotiations on the final draft document of the special session already started some months ago. It is heartening that we have now seriously embarked on the road to promoting the process of genuine disarmament. The plethora of disarmament proposals is overwhelming but it is a good sign. It reflects our earnest desire to create a disarmed world, free of conflicts, insecurity and hostility. We need to look forward and build on this start to make substantial progress in our deliberations. Each State has a special responsibility to demonstrate goodwill, and a firm commitment to ensure that we do not again live in constant fear of annihilation. I extend, on behalf of my Government, all best wishes for the success of this special session and assure the Assembly that my delegation will give its fullest co-operation to ensure its success.

92. Mr. PUJA (Hungary) (*interpretation from Russian*): On behalf of the Hungarian delegation, may I wholeheartedly congratulate Mr. Mojsov on his election as President of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. I am sincerely pleased to see that the deliberations of the General Assembly are guided, in his person, by a representative of friendly Yugoslavia, a good neighbour of my country.

93. The past decade has produced considerable results in resolving certain urgent international problems, results that have served to increase the hopes of mankind. The policy of peaceful coexistence, the demand for lasting peace and stable security and all-round international co-operation are steadily gaining momentum among countries with different social systems. Such developments in international politics, however, are not received favourably by all. Highly influential circles are trying to block the way to positive changes in this field; hence, the process of détente has slowed down, and there has clearly been an impasse in negotiations on certain disarmament problems. We hope that through joint efforts we shall succeed in eliminating the difficulties and assuring the continuance of détente.

94. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic considers it the main task of its foreign policy to contribute to the consolidation of peace and security. It works tirelessly to help deepen political détente and strengthen co-operation among peoples and nations. My Government believes that the cause of détente has perhaps never been so closely bound up with problems of disarmament as it is now, and that the achievements of political détente and its future success can be secured only if they are supplemented by effective measures in the field of disarmament. This is the most urgent task of the present day. Therefore, the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic agrees with any measures designed to curb the arms race and lends support to any initiative or proposal that serves to promote progress in disarmament.

95. World public opinion is well aware that the socialist countries have from the very beginning been sincere and consistent advocates of disarmament. It is equally well known that they have taken a whole series of far-reaching initiatives to achieve the goals of disarmament. It is not their fault that only a small portion of their proposals has been accepted.

96. There is one more point to be recalled here. With a view to strengthening peace and security, the socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union, have always come out in favour of general and complete disarmament. However, when it became evident that because of the Western Powers' opposition this ultimate aim could not be achieved directly, the socialist countries tried—by way of numerous initiatives and partial disarmament measures—to promote progress towards general and complete disarmament. The efforts of the socialist and certain other countries have already resulted in the signing of some important agreements, but there is a compelling need for further steps to be taken.

97. Today, when the most burning task is to save mankind from nuclear devastation, extreme importance is placed on co-operation in the field of disarmament between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, the two strongest world Powers. The Hungarian Government favours and welcomes the efforts to improve Soviet-American relations, the continuation of the strategic arms limitation talks, and the extension of negotiations to other areas, and it earnestly wishes to see a speedy and successful conclusion to the talks. New agreements, particularly the agreement negotiated during the second round of talks, would have a very positive effect on the disarmament process as a whole and on the international climate in general.

98. In Europe, where considerable gains have been made in the field of political détente, there is a continuing need to pay great attention to reducing military confrontation. We are firmly convinced that there is a genuine opportunity for doing so in such a way as not to upset the military balance, and not to give advantages to one side and disadvantages to the other. The socialist countries are following this principle at the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. We hope that the NATO countries participating in those talks will give up their attempts to obtain one-sided advantages, and that it will thus be possible to continue and successfully conclude the talks.

99. A reduction in the level of military confrontation is sought also by the two proposals adopted by the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty at its Bucharest meeting in November 1976.⁷ It is absolutely clear that if the States signatories to the Final Act of Helsinki, including four nuclear Powers, were to pledge, under a binding treaty, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against one another, it would constitute a significant step towards eliminating the threat of a nuclear world war in general. Similarly, there are possibilities for the States concerned to agree not to admit new members to

⁷ Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-first Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1976, document S/12255.

the Warsaw Treaty Organization or to NATO, while awaiting the time when simultaneous abolition of military alliances becomes a reality. I think I need not advance arguments to show that realization of the said proposals would favourably influence international co-operation in and outside Europe, and would do a valuable service to the interests of peoples all over the world.

100. In analysing the problems involved in disarmament talks my Government proceeds from the fact that the peoples of all countries are vitally interested in curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament. It is, therefore, a duty of the Governments of all countries to contribute actively to the disarmament process by showing goodwill and exerting sincere efforts.

101. Starting from the principle of the joint responsibility of States, the Hungarian Government has long been of the view that the problems of disarmament should be examined in a comprehensive manner, in the broadest possible forum. Every people, every country, should be enabled to state its views on the steps to be taken towards disarmament and, with full knowledge thereof, to work out together a realistic programme of practical measures. The Hungarian Government is convinced that the most suitable forum for tackling these tasks would be a world disarmament conference.

102. As it has not yet been possible to convene such a conference, in view of well-known difficulties, we welcomed the proposal to have the issues of disarmament discussed at a special session of the General Assembly as a useful step in that direction. As a member of the Preparatory Committee, Hungary tried to contribute to the success of the special session, and I can assure you that during the weeks to come it will continue to do everything possible to promote this same goal.

103. We expect this session to create the appropriate propitious atmosphere which will allow the representatives of the participating countries to assess in an objective manner the progress made in disarmament, to define carefully the basic principles governing disarmament negotiations, and to point out the urgent problems that are most ripe for solution. Realistically, our task can be to formulate the respective conclusions in a balanced and generally acceptable final document. If the special session works in this spirit it will be able to encourage the disarmament talks under way in various forums. In that case it will be able to encourage States to increase the pace and the effectiveness of disarmament negotiations and, by giving fresh stimulus to all peace-loving forces, it will promote détente and the solution of the current disarmament issues, and help isolate and repulse the enemies of disarmament.

104. My delegation is following the general debate with keen interest. In the statements delivered so far, there have been a number of ideas which merit attention and study. We attach special importance to the document presented on 26 May by the delegation of the Soviet Union on practical ways to end the arms race [see A/S-10/AC.1/4]. The Hungarian Government is in full agreement with the proposals contained in that document and, for its part, gives all-out support to efforts aimed at their implementation.

105. The position of the Hungarian People's Republic concerning the items on the agenda of the special session is well known; it is also clearly summarized in the working document which we, together with several other socialist countries, submitted to the Preparatory Committee. Therefore, I shall refrain now from further expounding our standpoint; but would like to set forth the views of the Hungarian Government on a few of the questions under discussion.

106. I wish to stress, in the first place, our satisfaction with the atmosphere that prevailed during the work of the Preparatory Committee. The principle of consensus has proved its worth, and we deem its application indispensable throughout the special session. It is the only workable method of dealing with questions affecting the fundamental security interests of States.

107. We are basically in agreement with the structure of the draft final document drawn up by the Preparatory Committee. Great efforts are needed, however, to bring the various positions of substance closer together and to bridge the differences of opinion. I trust that the Committee of the Whole will in the coming weeks produce a draft acceptable to all countries.

108. I have already touched on some problems related to the draft declaration, but I should like to make a few more points in connexion with it.

109. The Hungarian Government agrees with all those who have expressed concern over the harmful consequences of the arms race. It was precisely for this reason that in the preparatory stage our delegation wanted the document to spell out in clear terms the true causes of the arms race and to pinpoint the forces that oppose and hinder détente and disarmament. The socialist countries can safely do so, for in a socialist system there is no class or layer of society which would, directly or indirectly, have an interest in, or draw profit from, the arms race. On the contrary, acting upon the dictates of the essence of socialism, we are eager to utilize all resources for peaceful construction. It is not our fault that that is not yet possible.

110. Our country would willingly reduce its military expenditure in proportion to the decrease in international tension and the strengthening of peace and security. For such action, however, it would be necessary for other countries, primarily the militarily significant ones, including the nuclear Powers in particular, to begin to reduce their military budgets in accordance with the relevant proposal of the Soviet Government.

111. The Hungarian Government agrees with all those who urge that States should devote the resources released by the reduction of military budgets to economic growth and social progress and should allot part of such resources for assistance to developing countries.

Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) resumed the Chair.

112. The greatest difficulty faced by the Preparatory Committee in its work had to do with the elaboration of

the draft programme of action on disarmament. Member States presented a great number of proposals in this connexion; several of those proposals, while undoubtedly prompted by good intentions, went far beyond the realities of the present situation. In the opinion of the Hungarian Government, the programme to be adopted at this session, just like any similar programme, can be expected to succeed only if its drafters keep in mind the realities of world politics, if they have regard for the requirement of equal security, and if they consider and discuss every single measure in close correlation with all the others.

113. We unswervingly maintain that in the process of disarmament special importance and urgency should be placed on questions of nuclear disarmament. This session should also call upon the nuclear-weapon States to stop the production of nuclear weapons and proceed to a gradual reduction of their existing stockpiles, which would lead ultimately to the complete and final destruction of all the nuclear-weapons arsenals.

114. We deem it indispensable, however, that, concomitantly with the adoption of such measures, talks should be started on ways to strengthen the security of States by international political and legal instruments. Of primary importance among the required measures would be the conclusion of a world treaty on the final elimination from international relations of the use or threat of force in all its forms.

115. A major immediate task in nuclear disarmament is, we believe, the acceleration and conclusion as soon as possible of the talks on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. We are confident that the ongoing tripartite talks, which have already made considerable headway, will find solutions to the problems that are still outstanding.

116. The Hungarian Government would regard it as a highly important step if the Government of the United States of America were to renounce once and for all the production of the neutron bomb, that new type of nuclear weapon. Production and deployment of the neutron bomb would start a new spiral in the arms race which would be seriously detrimental to the cause of peace and security.

117. In addition to the existing nuclear weapons, mankind is threatened by new types of weapons of mass destruction, already in existence or still in the blueprint stage. Through the conclusion of an appropriate treaty we must prevent the diversion of the latest scientific and technological advances to weapons purposes. Efforts are needed to speed up the elaboration of an agreement on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons.

118. While the Hungarian Government looks upon the limitation and prohibition of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction as the most urgent task, it considers it no less important and timely for the militarily significant States to proceed to a reduction of their conventional armaments, primarily the most sophisticated and destructive weapons.

119. Similarly, the Hungarian Government supports real-

istic initiatives aimed at the adoption of regional disarmament measures designed to limit or reduce nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction or of conventional armaments and armed forces, including proposals to create nuclear-weapon-free zones or to declare the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

120. Disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, will become genuinely effective only if it is universal, if all countries participate in it. Consequently, the cause of disarmament would be greatly enhanced if this special session called upon all States that, for various reasons, had not yet done so to adhere without delay to the existing agreements on disarmament.

121. During the preparation for the special session too much emphasis was placed on reforming the machinery for disarmament negotiations. In my opinion, the responsible politicians in the States Members of the United Nations must not impute the paucity of existing results to the negotiating machinery. The causes are to be found in the manoeuvres of the forces opposing and hampering détente and disarmament, in the lack of will by the Governments of certain capitalist countries to reach agreements.

122. The existing forums of disarmament negotiations are not, of course, perfect, but this is not the fault of the forums, which cannot but reflect the divergent views of the participating States. We feel that the established machinery for disarmament negotiations, particularly the Geneva Conference of the Committee on disarmament, has given proof of its viability and usefulness. Therefore we cannot support the efforts which tend to emphasize questions that are of only secondary importance for actual disarmament and which seek a radical reorganization of that forum. But we are willing to support any reasonable proposal aimed at an actual increase in the effectiveness of the disarmament forums. However, we disagree with changes that would diminish the responsibility of the nuclear Powers in disarmament negotiations.

123. I should like to express once again, from this rostrum, my Government's hope that the tenth special session will advance the cause of disarmament by focusing world attention on the real causes of the arms race, on its harmful effects, and on the need for faster progress in large-scale disarmament measures. We are confident that the recommendations to be adopted at this special session will result in accelerated and more intensive work by the existing disarmament forums.

124. Mr. RICHARD (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar would like to express to you our special pleasure at seeing you conducting, with your characteristic devotion and outstanding qualities, the work of the important special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The role that you and your country have played in the international community and in the movement of the non-aligned countries in the defence of principles which have long guided our action in the field of security and disarmament justifies a certain amount of optimism on our part, notwithstanding the difficulties that we shall surely be encountering.

125. There is a paradox which it is very difficult, if not impossible, to explain, for want of a rational justification to the peoples we represent in this Assembly: I refer to the incredible disparity between the intentions that have been proclaimed in the name of the Charter and what we have actually been able to accomplish in the field of disarmament.

126. And yet the objectives that we have chosen to set for ourselves as a result of our experience during the Second World War, and which were intended to bring about a world of peace and security, were at least clearly defined, and we like to think that they were accepted in good faith. The enthusiasm of the early years was such that the peoples of the world—who, in fact, had been deceived—were incapable of understanding that it was necessary to struggle painstakingly for a meeting of the minds when, after all, the paths to be followed had already been determined.

127. Here at this session, while we all recognize that it is necessary—indeed, urgent—to move forward towards our agreed upon objectives, some have openly asked whether we shall ever get started on our long journey, a journey destined to be so long that one wonders whether, in fact, it is not purely imaginary. Others have yielded to despair as they behold a world meekly submitting to the efforts of a few Powers to over-arm themselves.

128. More than 30 years have passed since the world decided to disarm to prevent the horrors of war. But how many times has that decision been invoked to demobilize a single soldier or to destroy a single gun? Reduced to the status of hapless onlookers, we have witnessed a frantic increase in military expenditures, which have tripled over the past 15 years and reached a record figure representing 1,000 times the annual development budget of a third-world country the size of mine.

129. The major Powers and the super-Powers have tried to out-do each other in the development of sophisticated missiles and other nuclear and conventional weapons, although it has been recognized that what they have done has been damaging to collective security. The enormous progress of technology, the heedless build-up of nuclear weapons and the ever greater dissemination of knowledge among a growing number of nations increases the risks that weapons will proliferate throughout the entire world, and if that happens then control will be quite out of the question, and the purveyors of strategic materials and equipment will scarcely be able to conceal their delight.

130. To fill in this rather sketchy picture, let me remind the Assembly that foreign military bases are still being maintained in zones of influence or presence, notwithstanding the repeated appeals of the international community, in particular of the non-aligned countries. May I also remind the Assembly that zones of peace are neither recognized nor respected as means of contributing to regional or international security. The arms traffic is constantly expanding, making the outlook for conventional disarmament even more uncertain than it has been in the past.

131. Faced, as we are, with these harsh realities, the peoples of the world are reluctant to believe that disarma-

ment can ever gather enough momentum to curb the escalation of the arms build-up, which seems to respond to the imperatives of national security, the manipulations of the military-industrial complexes and the wheeling and dealing of multinational corporations. The fears so often voiced that disarmament will prove to be nothing more than a pipe dream are neither imaginary nor exaggerated, and can certainly be justified in the short-comings and disappointing results of negotiations.

132. One single convention—on bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons—contains a destruction clause that is one of genuine disarmament. A single treaty on regional security has been adopted—the Treaty of Tlatelolco. As far as other conventions and agreements are concerned, they deal only with the activities taking place in specific zones where the major and super-Powers have felt the need to regulate their competition, and the requirements of disarmament and the reduction of armaments have therefore only taken the form of measures of mere control or limitation.

133. An objective evaluation of negotiations shows that the first deficiency is due to a growing number of so-called collateral measures, which have made for a general impression of disorder, of fragmentation and of improvisation instead of logical order in the choice of priorities in keeping with our objectives. It is not surprising, then, that our peoples have asked what is the immediate connexion between these collateral measures and their deepest aspirations. This would especially apply to treaties banning the military use of uninhabited regions, such as the moon, outer space, Antarctica and the sea-bed, while free rein is given to activities closer to home which often do violence to our sovereign rights. In their desire to curb their competition, all that the major and super-Powers have done is to confine it to areas that we consider vital.

134. The importance of these collateral measures has, at times, been over-estimated. Much effort and ingenuity have been expended to ensure that the non-nuclear States maintain their status, either by conviction or by necessity. However, what can we do in response to the decision of certain States not to be part of the non-proliferation system? Their very existence poses all kinds of problems relating to the use of nuclear energy, to the restriction or prohibition of nuclear explosions and to rules and regulations governing the transfer of technological equipment and fissionable material.

135. But might it not be better to agree that the danger of horizontal proliferation stems essentially from the inability of the major and super-Powers to halt the thrust and reverse the general trend of vertical proliferation, from their refusal to destroy their weapons and provide guarantees for security to the non-nuclear States without asking anything in return?

136. Another drawback that needs to be mentioned is that disarmament negotiations have tended more and more to sound like a dialogue between the two super-Powers, with all that that entails regarding the choice, the nature, the general direction and the results of the initiatives that have been taken. It is difficult to speak of a *de facto* veto

or a monopoly, but the narrow framework, whose only virtue is one of *realpolitik*, represents certain obvious limitations that are due to the lack of unanimous support and inadequate participation.

137. The third comment we would like to make applies to the lack of consideration given to the urgent nature of disarmament, which is made even more urgent by the opposite process of over-aiming and the latitude enjoyed by the super-Powers within the "limitation, reduction, elimination" sequence, and the uncertainty of negotiations on strategic weapons.

138. The non-aligned countries were the first to advocate the idea of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and took that initiative as far back as 1961 at Belgrade, at a meeting of their heads of State or Government. They showed the international community then that there was a new majority emerging which wished to be a responsible partner in all negotiations relating to peace, international security and disarmament.

139. The concerns underlying that proposal still stand today. They relate to our desire for consistent action, the need to accelerate the disarmament process and the importance of democratic participation which would facilitate the support of one and all for decisions adopted.

140. Consistent action means that actions must be based on a central idea, so that each decision may be reviewed in the light of the final goal. Without that, no moves can be any more than partially effective. Our choices should also be compatible with the requirements of our common survival and must involve a reduction of the dependence of States on weapons and the strengthening of the United Nations ability to ensure the individual security of Member States.

141. That is why nuclear disarmament must receive top priority, in spite of, or perhaps because of, the special responsibility of the two super-Powers. The complete cessation of nuclear-weapon testing, the prevention of proliferation, and the reduction of conventional weapons would all have been made much easier if the principal military Powers had been able to see eye to eye from the beginning on a programme of general and complete disarmament.

142. The need for consistent action, finally, requires that one and all should accept certain principles which should ensure that no decision shall be adopted in a spirit inconsistent with the requirements of peace and security. In this connexion it should be pointed out that all negotiations or decisions on disarmament must be guided by the principles of non-intervention, non-interference and non-use of force or of the threat of force, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the need to maintain a balance of responsibility and mutual obligation between the nuclear and non-nuclear States.

143. All countries readily agree that the process of disarmament must be accelerated but, judging from the preliminary discussions held in the Preparatory Committee and from certain statements that have been heard in this Assembly, the chances seem to be slight that this con-

sensus will ever lead to the adoption of a programme of action likely to give the movement more momentum or, indeed, make it irreversible.

144. We note, first, that the strategy of those who feel that their security ought to take preference over disarmament remains what it has always been and that the political will to take concrete action is still sadly lacking. That is especially true of nuclear disarmament. While the non-aligned countries say that they want, within a precise timetable, binding commitments to destroy existing stockpiles, others rationalize the idea of balance and vaunt the virtues of realism and action which could strengthen confidence among States.

145. It is significant in this regard that other groups have had great difficulty in accepting the formulations proposed by the non-aligned countries relating to the urgent conclusion of a convention on the non-utilization of nuclear weapons, to the guarantees to be given to non-nuclear States and to the commitment of the five members of the atomic club not to be the first to use those weapons.

146. At the same time we note that the major and super-Powers tend to give undue significance to the problems of non-proliferation. The non-aligned countries do not wish to minimize their importance, but they would like to discuss them in the light of the following principles: the recognition of the direct link between nuclear disarmament and non-dissemination; general acceptance of the universal scope and non-discriminatory nature of safeguard measures to be applied to activities and installations in all countries; and the right of all countries to develop and implement their programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, with respect for safeguards measures consistent with their own interests.

147. While a start has been made on an agreement among all groups to ban chemical weapons and to give high priority to the banning of other weapons of mass destruction, it does not seem that everyone agrees that conventional disarmament should be viewed with the same degree of urgency.

148. In view of recent trends which can be detected in certain zones of international tension, some have tried to stress the growing role of third-world countries in the trade in conventional weapons. No one can remain indifferent to such a state of affairs, but that does not tempt us to alter the order of priorities already agreed upon.

149. The idea of negotiating machinery and the allocation of functions and assignments among its various elements should be based upon the following considerations: first, the United Nations is endowed by the Charter with special responsibility in the field of disarmament. Its mission and its authority make it the primary centre for negotiations, study and concerted action. No obstacle should be raised to the accomplishment of its mission and the exercise of its authority. Secondly, disarmament is of concern to all peoples, inasmuch as its achievement or non-achievement affects international peace and security and has a direct influence on the quality and the extent of so-

cial and economic development. In this area, perhaps more than in any other, the principle of the sovereign equality of States and their right to participate in the decision-making process should be carefully respected.

150. Those fundamental positions prompt us, when international security is in question, to support any proposal to allow the United Nations to play a decisive role in the promotion and co-ordination of initiatives, in the supervision of the implementation of decisions and in the carrying out of programmes.

151. The acceptance of a majority decision is inevitable, since the negotiating bodies constituted under the authority of the Security Council have not justified the hope and the confidence placed in them, as a result of the lack of unanimity on the part of the permanent members, and since the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee, a predecessor of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, found itself in an impasse, thereby showing that the parity representation of the two most important military blocs does not guarantee success.

152. We continue to favour the convening of a world disarmament conference and, if all the conditions for that have not yet been fulfilled, we certainly could accept further special sessions of the General Assembly or further meetings of the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations.

153. Finally, we shall support whatever proposals are forthcoming to strengthen the bonds between the United Nations and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and that call for the genuine democratization of that body.

154. Regardless of the importance ascribed to international security, international security would be meaningless if the countries of a given region did not have the latitude to organize, or if necessary defend, their own security in keeping with genuine respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the genuine desire to work for co-operation devoid of any ulterior motives of domination or indirect relations with military blocs.

155. At the Conference held from 17 to 19 May 1978 at Tananarive, Madagascar, the progressive parties and organizations of Africa considered the question of disarmament and adopted a regional approach to problems of security and the need for democratic and sovereign participation in them. They took note of the Soviet-American talks on the "demilitarization" of the Indian Ocean and expressed the view that the peoples of the area—the parties primarily concerned—should not only be consulted and informed about the progress of those talks but should also be allowed to participate in the preparation and implementation of any agreement concerning the Indian Ocean. The Conference made it possible to establish that there exists among the participants a common determination to reject any hierarchy of interests between the countries of the area and external Powers, and to adopt a consistent programme providing, *inter alia*, for: the dismantling of the Anglo-American nuclear base at Diego García and of those used by intervention troops or for pur-

poses of military communication, a ban on the introduction and stockpiling of nuclear weapons in the Indian Ocean peace zone, abstention by States of the area from taking part in military pacts, abandonment of the draft covenant promoted by South Africa and its imperialist allies aimed at selective encirclement, and progressive and reciprocal reduction of naval and air forces of external Powers.

156. The President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, recently pointed out that events in the area justify strict vigilance aimed at exposing and thwarting manoeuvres of intervention, sabotage or destabilization through the use of mercenaries introduced in defiance of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [*resolution 2832 (XXVI)*] which reveal the true intentions of those who seek only to disturb the area to the detriment of peace and security.

157. With regard to our partners in the area, we are prepared to make serious efforts to conclude arrangements and instruments with binding force, guaranteeing respect by the nuclear States and the principal military Powers concerned for our status as a zone of peace. Those agreements should involve an obligation on the part of those States to refrain from using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against the countries of the area.

158. We might have stressed the proposal that we made some time ago to establish a formal link between disarmament and economic and social development. At the time that proposal was greeted with mixed feelings at best by those who, for whatever reasons, refuse to divert or transfer part, even the smallest part, of the resources freed by disarmament to improve the well-being of the most impoverished peoples of the world. Our position remains the same, but here we have deliberately sought to shun an approach that has been said to be too self-interested, and to highlight the central theme of our debate, that disarmament is desirable in itself.

159. Now we have taken the initiative of convening a special session to accelerate the process leading to disarmament in a new context, namely, development with security. The very fact that we are here at all may be taken as an initial response to some of our anxieties. The pessimism of those who fear that this meeting will lead to the capitulation of the disarmed of the third world to the reprehensible arrogance of the militarily mighty is a pessimism that we share. But we are convinced that with this session we have got off to a fresh start which may give the major Powers and super-Powers an opportunity to enter into real commitments commensurate with their responsibilities.

160. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

161. Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): In a statement yesterday to the Assembly [*8th meeting*], the head of the Cuban delegation attempted to justify the military adventurism in Africa of Cuban armed forces and boastfully described their so-called professional use of sophisticated arms as Cuba's contribution to the cause of peace and understanding. In

particular, my delegation has in mind the exploits of Cuban forces in the Horn of Africa and elsewhere which have continued unabated for the past 12 months.

162. In his statement the Cuban representative attempted to conceal Cuba's military intervention in the African continent behind a smoke-screen of high-sounding clichés and slogans. The true purpose of its action is to impose a colonialist régime on the peoples of the Ogaden and Eritrea, to frustrate the legitimate struggle of the peoples of the region for self-determination and, most important of all, to serve the interests of a super-Power.

163. The self-congratulatory statement of the Cuban representative that the battles "around Harar and Dire Dawa" are evidence of the new organization and military know-how of the Cuban forces was nothing else but a euphemism for the atrocities and barbarities that those forces have perpetrated against innocent and defenceless people. No amount of glorification of the Cuban army or of Cuban policy in Africa can absolve Cuba of the criminal deeds it has committed, and continues to commit, in Africa.

164. So long as there are foreign forces of that nature in Africa, it will not be possible for any African State jealous of its independence and national dignity even to think of genuine disarmament.

165. Cuba's presence in Africa is not a force for peace and stability; rather, it is a force for insecurity. One can legitimately ask how a small, under-developed country, such as Cuba, with no military-industrial complex of its own, can send to, and maintain on, the African continent, 10,000 miles away, expeditionary forces totalling more than 50,000 men. It is perfectly evident to everyone that the cost, the logistics and the type of armaments involved in these operations are far beyond the resources of Cuba. It is no secret that Cuba's ability to maintain its military presence in Africa has been made possible by the direct support of a super-Power.

166. In some quarters serious thought is now being given to dividing the continent into opposing military blocs similar to those which exist in Europe. If this happens it will be a most tragic set-back to African unity, and Cuba will be held primarily responsible for it.

167. The hypocrisy of Cuba's foreign policy can be seen in its actions in Africa, as well as in the statement of its representative in this august Assembly. That policy is to call upon others to disarm, while arrogating to itself the right to build an arsenal of deadly weapons unprecedented, in relative terms, for a country of its size, population and resources. We know that its military intervention in Africa serves purely as a spearhead for the furtherance of the political and strategic designs of a super-Power.

168. No one should be misled by Cuba's role in the Horn of Africa or, for that matter, in Africa generally. Cuba is not fighting for the high-sounding principles that it would wish the international community to believe it is defending. Its actions have been contrary to the promotion of peace, to the lessening of tensions, to the enhancing of co-

operation, to observing the objectives of non-alignment, and to supporting the self-determination of peoples. The irrefutable fact is that Cuba's military intervention in the Horn of Africa and elsewhere represents a new and dangerous phenomenon, namely, State-organized mercenarism.

169. The extent to which Cuba is subservient to the will of a super-Power is illustrated by its attitude to the Eritrean and Western Somalia liberation movements. It is common knowledge that Cuba actively supported and assisted those movements over the years, until recently, when, at the instigation of its powerful friend, it adopted a contrary policy. As history bears testimony, we have no doubt that the peoples concerned will eventually attain their inalienable rights regardless of the position which Cuba and others take. The presence of Cuban and other foreign forces in the Ogaden and Eritrea not only contributes directly to the subjugation of the peoples' struggle for their legitimate right to self-determination and freedom, but also constitutes a serious threat to the security of the region as a whole. Furthermore, it constitutes an obstacle to the prospects of achieving a peaceful solution to the problems of the Horn of Africa, as sought by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and other organizations.

170. Cuba's false and often-repeated claim that it respects Africa is in complete contradiction of its military intervention, at will, to shed African blood on African soil. It does so notwithstanding the OAU resolution, adopted at Libreville last year, in which the heads of State and Government called upon all extra-African powers to refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of African states.⁸ Cuba's wanton defiance of that resolution not only constitutes contempt for OAU, but also undermines the Organization's efforts to find a just solution to the African problems, in accordance with the Charters of the United Nations and of OAU.

171. At this juncture we should also take note of the fact that Cuba's behaviour and policies contradict the lofty principles of the non-aligned movement. As we all know, one of that movement's cardinal principles is the pursuit of the policy of positive neutrality, in opposition to big-Power and bloc rivalry. In this regard I leave the non-aligned countries to conclude whether Cuba can, in all honesty, be described as a non-aligned country.

172. The PRESIDENT: I should like to remind members that, in accordance with the practice established by the General Assembly during its last session, statements made in exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes.

173. Mr. LINARES (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, you may rest assured that I shall confine myself to the 10-minute rule, although the representative of Somalia did not do so.

174. First of all, we should review very carefully the words of the representative of the Government of Somalia

⁸ Document A/32/310 of 1 November 1977.

and we should see who he agrees with in his statement. Those words certainly do not coincide with the words of the representatives who from this rostrum have defended the right of every State to independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

175. In the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and in the Charter of the United Nations there is a reference to the right of every State to defend its territorial integrity and to choose the social régime that suits it. But again, no reference to those principles was found in his statement. He was more concerned about alleged alliances with a super-Power. He was concerned with what Cuban troops were doing away from Cuba, counteracting the designs of the imperialist Powers. He was worrying about whether Cuba was a non-aligned country or not. His words do coincide to a very considerable extent with the words of President Carter. They also agree with the words of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of China. I would say he has chosen poor allies!

176. When the Cuban army responded to the call of the legitimate representatives of Ethiopia, it did so in order to help them in the defence of the territorial integrity of that country in the face of aggression by Somalia. The Somali army was sent out by its leaders—and it should be said that they are very fine soldiers and very fine citizens—on an adventure aimed at destroying the Ethiopian revolution and cutting off a portion of the territory of that country.

177. That does not conform to the principles of the non-aligned countries. In these principles there is a reference to solidarity, mutual assistance, defence against the imperialist enemy. That is what the Cuban troops were there for, to help Ethiopia in the face of aggression promoted by imperialists and, regrettably, carried out on orders from the leaders of Somalia.

178. The peoples of Africa will have to face many more acts of aggression, as has been the case in other continents. The enemies of the African people would like to isolate them, separate them from international solidarity. That is reminiscent of the time of the Monroe Doctrine in America when the United States proclaimed that America belonged to the Americans; and they meant, not Latin Americans, but North Americans. Now there is a desire for Africa to belong to the former colonialists. But Africa belongs to the Africans, and for that to be so international assistance is needed.

179. Cuban soldiers in Angola helped to face aggression on the part of the South African racists. In Ethiopia they have dealt with acts of aggression aimed at cutting off a portion of Ethiopian territory.

180. Many are getting ready to intervene in Africa, to re-colonize Africa. There is really a very unholy alliance indeed between China, the United States and representatives of other reactionary Governments.

181. I invite you to read this week's *Newsweek* and see the bet made by Mr. Brzezinski, the Assistant for National Security Affairs to the President of the United States, with

his Chinese companions as they climbed the Great Wall of China. He laid a bet as to who would get there first, saying "If I get to the top first, you go in and oppose the Russians in Ethiopia; if you get there first, we shall go in".⁹

182. That is the kind of intervention that the representative of the Somali Government would like. That is an intervention that contravenes the principles of the non-aligned countries. But the international assistance given to Ethiopia by the socialist super-Power and by Cuba—the socialist super-Power, I say, since the super-Powers are not the same, mind you—was internationally inspired and aims at the defence of territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty.

183. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): In view of the statement of the representative of Somalia, I feel compelled to make one or two remarks. First of all, we shall study his statement and give the appropriate reply in due course.

184. Having said that, I am wondering for how long we must put up with Somali lies and fancies. The issue is simple: the Government of Somalia had no business to invade Ethiopia. It is as simple as that. Once they had invaded it, it is immaterial how, when and under what circumstances we threw them out of our country. Surely they did not expect us to go and embrace them after they had killed and maimed innocent people, civilians, children, and destroyed their means of livelihood? We have appealed to them, appealed to their reason, for over 10 years. If they persist in solving all their difficulties through force, well then, we shall reply by force.

185. I hope that they have learned their lesson. It is still not too late to heed reason and behave as responsible Members of the United Nations and abide by the Charter; but if they persist in their interference and provocations, certainly Ethiopia will not be responsible for the disgrace that will befall that poor nation.

186. Mr. HUSSEN (Somalia): I apologize for having asked to be allowed to speak again at this late hour.

187. First, as we said in our statement, it is obvious that the forces that call themselves socialist—I doubt whether they are true socialists—are organized by, and under the influence of, a super-Power.

188. I shall not defend President Carter or the Chinese Government. The United States and China are two big nations, and I am sure that they can defend themselves. The fact that the Somali statement coincided with remarks made by President Carter or by the delegation of the People's Republic of China and, privately, by many other representatives now in this hall does not mean that we are in league with those nations. Of course, we have friendly relations with them. We have no reason to deny that, and we are very proud of it. But everyone who knows Somalia knows very well that the Somali nation is independent-minded.

⁹ Quoted in English by the speaker.

189. To support what I am saying, I remind the Assembly that in this very hall about a year ago there were people who gave the impression that Somalia was in the pocket of a super-Power. I think that everyone present knows to whom I am referring. It has been demonstrated that we are in no one's pocket. I am sure that that is a sufficient reply to the representative of Cuba, who tried to convince the representatives present that what Somalia had stated in this forum was inspired by somebody else.

190. I do not have many observations to make on the other remarks made by the representative of Cuba. One could not have expected him to deny that Cuba was an independent, non-aligned, progressive country. We shall leave the truth and the facts to history and to the judgement of the world community, but we in the Somali Democratic Republic have strong reservations about that statement.

191. Whilst I reserve my delegation's right to reply at a later stage to the statement made by the representative of Ethiopia, I should like now to make the following comment. If it is true that Ethiopia is a big, rich nation, why has it found it necessary to call upon other countries for assistance in the face of internal liberation movements? I am referring to Eritrea and the Ogaden. The Ethiopians have

always minimized the existence of the liberation movements to the point where they say that there is none.

192. Even if I accepted that Somalia was involved, Somalia is, as the representative of Ethiopia said, a poor nation and, as he also maintained, has a population of less than 3 million people. Even if one accepted that Somalia was involved, why is it necessary for Ethiopia—which claims to have a population of 30 million people and to be a rich country, a strong nation—to call in foreign mercenaries? Why should it not defend itself, if what it says is true?

193. The fact that Ethiopia could not defend itself against internal opponents, and had to call in mercenaries from outside, is evidence that there is no empire of Ethiopia. There is a feudal régime which has colonized a multitude of tribes and ethnic groups which were, at a certain period in history, the people living in that region and ruling themselves.

194. I should like to respect the rule of 10 minutes' right of reply. As I said earlier, I reserve my Government's position with regard to the statement by the representative of Ethiopia.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.