

of thorium, which is as important a resource as uranium, also merits active consideration.”

Technology embargo

The other area of difficulty that Dr. Iyengar addressed, where the IAEA has seldom taken a separate stance from the nuclear weapons states, was the issue of “spin-offs.” Iyengar urged that “it is necessary to ensure that there is no interference in the internal policies of the member-states and no infringement of their fundamental right to carry out research and development, and thereby benefit from its spin-offs.” He insisted that emphasis of “special inspections,” or “what we may call as ‘challenge inspections’ beyond the provisions of existing documents, are bound to vitiate the atmosphere, for the simple reason that ‘challenge inspections’ by their very nature, presuppose acquisition by the agency of information through questionable means.”

Addressing the increasing difficulties faced by developing nations in obtaining essential technologies blocked by the powerful nuclear weapons states in cooperation with the IAEA, Dr. Iyengar cited the thin line that separates the “sensitive” technology from the “non-sensitive” variety. He pointed out that there is “a number of applications in which changing the ratio of isotope of naturally occurring non-fissile elements has significant advantages, such as nitride fuel in fast reactors and improving the efficiency of mercury vapor lamps.” He went on: “The dividing line between sensitive and non-sensitive technology is rather thin, and this essentially is the character of modern science and technology. To achieve its objective of promoting peaceful nuclear energy, the agency should ensure that no artificial barriers are raised to impede the development of high technologies.”

Dr. Iyengar also criticized the lack of an advisory scientific committee in the agency which he described as “a major lacuna which needs to be corrected.” In the 1960s and ’70s, the IAEA used to sponsor a number of international conferences to bring together scientists working in different areas of fundamental science. These interactions resulted in developing new areas of research, which often shaped the development of new technologies. “It is indeed unfortunate that in the recent past, there has been a dilution of these activities in preference to those that mainly deal with regulations, accounting, and safeguards,” Iyengar said. He urged the agency to “seek the advice of eminent international experts so that the activities of the agency are not reduced to merely carrying out tasks of a mundane nature.” Dr. Iyengar also cited the usefulness of the Regional Cooperative Agreement for promoting cooperation amongst developing countries. Urging the IAEA president to revitalize the the practice, Dr. Iyengar said: “During the last year we [India] hosted regional training courses in research reactor safety and principles, and isotope techniques in hydrology. Three more programs and workshops are planned for 1991-92.”

High-handed U.S. memo outrages U.N. members

At the United Nations General Assembly meeting in New York in July, the U.S. delegation, led by Amb. Thomas Pickering, surprised member states by delivering to each a memorandum entitled “United States priorities for the forty-sixth regular session of the United Nations General Assembly.” The document contained a litany of U.S. priorities for the session.

While reviewing section 6, it should be kept in mind that millions of children in Iraq are facing starvation because of the U.S.-instigated United Nations economic embargo.

In section 7, the United States particularly singled out for verbal abuse the U.N. Fourth Committee, and threatened to pull out of the committee. The Fourth Committee has been the particular forum which has heard complaints that U.S. statesman Lyndon LaRouche has been the victim of human rights violations, a judicial railroad, and political imprisonment. We excerpt from the document here to give readers a flavor of the U.S. attitude.

1. Arab-Israeli issues

The United States has in recent years looked closely at the U.N. resolution on U.N. cooperation with the Arab League with a view toward developing a consensus text. . . .

Unfortunately, we have been unable to vote in favor of this resolution whose concept we support, because some very contentious language remains in the text. At last year’s UNGA [United Nations General Assembly], progress was made in working to excise some of the most egregious language. But we could not support a text that still includes references to implementation of UNGA resolutions the USG [U.S. government] had vigorously opposed, as well as reference to the 1980 Amman summit report which specifically criticizes the United States. . . .

In our view this plethora of measures is excessive and does nothing to help the situation between Arabs and Israelis. It also consumes a considerable amount of General Assembly time and energy in a duplicative effort. We should think about consolidation of a number of these resolutions and, where possible, the elimination of contentious and gratuitous rhetoric. We want your views and support for such an effort. . . .

One final key issue: The 1975 UNGA Resolution 3379, the so-called “Zionism is Racism” resolution, continues to tarnish the U.N.’s respectability and its ability to play a responsible and unbiased role addressing Arab-Israeli issues. My government remains committed to the repeal of this reso-

lution. We will be looking at prospects for repeal at the upcoming UNGA. *We urge your government to also publicly support a repeal effort. Specifically, you might urge your President or prime minister to include a call for repeal in his UNGA address [emphasis added]. . . .*

6. Human rights

. . . We hope that you will lend your support to efforts to continue the broad international condemnation of Iraqi human rights violations within Iraq and during its occupation of Kuwait. We also hope you will resist competing efforts to detract attention from Iraqi responsibility for gross and systematic violations of human rights. . . .

Similarly, we hope you will support the resolution on respect for the will of the people in Burma, as indicated in the May 1990 national elections. . . . There have been no signs of movement by the Burmese military authorities to respect the election results and return the government to civilian control. We hope you will give your support to the deferred resolution at the UNGA. . . .

We do ask that you help maintain the international pressure on Cuba to improve its human rights practices by monitoring the situation there and supporting a strong, active, and credible investigation by the UNHRC [U.N. Human Rights Commission] special representative.

The question of human rights in Afghanistan will again be considered by the UNGA, and special rapporteur Ermacora will present an interim report on the human rights situation there. Any resolution based on that report should be objective, recognizing the responsibility which must still be borne by the Soviet Union and the Najibullah regime, the parties which started the conflict in the first place. . . .

The Third Committee should also address issues of human rights violations in Africa. . . .

7. Fourth committee reform

We are following closely developments in the Fourth Committee/C-24 reform working groups and remain concerned about the committees' penchant for extraneous and anachronistic rhetoric.

The Fourth Committee's resolutions do not reflect the positive political evolution that has taken place in recent years. We cannot continue to accept the committee's outdated rhetoric, misguided assertions, name-calling, and other vestiges of the Cold War. *Our ability to remain on the Fourth Committee and to respect its work will depend on its ability to adapt itself to the new world reality [emphasis added]. . . .*

We oppose also a resolution condemning foreign economic and military interests which allegedly impede implementation of the declaration. The United States strongly disagrees with the premise that mere presence of foreign economic and military interests in non-self-governing territories is an obstacle to self-determination. . . .

Thailand

Depopulation program was 'too successful'

by Michael Billington

The northern sector of Thailand has been a target area for the various world bodies involved in birth control efforts since at least the early 1960s. According to the World Bank and others, this area, and Thailand as a whole, stand as a success story for having radically reduced the fertility rate of a relatively underdeveloped nation. But one of the Thai professionals most intimately involved with the implementation of that program has, since the mid-1980s, been attempting to warn his nation and the world at large that the program was "too successful," creating a disastrous demographic collapse of the towns and villages of northern Thailand. Thai officialdom has refused to respond, primarily because the population control policies have been adopted at levels which political leaders are hesitant to challenge. In particular, members of the Royal Family have backed the depopulation programs.

Dr. Tieng Pardthaisong, a demography professor at Chiang Mai University in northern Thailand, has now been rewarded for his courage and honesty by having all his funding cut, from the Ford Foundation and other institutions unhappy with the exposure of the genocidal results of their programs. Dr. Tieng's worldwide reputation as a leading expert in the field will not prevent his community medicine operations from closing down when his personal funds run out, which he estimates will be within two years.

Dr. Tieng actively participated in the numerous studies and projects in population control in northern Thailand over the past 30 years. It was not until the mid-1980s that he realized the devastating impact of the "success" of the programs. Fertility had been decreased from over six children per woman to less than two children per woman (known as replacement level) by 1980 in the north, and the rates in the rest of the nation also fell below replacement levels over the next decade. What Dr. Tieng saw in a 1989 study of the province of Chiang Mai was a breakdown of school systems, a shortage of labor, skyrocketing social and medical costs due to the relative aging of the population, and a death rate so rapidly surpassing the birth rate, that villages were facing