



President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey): It is, Sir, a privilege for me to address the General Assembly at this special session, which, under your presidency, is called upon to deliberate on the most crucial issue for humankind. I am confident that your wisdom and guidance will enable the Assembly at this session to make a significant contribution to the process of disarmament.

2. I wish also to greet the Secretary-General, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, and to express our appreciation of his tireless efforts to promote peaceful solutions to the numerous problems he has had to confront since he assumed his functions.

3. The second special session devoted to disarmament has been convened at a time when the international situation has deteriorated as a consequence of frequent recourse to force, violations of the Charter of the United Nations and regional military conflicts.

4. At a time when we are here considering how to promote international peace and security, Israel, defying international law and the principles of the Charter, has unscrupulously invaded the territory of a Member country, spreading death and destruction. The Israeli action endangers the future of the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples and threatens peace and security in the Middle East and worldwide. As a country situated in the area, we are following with growing concern the grave developments taking place south of our borders.

5. This session also coincides with a greater awareness of the dangers of nuclear war throughout the world. The recent demonstrations in different parts of the world have underlined the anguish felt at the possibility that a nuclear exchange might annihilate life and civilization on earth. These fears cannot be dismissed as illusory. We all know, and the scientists have confirmed, that a nuclear conflagration would engulf the whole world in a holocaust. The possibility of a proliferation of nuclear weapons in the years ahead only increases our concern.

6. The arms competition, in both the nuclear and the conventional fields, diverts enormous resources to destructive purposes and hampers economic and social development. Since the last special session on disarmament, in 1978, military expenditures have risen by 50 per cent and transfers of arms have increased dramatically. Spurred by new technologies,

the armaments race has assumed frightening proportions.

7. Turkey is a country situated on the dividing-line between two alliance systems and is a member of one of them. Its geopolitical position and historical experience compels it to give primary importance to security requirements. But Turkey is also a developing country with a rapidly rising population. Despite scarce resources it has to carry a heavy burden in terms of defence expenditures. We are therefore fully conscious of the imperative need to promote disarmament in a manner that does not mean less security for each of us and for the world.

8. Four years after the General Assembly's first special session on disarmament we meet here again to express our concern about the perils of an escalating arms race and to devise means of checking and reversing this disastrous course.

9. The Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] adopted by consensus at the first special session on disarmament pointed to general and complete disarmament under effective international control as the ultimate goal. With this goal in mind a Programme of Action [*ibid.*, *sect. III*] is set out aiming at equal security for all at a lower level of armaments. Unfortunately, progress in this field has been disappointing. It has been confirmed that disarmament negotiations cannot take place in a vacuum; they are inevitably affected by the evolution of the international situation and by all the factors related to international security.

10. In considering the developments of the past few years it is easy to see that today we face an international situation which is in many respects more adverse than the one prevailing at the time of the tenth special session. The lack of international confidence and mutual trust is more acute. Efforts towards a more balanced international order have stalled. Non-compliance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki in 1975, and the Final Document endangers world peace and security. Respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-intervention in their internal affairs, the inviolability of frontiers and the peaceful settlement of disputes are some of the fundamental principles embodied in these documents. But these principles have been repeatedly violated. The international community should therefore strive to ensure that the principles to which all countries have agreed are upheld, to resolve existing disputes, to prevent new armed conflicts from erupting and to contribute to a relaxation of tension. No disarmament measure can be effective unless it provides for undiminished security, and this will require a political atmosphere that inspires confidence, and adequate and appropriate verification.

11. The greatest threat to mankind still lies in the expansion of nuclear arsenals. There is a world-wide consensus that the cessation of the nuclear arms race and reductions in strategic armaments levels have the highest priority in the agenda of disarmament negotiations. We are encouraged by the mutual decision of the United States and the Soviet Union to begin negotiations not only on the limitation but also on the reduction of strategic weapons. We hope that these negotiations will result in enhanced international stability through a balanced and verifiable agreement on substantial reductions. We welcome equally the pledges by the two countries to continue to respect the provisions of SALT I and SALT II.

12. We support the ongoing negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on intermediate-range nuclear missiles. The dismantling of all such land-based missiles, as proposed by the United States, would significantly promote peace and security and efforts towards disarmament.

13. The Programme of Action contained in the Final Document emphasizes also the need for the cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapons. The first step in this direction should be, parallel to the negotiations on the reduction of strategic arms, a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. In the absence of such an agreement, the vertical proliferation of nuclear arms cannot be halted.

14. In our efforts to preserve the world from a nuclear disaster, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] is of vital significance. Turkey has ratified this Treaty and has therefore undertaken not to possess nuclear weapons.

15. In 1980 the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was concluded. In view of the importance of the subject, the experience gained during a whole decade and the large and increasing number of adherents to the Treaty, one would have expected a more positive outcome from that Conference. We all know the reasons that prevented us from reaching consensus on a concluding document.

16. Furthermore, in the same period the detailed and valuable work accomplished during the international fuel-cycle evaluation demonstrated that no technological quick fix exists for preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. It is therefore clear that we have to rely on political means and international arrangements, agreed upon by common consent, to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We believe that the existing international nuclear non-proliferation régime should be adequately strengthened. IAEA has thus far proved itself an efficient verification entity. It deserves to be strengthened and further expanded to meet the challenges of the 1980s, particularly the legitimate requirements concerning the promotion of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, with special emphasis on the needs of the developing countries.

17. Turkey has traditionally supported the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones wherever possible and practically feasible. As the establishment of such zones has a direct bearing on the security of States within those defined regions and on the existing military balance, the desire for the establish-

ment of such zones should necessarily come from the States of the zone, and the principle of undiminished security should be strictly observed.

18. In addition to nuclear weapons, weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons, constitute other areas of priority as defined in the Final Document. Turkey believes that the conclusion of the negotiations on the complete and effective prohibition of chemical weapons, including satisfactory provisions for verification, is one of the most urgent tasks of our collective efforts.

19. In the field of conventional weapons, we welcome the successful conclusion of the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. Turkey, together with its allies and many other States, signed the Convention,¹ which in our view should be considered as only a first step in this field.

20. If we succeed in halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race in the coming years without parallel progress in the conventional arms sphere, we shall not be able to build a more secure world. In recent years the death toll caused by sophisticated conventional weapons in regional military conflicts has been simply stupendous.

21. The discussions held in the Disarmament Commission concerning a projected study by a Group of Experts on All Aspects of the Conventional Arms Race and on Disarmament relating to Conventional Weapons and Armed Forces were in fact not very encouraging from that standpoint. Furthermore, the provision in paragraph 85 of the Final Document which stipulates that "Consultations should be carried out among major arms supplier and recipient countries on the limitation of all types of international transfer of conventional weapons" has thus far remained unimplemented. In the past Turkey has repeatedly drawn the attention of the international community to the very dangerous consequences of arms smuggling and illicit arms sales, which are conducive to the destabilization of the domestic political and social order of States and to the impairment of regional security.

22. A wave of cruel and blind terrorism endangers the social fabric of several States and orderly international relations in the name of extremist and fanatic doctrines. Groups of criminals try to undermine the authority of legal Governments and to impose their will on nations by force. In our view, those clandestine groups, representing all possible forms of political extremism, constitute a special danger and should be treated accordingly.

23. Multilateral disarmament efforts cannot ignore this new form of the use of force, backed by clandestine and massive transfers of arms. A state of undeclared war cannot persist for much longer in different parts of the world without leading to larger disruptions.

24. Until very recently it was hard to find any encouraging element in the efforts undertaken in the field of conventional disarmament. But there are now new developments in connexion with the mutual and

balanced force reduction negotiations at Vienna. Western countries are submitting proposals with a view to promoting agreement on equal collective ceilings on both sides in central Europe. An agreement of this nature, which would also take into consideration the security concerns of all European countries, would go a long way towards achieving a stable military balance in Europe and complementing limitations and reductions in the field of nuclear weapons.

25. Another important element in the field of conventional armaments would be an agreement on confidence-building measures in the whole of Europe. We hope that when the Madrid meeting of representatives of participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe reconvenes, it will be possible to agree on a mandate for a conference on disarmament in Europe. Its objective would be, in the first place, to elaborate an agreement on security and confidence-building measures which would be militarily significant, binding and verifiable.

26. For a long time, Europe has been considered the priority area for such measures because it is in that continent that the greatest concentration of conventional forces exists. But as recent events have demonstrated, military confrontations in many other parts of the world have reached dangerous heights. Military stability on a regional level is therefore becoming more and more an important issue for other areas as well.

27. The tenth special session recognized the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The institutional arrangements undertaken to increase the effectiveness of the disarmament machinery constitute, in our view, a big step forward. On the basis of the experience gained so far, Turkey believes that we still need some further improvements in order to ensure a more suitable framework for the full and adequate expression of the will and desires of Member States.

28. In this respect, we believe that the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, which has performed successfully during the last four years, should be strengthened in order to meet the ever-growing needs in this field. The Centre should be given a higher status and greater financial resources to fulfil additional responsibilities in coming years.

29. Moreover, the deliberative organs should improve their working methods and procedures to avoid protracted discussions and devote more time to serious exchanges on concrete subjects.

30. We also believe that the single multilateral negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament, should be further enhanced in order to increase its effectiveness. In this context, following the resolution adopted by the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority, the first review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament should be completed during this special session [*resolution 36/97 J*]. The Turkish delegation will not fail to present concrete proposals aimed at facilitating the work to be done to this effect.

31. Those proposals will be inspired by paragraph 28 of the Final Document, which states, *inter alia*:

"All States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations. They have the right to participate on an equal footing in those multilateral disarmament negotiations which have a direct bearing on their national security. While disarmament is the responsibility of all States, the nuclear-weapon States have the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament and, together with other militarily significant States, for halting and reversing the arms race. It is therefore important to secure their active participation."

32. Turkey believes that as a militarily significant State it can make an important contribution to the work of the Committee on Disarmament. Because of this strongly held belief the Turkish Government took the initiative with regard to draft resolutions, adopted in 1978, 1980 and 1981 by the General Assembly, which called for the membership of the Committee to be reviewed [*resolutions 33/91 G, 35/156 I and 36/97 J, respectively*]. We consider that the four-year period which has elapsed since the Committee was established is sufficiently long to justify a review of membership. We therefore intend to ask for an enlargement of the membership, which would enable interested States to take full part in the work of the Committee, and subsequently to request support for our own candidature, which was submitted to the Committee at the end of its last session.

33. In our assessment of the results obtained during the last four years, the activities concerning research and information are commendable. The studies commissioned by the Secretary-General have helped to promote wide understanding of very difficult and complex subjects. The programme of fellowships on disarmament was particularly helpful for developing countries in the training of experts and was handled with pragmatism and efficiency. These few examples illustrate the benefits that may be obtained through the strengthening of the international machinery, and particularly of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, which in the future can be transformed into an organ entrusted with the task of monitoring compliance with existing disarmament conventions.

34. Finally, I should like to mention the study entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*,² which has been transmitted to this session not only for information purposes but also for appropriate action. Turkey has from the very beginning supported this important initiative, and we hope that this special session will be in a position to give effect to the recommendations contained in the study. We consider that this particular subject deserves a thorough and detailed examination in order to enlighten our future course of action.

35. We welcome the proclamation of the World Disarmament Campaign and believe that in concluding its work the twelfth special session will be able to adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament, which will help to translate our common objectives into action. The Turkish delegation will do its utmost to contribute to the successful outcome of the work of this special session.

36. Mr. BHATT (Nepal): Mr. President, I have the honour to convey greetings to you and, through you, to representatives from my august Sovereign, His

Majesty King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah Dev, and his best wishes for the success of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

37. It gives me great pleasure to extend to you, Sir, on behalf of my delegation and myself, our sincere felicitations on your election as President of this historic special session. You represent a country with which Nepal has friendly and cordial relations. Your stewardship of the thirty-sixth regular session of the General Assembly bears witness to your skill, wisdom and experience. My delegation feels confident that you will guide the work of this special session to a fruitful conclusion.

38. I also wish to avail myself of this opportunity to pay our compliments to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, for his dedication to the ideals of the United Nations and for the manner in which he has been discharging the heavy responsibility pertaining to his high office.

39. Four years have elapsed since the General Assembly met in an epoch-making special session to deliberate on the great anachronism of the modern age, the arms race. At that session the Assembly, representing the collective wisdom of mankind, made the first concerted attempt to embark on the quest for peaceful survival, which is our birthright. During the intervening four years, events of far-reaching consequences have taken place. Never before in the history of human existence has the man on the street been so acutely aware of what paragraph 11 of the Final Document so aptly describes as "an unprecedented threat of self-extinction arising from the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced". This growing public concern about the fate of human civilization is a hopeful sign in this troubled era. The question of disarmament has ceased to be of exclusive interest to a limited circle. This special session has the responsibility of finding some of the answers to the questions that have assumed serious proportions.

40. The question of the arms race and disarmament is obviously connected with international political events. The arms race is not simply the consequence of international tension; it is also the cause of deterioration in international relations.

41. Those cyclical relations have been clearly manifested in the events of the past few years. The 1980s, designated by the United Nations as the Second Disarmament Decade, opened on a note of uncertainty. The efforts of the international community to end armed interventions in some parts of the world have produced no result.

42. The current Israeli military action in Lebanon has caused us great concern. Nepal feels that such unilateral military action is not only contrary to the norms of international law and the principles of the United Nations but also a great threat to peace in an area already under considerable tension. Nepal joins all peace-loving countries in demanding an immediate cessation of hostilities and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon. As a contributor of troops to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon [UNIFIL], Nepal appeals to Israel and all other parties

concerned to co-operate with UNIFIL in restoring full Lebanese authority in that country.

43. The continued hostilities between two non-aligned countries—Iran and Iraq—have caused us deep anxiety. Nepal once again reiterates its appeal to both countries to exercise maximum restraint and seek a peaceful solution to their problems.

44. In the South Atlantic, now that hostilities have ended, we earnestly hope that both parties to the conflict will be able to achieve a permanent and peaceful settlement through negotiations.

45. While armed conflicts in various regions of the world are posing a grave threat to international peace and security, relations between the two super-Powers continue to be marked with deep suspicion and mistrust. The process of détente, if not already dead, is in serious jeopardy. Great-Power rivalry has spread a feeling of insecurity among smaller and developing countries. This atmosphere of fear and distrust has led to a vicious race for numerical and technological superiority in armaments among the big Powers. The smaller and developing countries too are seeking security in the buildup of more sophisticated conventional weapons. History has proved that security through armament can at best be extremely precarious. On the contrary, it fuels the sense of insecurity among nations, which adds to the momentum of the arms race. Consequently, expenditures on military research and development are rising fast, and more sophisticated and more lethal weapons are being spread around the world unchecked. Despite global economic stagnation, military spending has been following an upward trend at a rate of about 3 per cent per annum. The world military expenditure in 1981 has been estimated to have reached a staggering \$600 to \$650 billion.

46. This cycle of mistrust, violence and arms race requires that we examine the system for the maintenance of international peace and security envisaged by the Charter of the United Nations. This system is based primarily on the principle according to which Member States are to refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force—a principle which obliges Member States to settle their disputes by peaceful means—and the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. The Charter lays down a number of procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and for dealing with specific threats to international peace and security. The Security Council has been given special responsibility in this area.

47. Those elements of the United Nations system responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security have failed to work effectively, as experience in the past 36 years has shown. Member States have ignored the solemn obligation they have undertaken, and the Security Council has seldom been able to discharge its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

48. A gradual but determined approach to the goal of general and complete disarmament remains our primary aim. At the same time, however, it is absolutely necessary that the States Members of the Organization should try to restrain war and violence by developing and utilizing more effectively the

procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the Charter. This requires that every State faithfully abide by the principles of international conduct in relations with other States. Only consistent adherence to such principles will provide a solid framework for lasting mutual trust and confidence, which in turn will sustain international security and disarmament.

49. My delegation views the significance of this second special session on disarmament against the background of the paradoxical growth in the feeling of insecurity of nations in spite of a higher level of armament. The higher level of armament has the concomitant result of diverting resources towards refining and increasing the instruments of destruction, while these resources are sorely needed to alleviate the crushing burden of deprivation, disease and illiteracy, especially in the developing countries. This session has once again offered us an opportunity to review and evaluate accomplishments since the first special session on disarmament. It has also offered an opportunity to reiterate the solemn determination of the international community to uphold and implement the international strategy for disarmament that the Final Document incorporates.

50. After the tenth special session, some progress was achieved on the specific measures referred to in the Final Document. The deliberating and negotiating machinery has been revitalized and strengthened. The United Nations, especially through its Centre for Disarmament, has significantly expanded its activities by various means, including the preparation of expert studies on substantive issues and contacts with research institutions and non-governmental organizations. A Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, with related Protocols,¹ has been adopted and opened for signature.

51. However, despite those positive developments, the principles and priorities laid down in the Final Document, which given the necessary political will could furnish a solution to the problem, have not yet been translated into substantive action.

52. The Final Document described the principal goal of disarmament as ensuring the survival of mankind and eliminating the danger of war, in particular nuclear war. It accorded highest priority to nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war. Total lack of progress in this vital area of disarmament is the biggest cause of concern for mankind today. The confrontation between the two super-Powers in inter-continental nuclear weapons is becoming increasingly uneasy. The doctrine of pre-emptive first strike limited to land-based missiles is only a myth; any outbreak of nuclear war on whatever scale will expose to extreme risk the very survival of the human race. However, each side claims that the other is trying for a first-strike capability, while declaring its own objective to be solely defensive. The myth is being increasingly used as a rationale for the tremendous increases in strategic weapons production and procurement, a development which defies all logic and reason.

53. Nepal welcomed the signing of SALT I and welcomes the declaration of the two super-Powers to

abide by the terms of the unratified SALT II. However, the procurement and production of nuclear weapons of unimaginable destructive power long ago crossed the threshold of reason or deterrence. Consequently, agreement which merely sets an upper ceiling on the quality and quantity of these weapons is no longer acceptable to mankind. While welcoming the intention of the United States and the Soviet Union to resume their strategic nuclear-weapons talks, we urge them speedily to agree on a balanced and verifiable reduction leading ultimately to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

54. The question of intermediate-range nuclear weapons is inextricably tied up with that of strategic weapons. We hope that the parties to the current Geneva negotiations on these weapons will achieve concrete results. Nepal believes that continuing dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union is necessary to open the way to the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons.

55. The building of trust and confidence between the East and the West is a difficult task. But the prevention of nuclear war is an absolute requirement for all human ambitions, personal, national and global. It is the precondition for tackling economic, environmental, cultural and other goals to which mankind aspires.

56. A comprehensive treaty banning all nuclear-weapon tests is long overdue. In spite of the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water,³ the rate of nuclear weapon tests has steadily increased in the past four years. We look forward to the elaboration of a comprehensive test-ban treaty in the Committee on Disarmament in the near future. Such a treaty, we believe, will help restrain the qualitative development of nuclear weapons and prevent their proliferation.

57. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons remains one of the most important instruments devised to check the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We appeal to nuclear-weapon States to honour the solemn commitment that they have made under article VI of that Treaty. Only strict adherence to the commitment made by the nuclear-weapon States can induce States which are not parties to the Treaty to join the Non-Proliferation Treaty. My delegation would support measures to strengthen the IAEA safeguard system.

58. My delegation reiterates its stand that the non-nuclear-weapon States which are not party to any military alliance are entitled to a categorical and legally binding assurance that they will not be subject to a nuclear attack. Pending the resolution of this issue in the Committee on Disarmament, we would support the common formula for a Security Council resolution covering common ground contained in national statements of the nuclear-weapon States.

59. We continue to believe that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of an agreement freely arrived at between States of a region can be an important step towards nuclear disarmament. The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)⁴ provides a model for the establishment of such zones in other regions of the world. We welcome efforts based on

this principle for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia. Nepal would fully co-operate with the African States in thwarting the designs of South Africa to introduce nuclear weapons in that region against the expressed will of the entire continent of Africa.

60. The lack of progress in the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [resolution 2832 (XXVI)] continues to cause us deep anxiety. We continue to support the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean as a necessary step towards the implementation of the Declaration. As a hinterland State of the Indian Ocean, Nepal believes that the present trend of military buildup and rivalry in the region can only aggravate the difficult situation there.

61. Nepal has always supported the promotion of understanding and goodwill between States. We believe that it is necessary to institutionalize peace in order to harness and mobilize all available resources for development purposes. We harbour no ill feelings towards anyone and we advocate friendship with all. Non-alignment and peaceful coexistence are the twin foundations of our foreign policy. It is in this context that we have proposed that Nepal be declared a zone of peace.

62. While attaching the highest importance to nuclear disarmament, Nepal supports the move for effective international measures to control the problem of the conventional arms race. The process, however, has to begin with the most heavily armed States. Nepal supports a regional approach to the problem of conventional disarmament, beginning again with the most heavily armed States. The creation of a climate of confidence at a regional level can greatly promote disarmament and the relaxation of tensions at the global level.

63. My delegation looks forward to the early conclusion of a treaty banning chemical weapons as well as one on radiological weapons. Nepal supports the strengthening of existing instruments or the negotiation of a new instrument to halt permanently the militarization of outer space.

64. At the first special session on disarmament the General Assembly introduced important reforms in the institutional arrangement for disarmament. The Committee on Disarmament has all the necessary qualifications to act as the only multilateral negotiating forum. At this special session the Assembly should examine the working of the Committee on Disarmament to ensure full co-operation by all its members, the nuclear-weapon States in particular. Likewise, the Assembly at this session should take concrete steps to help the deliberating forum, the Disarmament Commission, to find its proper identity and direction.

65. At the second special session on disarmament the Assembly has also to give serious thought to the enhancement of the role of the United Nations in the disarmament process. The Centre for Disarmament is already playing a key role in promoting a well-informed public opinion in favour of disarmament. My delegation would support any proposal for a gradual expansion in the structure and function of the Centre in keeping with the increasing role of the

United Nations in disarmament. Likewise, my delegation would like UNIDIR to play a more active role in its field. My delegation fully supports the increase in the United Nations capabilities to verify, monitor and enforce the compliance of the parties with arms control agreements.

66. The adoption of the comprehensive programme of disarmament will be a major achievement of this special session. My delegation hopes that the comprehensive programme of disarmament will be a carefully worked out package of both long-term and short-term measures designed to lead to the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The programme should have the force of a solemn undertaking by all Member States, the nuclear-weapon States in particular, that they will faithfully translate it into action within an agreed broad timetable.

67. My delegation welcomes the launching of the World Disarmament Campaign at this special session. We feel that the Campaign will add strength to the growing constituency for disarmament. I should also like to express our commendation to the non-governmental organizations and research institutes for the very important contributions they are making. I should like here to make special mention of the important recommendations made by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues.⁵ These recommendations are worthy of serious consideration by this special session.

68. At this special session the Assembly has before it a recent United Nations study entitled *Comprehensive Study on Confidence-Building Measures*.⁶ The study has made a systematic effort to develop the concept of confidence-building measures in a global context. It rightly points out that the promotion of confidence in the military field alone will not be enough, and it goes on to elaborate the role which the United Nations can play in the process. My delegation hopes that the Assembly will give serious consideration to the conclusions and recommendations of the study, for translation into action by Member States.

69. The General Assembly has repeatedly stressed the close relationship between expenditure on armaments and economic and social development. The recent United Nations study entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*² has pointedly focused on the triangular relationship between disarmament, development and security in the global context. Economic and social conditions have assumed major significance for development. A balanced global development, which can contribute to ending poverty, enhances the global security arrangement which would be beneficial to all countries. Disarmament can strengthen international security by releasing the scarce resources needed to combat unemployment, to serve social needs in the developed countries and to overcome the increasing misery in the developing countries. Armament, while wasting human and economic resources, causes untold devastation to the human environment. Only a decisive reversal of the present course of events can save us.

70. The delegation of Nepal hopes that this special session not only will reinforce the momentous con-

sensus of the tenth special session but will go beyond that by initiating concrete actions in implementing those decisions. There is an unprecedented surge of the peace movement today. Men and women all over the world are standing up for a cause that transcends all other differences. Theirs is the struggle for our common survival. This historic meeting cannot disappoint the great aspirations that it has given rise to.

71. Mr. NIASSE (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): For the second time since it was established the United Nations is devoting a special session to reflection on the crucial issue of disarmament. Senegal, my country, is very happy to participate in this session in accordance with the decision taken to this effect by our President, Mr. Abdou Diouf. The special attention devoted to this question does indeed reflect the ever growing threat of the frenzied arms race to the future of the human race.

72. Seeing you today, Sir, a representative of a third-world country, presiding over our meetings devoted to an issue that is supposedly the private domain of the big Powers gives us real reason to hope. Indeed, we may well hope that those Powers will properly appreciate the role that the young nations, because of the number of them and their human and economic potential, are in a position to play in respect of all the major issues determining the fate of the human race, and particularly the problem that we are dealing with here today.

73. In addition, you represent a country with the same aspirations as Senegal, which has close and fraternal relations with your country.

74. Your competence and profound devotion to the ideals of the Organization were characteristic of the way in which you presided over the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, and they are our best guarantee of success here.

75. I should also like to take this opportunity to address, on behalf of the head of State of Senegal, President Abdou Diouf, and on behalf of the Government and the people of Senegal, our very warm and sincere congratulations to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar on his unanimous election to head the United Nations. The choice of this son of the third world to preside over the future of the Organization is indeed a credit also to the Organization, because it eloquently confirms its democratic and universal nature. Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar's great qualities as a diplomat and humanist—and indeed he is no newcomer to the Secretariat of this Organization—preceded him here in his new and difficult task, and we are firmly convinced that he will indeed be a credit not only to the third world but also to the entire community of nations in his defence of its noble ideals of justice and peace.

76. I must also pay a tribute to his predecessor, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for the competence and devotion that he demonstrated in the service of the Organization during the past 10 years. His spirit of initiative, his devotion to the principles of the Charter, on several occasions advanced the cause of peace at times when the United Nations was faced with some of the most serious problems in its history. Therefore he can be assured of the great gratitude and respect of Senegal

for the service that he has thus rendered to the international community.

77. Four years have elapsed since 1978, when the entire international community unanimously expressed its hopes and fears, and also some of the greatest aspirations of the peoples of our planet, namely, to push the spectre of war as far away as possible and to bring peace much closer.

78. Two years ago now, at the time when it proclaimed the Third Development Decade, the United Nations decided to make the 1980s the Second Disarmament Decade. Indeed, to highlight this event, the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session adopted a resolution proclaiming an international peace year, a month of peace and a day of peace.

79. On all those occasions the international community laid the bases for a comprehensive strategy for attaining two objectives: the immediate goal, the elimination of the danger of nuclear war; and the long-term goal, general and complete disarmament under international control.

80. These particularly encouraging results of the first special session on disarmament gave rise to many hopes, legitimate ones, among all those who consider halting the arms race one of the most serious challenges facing the human race in this last quarter of the twentieth century, because of the increase in and the persistence of hotbeds of tension which no longer spare any continent today, ranging from Asia to Latin America and including the Middle East and, of course, Africa.

81. Here it is Cambodia and Afghanistan. There, it is the war between Iran and Iraq, two non-aligned countries that share the same ideals of peace and justice, as well as the heritage of Islamic civilization. Elsewhere it is the State of Israel, which has elevated to a Government policy organized aggression against other States and peoples, particularly today against the people of Palestine and Lebanon. In Africa, it is the question of Namibia, the situation in Chad and the question of Western Sahara. In the South Atlantic, it was the war in the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands.

82. Thus we can see that those noble declarations adopted at the end of the tenth special session did not always, unfortunately, yield positive results, which can be achieved only with the political will of all the States Members of the Organization.

83. Disarmament is, of course, a long-term undertaking, but after several decades of proposals, negotiations and partial progress we have to recognize that the balance sheet at the end of 1981 was completely negative in that no progress had been made in the world in respect of arms control and disarmament. This is not a subjective evaluation; it is simply a statement of fact backed up by figures.

84. Indeed, the amounts devoted to arms expenditures at the world level continue to increase faster and faster, going from \$500 billion in 1979 to \$650 billion in 1981. This is an increase of almost 30 per cent in two years, and that increase is twice what it was 20 years ago and four times that in 1945.

85. The figure recorded in 1981 should give grounds for concern in an international situation which is marked today by a profound economic crisis, with its

accompanying wretchedness and poverty, which endanger the lives of millions of human beings and leave them prey to famine and disease.

86. In addition to these vast amounts, there is a lack of proportion. The first and most disturbing is the lack of proportion vis-à-vis the fundamental needs of mankind. Arms expenditures are 14 times the total amount allocated to development aid in all its forms. At the beginning of the Third Development Decade and the Second Disarmament Decade the community of nations continues to devote 4.5 per cent of its gross national product to war budgets, in other words to increased distrust, as opposed to 0.3 per cent to development aid, in other words, to the solidarity of the whole human race.

Mr. García Robles (Mexico), Vice-President, took the Chair.

87. There is also a lack of proportion—and this is very paradoxical—vis-à-vis security needs, because the accumulated destructive capacity is far higher than would be needed to annihilate the entire human race. It should be noted that the explosive power of the nuclear weapons held by the two super-Powers is 8 billion tons of TNT. Thus, competition between the two super-Powers continues at an infernal rate.

88. It is clear that the world is over-armed, and this special session should be the occasion not just to continue deploring failure or accepting with resignation what seems to be the situation at the international level, but rather to persevere in the work begun in 1978: searching together in an atmosphere of trust for ways that would enable us to make real progress which would, above all, limit the uncontrolled growth of this over-armament, which is an absolute prerequisite for initiating long-awaited true disarmament.

89. That is at least the desire of my country, Senegal, which since it acceded to independence has resolutely applied itself to establishing relationships of trust with all those countries that share its concern to live in peace in order to enable all peoples to make economic and social progress.

90. My country has translated that policy into reality by joining with the rest of the international community in the search for the peaceful settlement of armed conflicts, by participating, despite its meagre resources as a developing country, in various peace-keeping operations in the world and in working together with our close neighbours to establish various kinds of regroupings.

91. The purpose of those regroupings is to resolve not only military security problems by concluding appropriate agreements, but also and above all to solve the problems of economic security. If the solution to the problems of economic security which face our young States is not found collectively and on the basis of solidarity, then military security cannot be guaranteed for those same countries.

92. The link between those two concepts of security is, of course, clear when we know that the search for any economic progress and for justice that would uphold human dignity can succeed only in a context of peace, tranquillity and mutual trust.

93. Accordingly, our main concern is still to contribute, by a subregional and regional approach, to the

creation and maintenance of a peaceful and stable international atmosphere, because it is only in that kind of atmosphere that small countries like our own can consolidate their independence and devote themselves to their main task, namely, improving the conditions and standard of living of their respective populations.

94. This is the time and place to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Group of Governmental Experts that the Assembly established in 1978 to study the link between disarmament and development [*resolution S-10/2, paras. 94 and 95*]. I would pay a tribute first of all to the Chairman of the Group, Mrs. Inga Thorsson of Sweden. From the work done by that Group² it can be seen that the arms race and the seeds of violence—poverty and injustice—are just two sides of the same equation, namely, international security.

95. To ensure that security also means to eliminate the injustice which requires the international community to continue to spend more than \$1 million every minute on purely military ends, while at the same time every year some 30 million people are left to die of hunger because the political will to help them is lacking, even though there is the potential to save them.

96. At this stage my country would like to refer to a positive and perhaps decisive contribution that third world countries could make to the solution of the problem of arms proliferation, with respect to which they have a responsibility, albeit a partial one, and that could be to work for the adoption within organizations such as the non-aligned movement of recommendations for an actual reduction of their armaments, which in 1981 led to the phenomenon of over-armament amounting to \$13 billion.

97. No doubt a real and tangible reduction of the arms expenditures of third world countries, whose increase has just been evaluated at 300 per cent, could lessen the tendency to over-arming. Such recommendations, however, assume the political will of the countries concerned to settle any disputes that might arise between them by peaceful means and without foreign interference.

98. With respect to the next stage, which would be that of actual disarmament, it could be begun, at the level of third world countries, thanks to a policy of complete denuclearization of the regions involved. I refer here mainly to Africa, the Middle East, Asia, the Indian Ocean and Latin America.

99. My delegation believes these suggestions are worth thinking about because, in the climate of the cold war, what has happened is that the focus of the conflicts have simply shifted to the third world, which is now an arena where armed aggression, foreign intervention and interference, oppression and the thirst for domination engender localized wars, often deliberately unleashed and maintained by outside Powers which, while they are dragging the entire human race into the perilous escalation of armaments, are using those conflicts to satisfy their geostrategic objectives and at the same time testing new destructive techniques.

100. Within the context of this policy of denuclearized zones we have to look at the specific nature and the diversity of the various situations. To deal in particular with the African continent, the immediate threat and danger comes from the southern part, that is to say, from the racist régime of Pretoria, for today nobody doubts that it has the secret of the atomic weapon. At the same time that it constitutes a potential challenge to the Declaration adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity in 1964 on the denuclearization of our continent, this situation is also in clear contradiction with the efforts made by the international community for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

101. It is against this background that Senegal, during the tenth special session [*17th meeting, para. 33*], in 1978, reaffirmed here the need to maintain Africa's status as a non-nuclear zone.

102. The African countries, in proclaiming the 1964 Declaration and by acceding to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, clearly committed themselves to making their continent a zone free of nuclear weapons. Yet today the threat that the nuclear programme of South Africa is bringing to bear on the security of the continent has become so real that the international community cannot remain indifferent to or aloof from this situation.

103. The role to be played by the nuclear Powers in full exercise of their responsibility in this field, in order to remove that threat which hangs over our continent, seems to us to be decisive. Those Powers should, by precise and binding commitments, guarantee the non-nuclear status of Africa. To that end they should prohibit any transfer of nuclear technology to South Africa until it signs the Non-Proliferation Treaty and opens its facilities to IAEA inspection.

104. That is not too high a price to pay to preserve what has been achieved by way of non-proliferation.

105. Thus, for hundreds of millions of men and women the objective of the United Nations, which was established precisely to preserve future generations from the scourge of war, is still a challenge to be taken up and a hope to be achieved.

106. Today the human race, which, to judge from the figures just quoted, does not seem to be aware of its common destiny, is still living through a crisis of security, for while détente between East and West is a paramount factor in formulating any disarmament policy, its extension to other parts of the world, more precisely to the third world countries, and particularly the search for balanced relationships between North and South, assumes a new concept of that détente.

107. To date it has been a détente whose definition has been completely alien to the developing countries. That definition, which still prevails, perpetuates the interests of the big Powers which are determined to limit conflicts to the areas where they arise, which is definitely to the detriment of the people who wish to live there peaceably.

108. International peace and security, therefore, cannot be guaranteed while localized armed conflicts continue and enormous sums of money continue to be spent on military purposes, at a time when the majority

of the inhabitants of the planet are still living in dire poverty, ignorance and disease. Peace cannot be conceived of without justice, which implies respect for the rights of peoples to self-determination without foreign intervention, and without the acceptance, in a spirit of tolerance, of the right to be different, regardless of the socio-political, socio-economic or socio-cultural order.

109. That is a challenge which the international community, more aware of its common destiny, can and must take up. It can do so if the nations learn at last to distinguish the interests that are their own from the common interests which should be defended by all and which must indeed prevail.

110. The Group of Experts to which I referred earlier proposed several solutions to us. Releasing and using for development purposes a tiny part of the resources now devoted to preparing for war would suffice to reduce considerably the areas of poverty in the world.

111. Here I would emphasize that expenditures on arms are now 240 times higher than the resources available to UNDP, which is encountering serious financial difficulties.

112. The solutions proposed to us by the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development are simply in keeping with justice, and so we fully endorse the idea put forward by the Group, paragraph 426 (7) of its study, that an international disarmament fund for development should be set up, financed by a tax on military budgets. Moreover, at the special session in 1978 Senegal advocated levying such a tax [*17th meeting, para. 35*].

113. The Head of State of Senegal, President Abdou Diouf, repeated that proposal at the last summit of the Heads of State of France and Africa, held in Paris in 1981.

114. The proposal seems feasible to my country, to the extent that the standardized system for reporting military expenditures developed by the United Nations some years ago makes it possible to find a solution to the problem of measuring the real level of armament in the world.

115. One of the most serious obstacles to disarmament—which, we can never say often enough, must begin with a cessation of over-armament—remains verification of the implementation of agreements on the freezing and reduction of military efforts. This obstacle has even been used by some as an alibi, a pretext for refusing to continue disarmament negotiations, because everybody wants to be sure in advance that agreements to be concluded would be respected by others.

116. Senegal proposed here in 1978 the establishment of a United Nations specialized body for the satellite monitoring of military activities throughout the world [*ibid.*, para. 34].

117. The President of the French Republic made a similar proposal, and today, after three years of work, the Group of Governmental Experts on the Question of the Establishment of an International Satellite Monitoring Agency which we asked to study the problem has provided us with the basic data on the technical, legal

and financial implications of setting up an international satellite monitoring agency.⁷

118. Setting it up would require less than 1 per cent of annual world arms expenditures. Such an agency, while it would help to reduce considerably the difficulties involved in verification of disarmament agreements, would also be extremely useful in preventing or effectively handling crises in the world, and thus strengthening international peace and security.

119. It is thus clear that establishing such an agency—without prejudging any interim solutions to verification problems—undoubtedly would effectively meet one of our major concerns: effective disarmament, effective because it is monitored.

120. I emphasize that, in view of the continuing and widening hotbeds of tension throughout the world, the strengthening of international security is more than ever of vital concern to the human race.

121. Twelve years ago the General Assembly expressed this concern by adopting the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)], in which it defined the general objectives the attainment of which would make it possible to avoid any further deterioration of the international situation. No effort should be spared to apply the provisions of that important Declaration. We feel that, following appropriate consultations, it would be a good idea for the permanent members of the Security Council and representatives chosen from the various geographical groups in the Organization to participate together in a summit meeting which would deal exclusively with promoting international peace and security. Such a meeting would be advisable at a time when peace is a matter of greater concern than ever in a world that is constantly preparing for war.

122. Here I would emphasize the special efforts made by President Abdou Diouf, the Head of State of Senegal for the establishment of an atmosphere of peace and co-operation among all nations. And how can I fail to refer, with respect and sadness, to the death, on 13 June, of a man who worked with great sincerity for peace and concord between the peoples, His Majesty King Khalid ibn Abdul Aziz of Saudi Arabia.

123. President Abdou Diouf has always maintained that disarmament and development are linked and are a collective challenge to us. To take up that challenge would mean not only freeing the human race from the threat of an unprecedented holocaust but also distributing more equitably and more fairly the immense resources of our planet, in order to triumph over poverty, disease, ignorance and the other scourges which afflict so many peoples.

124. We live in an age when, because of the close interdependence of nations, no one country can hope to remain on the sidelines of a world conflict, far less to hope to overcome by itself alone all the difficulties that face the human race as a whole.

125. Faced with the perils threatening the human race, rationality, common sense and the solidarity dictated by an all-too-clear fate must prevail and silence those demons of distrust which could make us lose the fight for peace. For peace is but one option

among others, to be chosen and defended, sustained and safeguarded. We chose it when we proclaimed the ideals set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. We must now, all together, defend it, being guided by those same ideals.

126. Mr. D'ESCOTO BROCKMANN (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): May I first of all extend to the President of this special session, Mr. Kittani, my warmest and most sincere congratulations on the able way in which he guided the discussions at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and is guiding those at this second special session devoted to disarmament.

127. Also, we cannot but express our most sincere gratitude to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar for the magnificent work he has been doing for peace as Secretary-General. Nicaragua will always be ready to co-operate with him in everything relating to the attainment of that noble objective.

128. The attention of the world community is increasingly focused on the arms race, with its ominous overtones in the sphere of nuclear weapons, which has continued without respite since the end of the Second World War. It poses a problem of such magnitude that it can only be described as one of life or death for mankind.

129. The arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, and the obvious risks involved for the future of the world, fully justify the outcry of the peoples, who are urging prudence and calling for a halt to a suicidal policy which can only lead to annihilation. This outcry forces us to recognize that the interests of the peoples are above any alleged requirements of security, claims to hegemony or senseless ambitions for military superiority.

130. This special session of the General Assembly, the necessity of which cannot be questioned, should lead to a demonstration of the political will on the part of the nuclear Powers to put into effect a programme of action for disarmament, thereby guaranteeing the survival of mankind.

131. In 1980 the First Disarmament Decade and the Second Development Decade ended. History will show that the results of those Decades were over-armament and underdevelopment, since most of the world's inhabitants are today facing greater wretchedness and a greater probability of being the victims of a nuclear holocaust.

132. At the tenth special session the foundations were laid for an international disarmament strategy; a Final Document was adopted by consensus on the danger of nuclear weapons and the need to establish the conditions for reducing and eliminating the possibility of the use or the threat of use of such weapons.

133. Although the Organization had from its beginning shown constant concern about general disarmament, the Assembly at that session rightly emphasized that the stockpiling of nuclear weapons could in no way be regarded as necessary for the security of any State and that, on the contrary, it represented a threat to the security of all States. As everyone is well aware, a small proportion of the present nuclear-weapons arsenals would more than suffice to destroy every form of life on earth.

134. Lasting international peace and security cannot be based on the accumulation of every kind of weapon *ad infinitum*, whether for the purpose of maintaining a precarious balance of nuclear deterrence or of implementing doctrines of strategic superiority. The arms race impedes the fulfilment of the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and is incompatible with its principles, in particular those regarding the sovereignty of States, the non-use of force or the threat of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, the peaceful settlement of disputes and non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

135. There have been encouraging results with regard to the growing general awareness of the threats posed by the arms race, but it is regrettable that the hopes kindled by the convening of the first special session devoted to disarmament have not been fulfilled by significant results.

136. In the Final Document of 1978 stress was laid on the need to make efforts to prohibit new weapons systems and nuclear testing. None the less, there have been new and dangerous technological advances in weaponry and more than 200 nuclear-weapon tests have been carried out. At the same time negotiations on the drafting of a multilateral treaty to ban such tests have been deadlocked. An appeal was made for the implementation of the SALT II Treaty, but thus far that agreement has still not been ratified.

137. Hence this second special session devoted to disarmament offers us an excellent opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to the recommendations and decisions in the Final Document.

138. It is also necessary that in this debate there be an analysis of the factors which have prevented the implementation of the Programme of Action [*resolution S-10/2, sect. III*] of the tenth special session, thus frustrating the just demand of the peoples that the insane arms race be ended.

139. Détente and security are indivisible and universal. As long as an understanding has not been reached among the nuclear Powers making it possible to halt the arms race, it will be extremely difficult to ensure world peace and stability.

140. As long as Israel can continue to rely on the immoral and unconditional support of Washington, which is always ready to misuse the veto in order to support the crimes of its puppets, as in the case of the most recent brutal Zionist invasion of Lebanon for the purpose of annihilating the Palestinian refugees and their leaders, world peace will continue to be seriously endangered. Until the inalienable national rights of the people of Palestine are recognized, including the right to return to their homes, to free determination, to national independence and to establish an independent sovereign State in Palestine under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, there will be no peace in the Middle East.

141. As long as the racist régime of Pretoria can continue to rely on the acquiescence of some Western Powers and can continue its diabolical policy of *apartheid*, its illegal occupation of Namibia and its policy of destabilization of and aggression against Angola,

Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana and Seychelles, peace will still be out of reach.

142. As long as the United States continues its threats, aggression and policy of destabilization directed against Nicaragua, Cuba, Grenada, Argentina and all the Latin American peoples struggling to defend their sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, Latin America will continue to be condemned to war and poverty and will be compelled to divert a substantial part of its limited resources to meet the needs of defence.

143. Regardless of the degree of sincerity of the various American Governments in the quest for a stable and lasting peace, since 1981 there has been every indication that that noble objective is not exactly a priority for the present Government of the United States.

144. Since the victory of the Reagan Administration dangerous and irresponsible doctrines have been aired, such as those of nuclear deterrence, limited nuclear wars that can be won or that some will survive, preventive nuclear strikes and demonstration nuclear explosions. The SALT II agreement was frozen, the decision was taken to continue with the full production of the neutron bomb and the announcement was made that 17,000 warheads would be added to the American nuclear stockpile over the next 10 years. The Reagan Administration is also disproportionately increasing its already enormous expenditures on new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, while at the same time its high officials are proclaiming that there are more important things than peace and that force is a legitimate means of gaining the objectives of world domination and political hegemony. Nicaragua has itself suffered the consequences of such a deviation, but the whole world may fall victim to the determination of the present Administration in Washington to attain its strategic objectives at any cost.

145. Nicaragua shares the concerns expressed by United States Senators and Congressmen about this attempt to obviate the ratification of the SALT II Treaty as a means of justifying another round of the arms race. We therefore welcome the introduction in the Senate of the Kennedy-Hatfield resolution, which calls for the immediate freezing of the production, deployment and testing of nuclear weapons together and their subsequent reduction through negotiations. That and other proposals on freezing provide an historic opportunity to put an end to the escalation of the arsenals of the great Powers and to reverse the arms race until general and complete disarmament has been achieved. In this context we most warmly welcome the commitment made by President Leonid Brezhnev on behalf of the Soviet people and Government that the Soviet Union will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. We see that statement as one of the most significant recent contributions to the cause of peace throughout the world. We also welcome the forthcoming Soviet-American talks, which the whole of mankind hopes will produce useful results for world peace.

146. We reaffirm what was said by the ministers for foreign affairs at the recent Ministerial Meeting of

the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Havana from 31 May to 5 June, as follows:

“Any attempt to hide from the peoples the real consequences of a nuclear conflict, in order to make them believe that it can be limited to a given geographical area or to instil in them the idea that it might be viable to start such a war with the possibility of emerging from it victorious, is extremely dangerous and incompatible with the vital interests of all mankind.”

147. The people of Nicaragua share with all the peoples of the world the concern that its security and future are largely dependent on the willingness or otherwise of some of the nuclear Powers to arrive at an understanding that would guarantee effective control of the arms race, beginning with freezing the production of nuclear weapons, until total disarmament has been achieved. None the less, we feel that guaranteeing peace is a task that falls to all States and should be promoted in the context of the bilateral and regional relations of each and every one of them, in order to ensure that dialogue and negotiations may always be used for the settlement of disputes between States.

148. That is why Nicaragua, together with the rest of Latin America and the non-aligned movement, regrets that the many efforts made by the sister republic of Argentina throughout many years to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the dispute with Great Britain over the Malvinas Islands and adjacent islands did not meet with the proper response. We deplore the vetoes used by the United States and Great Britain to prevent the Security Council from adopting a draft resolution calling for a cease-fire in a sorry war in which domineering imperialists turned in fury against a Latin American country because it had dared to defend, without bloodshed, its territorial integrity.

149. Now that this most recent chapter in the historic struggle of our Argentine brothers to defend their legitimate right of sovereignty over the Malvinas and adjacent islands is over, we hope that the sacrifice of the heroes who fell in defence of their homeland may not have been in vain and that henceforward negotiations will proceed, with the speed that justice requires, since they must of necessity be held before the return of the islands which Great Britain usurped by force and has occupied illegally since 1833, on the basis of military superiority which neither Nicaragua nor Latin America as a whole can recognize as a source of law. We think that these negotiations should be held within the framework, and with the proper civil administrative presence, of the United Nations.

150. Our people suffered the ravages of a war of liberation imposed on us by a genocidal military dictatorship supported by the United States. Therefore, in the face of internal struggles or conflicts in border areas in the countries of the region, our Government, which always respects the right of self-determination of peoples, has applied itself to seeking just, peaceful and lasting solutions to the crisis in Central America which, aggravated by interference from outside the region, may give rise to a conflagration of unforeseeable proportions.

151. To our mind there is a pressing need for all the Central American countries to provide concrete

evidence of the will for peace with regard to resolving the most serious aspects of the regional crisis. First of all, a genuine political solution must be sought to the conflict raging in the sister republic of El Salvador. Nicaragua, through the Co-ordinator of the Governmental Junta of National Reconstruction, Commander of the Revolution Daniel Ortega Saavedra, in October 1981 brought to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly [29th meeting, para. 55] a peace proposal urging negotiations between the parties to the conflict and extending specific offers of dialogue on the part of the Farabundo Martí Front for National Liberation and the Revolutionary Democratic Front. We also supported the initiatives for dialogue submitted by the President of Mexico, José López Portillo, on 21 February at Managua as one of the most viable and realistic ways of finding the much-needed solution to the problems of the region. Meanwhile the flow of arms and advisers to that nation must cease totally, not only in order to bring about the proper climate for negotiations but also in order to help check ruthless massacres of the civilian population.

152. Another critical point, which calls for immediate solution, is the existence of and actions by counter-revolutionary gangs, the vestiges of the criminal Somoza National Guard, which launch aggressions against our people from the territory of Honduras, thus far causing the deaths of hundreds of Nicaraguan civilians and military personnel. This campaign of aggression, financed and supplied by the United States, as has been made clear in the American press itself, is intended to provoke a conflict between Honduras and Nicaragua as a first step towards generalized aggression against our Sandanist people's revolution.

153. We believe that the greatest contribution to peace and stability in Central America is that which the United States could make but has not wished to make. That contribution would start with a simple recognition of what was said by President López Portillo, to the effect that what happens in Nicaragua, what happens in El Salvador and the wind that is blowing over the whole region is no threat to the United States or to any other country.

154. It is time for Washington to understand that its military and political interference in El Salvador, its desire to set up military bases in another country of the area, its open campaign of destabilization against Nicaragua, its refusal to reject the use or threat of use of force against my country, made clear by its veto of a resolution along those lines in the Security Council, its tolerance of military training camps in United States territory which have the avowed purpose of organizing an invasion against Nicaragua, spy flights over my country, the presence of American warships in waters under our jurisdiction—the last incident occurred on 7 June of this year, when an American warship sailing 3 miles off our Pacific coast sent a helicopter which with apparent warlike intent came close to a Nicaraguan patrol boat, which was obliged to fire warning shots, after which the helicopter went back to the warship—that all of this is leading the Central American countries to the threshold of a conflagration which only with difficulty could be confined to the subregion. Hence, the many efforts to achieve peace

and political stability in Central America must no longer be foiled.

155. Nicaragua is prepared to improve the climate of relations with the United States on the basis of mutual respect and full acknowledgement of our right of self-determination. We have repeatedly said, and we do so again today, that we are ready to start direct, open and unconditional talks with the United States to cover the whole gamut of mutual concerns and positions in the context of the Mexican proposals. To this day we continue to hope for a serious response from the Reagan Administration to this appeal for dialogue and common sense.

156. As the Co-ordinator of the Governmental Junta of National Reconstruction, Commander Daniel Ortega Saavedra, said on 25 March to the Security Council:

“We feel that we are all obliged to find a solution to the problems confronting the region through negotiated political means and never to consider the possibility of negotiations being exhausted. We believe that all efforts must be focused on finding responses that are in keeping with reality and that would allow us to begin negotiations immediately, discarding preconditions of any kind.”⁸

157. It is our view that overcoming the stalemate in the relations between the United States and Nicaragua is essential for peace and stability in our region, and our revolutionary Government will continue to make every endeavour to that end.

158. We also think it absurd that the country which has set off on the greatest arms race in the history of mankind, which requires its allies to arm even more than they feel is appropriate or necessary, the country which has set itself to producing the neutron bomb and MX missiles and has 20,000 aircraft of different types, 70 nuclear submarines, more than 300 military bases scattered throughout the world with more than half a million soldiers stationed outside its frontiers and which is therefore not really threatened by anyone—that this Power, the United States of America, goes on accusing Nicaragua of arming itself and seeks to deny us the sovereign right to cover the minimal requirements for the defence of our nation which has been repeatedly assaulted and threatened by the United States itself.

159. We reject any claim that seeks to impose humiliating and unacceptable restrictions on our right to prepare ourselves to defend our homeland, which is the inalienable right of any sovereign country and which is necessarily exercised in proportion to the real threats of aggression facing each country. In that regard, it is worth recalling that ours is the only Central American Government which is threatened militarily by the United States and that therefore, without claiming to prepare ourselves to overcome it in its own territory, we are obliged to prepare to defend ourselves in ours.

160. The Final Document says in paragraph 1 of its Introduction, “Admittedly, [the survival of States] has, in certain cases, effectively depended on whether they could count on appropriate means of defence”.

161. Nicaragua only wishes to meet the requirements of its legitimate defence and security. That is why we reject the fallacious characterization of the Reagan

Administration of our defence policy as one of acquiring arms, and we condemn the eagerness of that Administration to inspire fear among other Central American Governments because Nicaragua is making adequate preparations to defend itself against imperialist threats.

162. Nicaragua also rejects and denounces as dangerous and partial Washington's insistence on artificially including the Central American crisis within the context of East-West problems and on thus justifying its military assistance to régimes of the fascist type and to counter-revolutionary forces just because they call themselves anti-Communist.

163. The Reagan Administration accuses us of seeking to destabilize our neighbours, when in fact the only country against which there is a threat of destabilization is Nicaragua. We have categorically stated that our country will never use its arms against any other country, least of all against any brother country of Latin America and the Caribbean, and, recognizing the danger of the arms race in our region, we point out our readiness to take part in a meeting at the highest level of the Central American leaders concerning the subject of arms, which does not mean that we consider any Central American country an enemy. We are not arming ourselves against them, although we know that there is an interest in using some of those countries to further the interests of the United States in preserving its hegemony in the area by attacking Nicaragua.

164. A clear distinction must be made between the legitimate right of peoples to arm themselves in self-defence against their historical aggressors and the criminal accumulation of weapons by oligarchies and their military guardians, who struggle against the tide of history and pin their hopes on the superiority of brute and material force over the spiritual strength of those struggling for freedom and justice.

165. The decision to be free or to die in the attempt to attain freedom means that militarily weak peoples become invincible Powers and bulwarks against the might of those who use their strength to defend their spheres of domination and exploitation.

166. At this second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament the principle should be reaffirmed that the progress of technology and science must be in the service of humanity, not in the service of those who seek solely to extend their political and economic hegemony on the basis of ever more instruments of death and destruction. This special session should adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament including such urgent measures as the cessation of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, and the prohibition of all other weapons of mass destruction. Public opinion plays, and must continue to play, a major role in disarmament. Churches and other non-governmental organizations interested in disarmament are making an important contribution through the wide dissemination of information. A systematic campaign of this kind could bring about international consensus at all levels on rejecting and condemning the arms race, since neither imperialism nor colonialism will of their own free will give up their ambition to destroy the liberation movements and enslave peoples, or halt the arms race.

167. The new Nicaragua considers that social justice, development and the satisfaction of the most basic needs of the people not only are essential to peace but are the very *raison d'être* and the principal goal of our people's Sandinist revolution. But while it is true that there can be no peace without development, it goes without saying that there can be no development without peace. Threats and acts of aggression by interventionist Powers criminally force countries such as Nicaragua to set aside for defence a considerable proportion of the meagre resources which they should allocate, and would like to allocate, to satisfying the most pressing needs of their peoples—needs which, in our case, have been sorely aggravated by the disastrous torrential rains of the past few days. None the less, Nicaragua will always be in the vanguard of countries that spare no effort to ensure that peace, so desired by the inhabitants of this world, becomes a reality.

168. Mr. SEWRAJSING (Suriname): It is with pleasure that I take this opportunity to extend to Mr. Kittani of Iraq the greetings of my delegation and to express our satisfaction at seeing him preside over this important special session of the General Assembly devoted to the question of disarmament. His election to the presidency of this session is a well-deserved recognition of his skills and of his knowledge of the issues confronting mankind in our time—attributes which he amply demonstrated at the preceding sessions over which he presided. We are confident that under his guidance this important gathering will achieve tangible results in the efforts to stem the tide of destruction that threatens to engulf our planet.

169. It is also fitting for my delegation to pay a tribute to the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the second special session on disarmament, Mr. Adeniji of Nigeria, who so ably presided over the Committee during its meetings to lay the groundwork for this session.

170. Four years have passed since the General Assembly held its first special session to deal with the problem of disarmament. Reflecting on that session, we have mixed feelings. On the one hand, we the peoples of the United Nations can take pride in the fact that our first post-war attempt at a comprehensive approach to the question of disarmament achieved a measure of success, which should not be underestimated in view of the fate of earlier attempts to that end. The unanimous adoption of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session testifies to that fact. My delegation, for its part, continues to regard that Document as a valid and viable approach to achieving genuine disarmament.

171. On the other hand, the past four years have taught us that it will take more than an elaborate document to enable mankind to translate into reality even its loftiest intentions to make the world a safer place for present and future generations. The dismal state of affairs in the implementation of the decisions of the first special session and the current state of the arms race are indeed regrettable developments which cloud our achievements of four years ago.

172. The expectation aroused by the achievements of the tenth special session that there would be

genuine negotiations to reverse the arms race was replaced by the distressing reality of the fact that soon after that session in 1978 the arms race escalated and accelerated to unprecedented levels, a trend which has continued undiminished till this date. As this session convenes, the figure for global arms expenditures, often cited during the tenth special session as \$400 billion, has already exceeded the \$500 billion mark,

173. Ominous for the world is the prospect that this figure could even double in the next four years if the military establishments of some Member States have their way and their plans now on the drawing-board are executed. The immense arsenals of destruction thus created would be more likely than ever to place the world permanently on the brink of a nuclear catastrophe and further diminish our chances of reversing this certain route to the annihilation of the human species and its elimination from the face of the earth.

174. In the light of this alarming development, this special session of the General Assembly on disarmament takes on extraordinary significance. As the world stands on the threshold of a new and unprecedented qualitative and quantitative escalation of the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, it is more than ever an overriding and urgent task for the Organization to revive the disarmament process and to create a climate of trust based on the common destiny of mankind. The causes of the failure to carry out satisfactorily the mandate of the tenth special session and to reach concrete agreements on the basis of the Programme of Action should be addressed and examined.

175. During the past four years it has been commonplace to refer to the deteriorating international political situation as the main cause of the renewed escalation of the arms race and the stagnation of disarmament negotiations within and outside the framework of the United Nations.

176. My delegation notes with interest that the state of affairs in the international political arena is determined to a large extent by the policies and actions of a restricted number of members of the community of nations, particularly the most powerful ones.

177. The chances of disarmament were adversely affected when the state of relative relaxation in the international political climate that marked the decade of the 1970s made way for a new round of super-Power rivalry at the end of that decade, a rivalry spurred by the policy of spheres of interest and of influence, which had never been abandoned. This concept in the approach to international relations has, as in the days of the cold war, inevitably led to increased political tension in nearly all regions of the globe.

178. As in the past, third world States are the prime victims of this global struggle for domination between the super-Powers, since their hard-won independence and sovereignty become irrelevant in the wake of the striving for world hegemony. Authentic struggles for freedom in third-world countries and the legitimate aspiration of their peoples to gain control over their natural resources in order to benefit their own development are placed in the perspective of super-Power

rivalry and increasingly threatened with outside interference and intervention.

179. The tension bred by this rivalry for domination handsomely serves the interests of the forces of colonialism, racism and oppression, since they can bring into play and practise their repulsive policies under the guise of furthering the interests of one or the other Power bloc.

180. On the continent of Africa, specifically in southern Africa, the massive growth of the military might of the racist Pretoria régime, in particular its nuclear capability, is applauded in some circles, since it is considered to be a bastion against what is perceived as the spread of influence of a super-Power. The truth of the matter is that this militarization of Pretoria only serves to intimidate and blackmail other States in the area which resist its abhorrent policies.

181. This week we are witnessing the tragedy of the onslaught on the territory of Lebanon in an attempt to wipe out a people struggling to restore its basic rights. It is appalling that even this internationally condemned act of ruthless aggression is being justified as serving the interests of a certain Power bloc.

182. In Latin America, a region which until recently had enjoyed relative stability, the peoples of this area of the world were squarely faced with a war reminiscent of an era that most of us thought had passed. Apparently it has not.

183. What are the chances of achieving progress in disarmament in the world as it is today? We cannot realistically expect to achieve real disarmament in a world in which relations between States are still dominated by military might instead of the rules of international law and respect for the independence, territorial integrity, sovereignty and equality of all States, or when these principles are applied only for the convenience of a few privileged States.

184. Efforts to achieve disarmament should therefore be paralleled by a change of the present perceptions of relations among States. This would lead to a lessening of tension in the world and prevent the many local and regional conflicts, almost every one of which bears the seeds of a conflict capable of escalation into a global confrontation of apocalyptic proportions.

185. It has been stated time and again, and justifiably, that the militarily significant States, in particular the super-Powers, hold the key to disarmament. We can state without hesitation that during the past four years, since the adoption of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, these countries have not fulfilled their responsibilities in this respect. On the contrary, it is the lack of political will on their part that is undeniably the major contributory factor in the distressing state of affairs that prevails in the efforts to bring the noble goal of disarmament within reach of mankind.

186. As I stated at the outset, my Government considers this second special session on disarmament to be a significant step and an opportunity to be fully utilized to give a new impetus to our faltering efforts to reverse the arms race and make a real start on the process of disarmament. In these efforts we should draw strength from the cries emanating from mass

movements all over the world for disarmament and peace.

187. Since nuclear weapons have been unanimously recognized as posing the most serious threat to our survival, my delegation believes that one of the prime objectives of this session should be to agree on concrete measures to prevent the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear exchange, for it cannot be denied that this horrendous possibility is no longer as unlikely as it was believed to be a few years ago.

188. The first step in that direction should be for all nuclear-weapon States to renounce the first use of nuclear weapons. Such a step would undoubtedly clear the atmosphere of the deep mistrust among those countries with regard to each other's intentions and, therefore, contribute significantly to establishing a favourable climate for the conduct of disarmament negotiations.

189. Another step which deserves our highest priority is a renewed commitment on the part of the nuclear-weapon States to the speedy conclusion of an agreement to halt the qualitative nuclear-arms race. The lack of progress in the negotiations on concluding such a treaty is a distressing indication of the sincerity of nuclear-weapon States as regards the cause of disarmament. The absence of such a treaty, moreover, seriously hampers efforts to prevent horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is understandable that it should be felt as another expression of the existing unjust system of international relations if a group of States is allowed to continue to improve its nuclear arsenals while attempting to dissuade other States from acquiring nuclear weapons.

190. In the view of my Government, one of the most promising corollaries of disarmament—and in saying this we do not stand alone—is the favourable and stimulating effect it will have on the world economy.

191. It remains unforgivable that we continue to waste a substantial portion of the human and natural resources of the earth on armaments while the suffering of millions of human beings, particularly in the developing world, is increasing because of global economic stagnation and recession.

192. The relationship between disarmament and development has been established through numerous studies initiated by the Organization. It is clear that the diversion of only a fraction of the resources now wasted on armaments to peaceful activities could alleviate the plight of millions of suffering human beings in the world. The reluctance of the industrialized States to adopt this approach is unfounded, as the improvement of the economies of the developing countries will eventually benefit their own economies. My Government believes that this, not the increase of arms production, is a humane approach to solving economic problems.

193. It is my Government's fervent hope that these noble goals can be brought within the reach of the international community through the labours of this session for the common good, well-being and security of all mankind.

194. Mr. IENG SARY (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): We all know that the President's experience, together with his wisdom and

moderation, helped to maintain a constructive atmosphere during the thirty-sixth session, the ninth emergency special session and the resumed seventh emergency special session. My delegation again extends to him our sincere congratulations on his unanimous election to the presidency of this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and our best wishes for success in conducting our proceedings in this session.

195. We should also like to congratulate most warmly the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, on his tireless efforts in the service of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, particularly during the present grave period in international relations.

196. It is unanimously recognized that there is a dynamic interaction between the arms race, the wars of aggression and expansion that destroy national and international security, and under-development. That global perception of the problem was clearly reflected in the fundamental and detailed Declaration [*resolution S-10/2, sect. II*] adopted four years ago by the General Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament. It is worth recalling paragraph 12, which emphasizes that:

“The arms race impedes the realization of the purposes, and is incompatible with the principles, of the Charter of the United Nations, especially respect for sovereignty, refraining from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, the peaceful settlement of disputes and non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. It also adversely affects the right of peoples freely to determine their systems of social and economic development, and hinders the struggle for self-determination and the elimination of colonial rule, racial or foreign domination or occupation.”

197. It is disappointing and distressing, to say the least, to note that after more than three decades of efforts to move towards the goal of the Charter “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind”, the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is opening in an increasingly tense international situation in which the arms race has never been so frenetic nor the threat to international peace and security so serious, with an increase in wars of aggression and military occupation. Not only have the old fires of war not been extinguished but others that burn even more fiercely, all in third world countries, have been lit. The war machines of the big Powers have reached a scale unprecedented in human history.

198. The present situation is the result of a long period of obfuscation regarding disarmament, détente and peace. The rostrums of the United Nations and other international forums have been used not for sincere consideration prompted by the desire to carry out concrete disarmament measures, but rather for rhetoric designed to cover up an accelerated arms race and to implement a strategy of regional and world expansion and domination.

199. Exploiting the peoples' desire for peace, the expansionists are past masters in the art of rhetorical

propaganda on disarmament, détente and peace, while doing exactly the opposite of what they profess. The more they talk of disarmament, détente and peace, the more they build up and refine their arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons, the more they start wars to destroy the independence of States and deny peoples their right to self-determination. Never in human history has the gap been so wide between word and deed, between the ideal proclaimed and the cynical reality of acts of regional and world expansion and domination.

200. Scarcely six months after the adoption of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, Viet Nam, with massive military assistance from the Soviet Union, launched its war of aggression and genocide against Democratic Kampuchea. One year later, barely two weeks after the General Assembly had adopted a Soviet draft resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations [*resolution 34/103*], the Soviet Union launched its war of aggression against Afghanistan.

201. Those two wars of aggression, waged in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations, are being carried on in Kampuchea in the name of “special friendship and solidarity” and in Afghanistan in the name of “fraternity and natural alliance”. In both cases the aggressors came to sow devastation and death in the name of freedom, revolution and humanism. In both cases they applied their military strategy of lightning attacks to create a fait accompli that the international community would accept.

202. For almost four years my country, Democratic Kampuchea, and South-East Asia have been experiencing the fatal consequences of Vietnamese-Soviet détente, peace and disarmament. They are learning to their cost the close links between the arms race, peace and development.

203. In Kampuchea the Vietnamese invaders have destroyed and plundered the many achievements of the past few years, particularly those of the period 1975-78: factories, dams, water reservoirs, irrigation networks, schools, technical institutes and laboratories. They have reduced to nothing the development efforts of the people of Kampuchea and have sown death and devastation throughout the country. The famine that they deliberately created has already killed hundreds of thousands of Kampucheans. The conventional weapons provided in profusion by the Soviet Union have already killed hundred of thousands of others. As these crimes have not been able to crush the growing resistance of the entire people of Kampuchea, the invaders are intensifying their use of chemical and bacteriological weapons. They began to use those weapons in early 1979, just a few weeks after the invasion began. The Government of Democratic Kampuchea alerted the United Nations and the international community at that time. As they become increasingly bogged down in their war of aggression and genocide in Kampuchea, the Vietnamese expansionists are intensifying and extending their chemical warfare from the mountainous and remote regions to the urban centres and regions that are accessible to international observers.

204. The range of these weapons prohibited by mankind and used in Kampuchea stretches from the

notorious yellow rain to white, yellow or bluish-grey gas or powders that are perfumed so as to lessen the unpleasant and irritating effect of ordinary toxic gases and thus encourage the victims to breathe more deeply and become more intoxicated. The toxic chemical powders are scattered by aircraft or helicopters over villages, fields, rivers, ponds, pools, wells and other water-supply points of the people. The toxic gases are released by cannon shells, mortars or rocket-launchers or from canisters or metal boxes scattered along the roads used by the people. To this range of weapons must be added the criminal activities of Vietnamese agents from special units trained in chemical warfare and detailed to spread toxic chemical products over vegetables, fruit, meat and other stock consumer goods sold in the markets. Kampuchea is currently a vast field for testing Soviet chemical and bacteriological weapons.

205. Much evidence and proof has been collected and scientific analysis of many samples of vegetation and water from regions subjected to Vietnamese attack and of the blood of victims of such attacks has revealed that the Vietnamese invaders are using in Kampuchea not only toxic gases but also lethal mycotoxins and one agent containing trichothecenes supplied by the Soviet Union.

206. Since 1979 chemical warfare in Kampuchea has killed thousands of people. During the last dry season, from October 1981 to April 1982, we counted more than 1,200 dead, including 42 entire families, and over 400 persons who had been seriously poisoned. In addition to the immeasurable suffering they cause the victims before they die, these weapons have consequences which affect the physical and mental development of victims and their descendants. Because of residual contamination they are a serious threat to the human and ecological environment.

207. It is essential to take forceful measures to ensure strict respect for the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, and the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, and to ensure the adoption of a treaty on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction. Pending the conclusion of such a treaty, it is imperative to take effective measures forthwith to put an end to the chemical warfare that is being waged by the Vietnamese and Soviet expansionists against the people of Kampuchea and also against the Lao and Afghan peoples. The Government of Democratic Kampuchea considers that an international conference would be the most appropriate means of doing this, and we ask that one be convened as soon as possible.

208. To pursue their policy of regional aggression and expansion, the Hanoi authorities maintain an army of 1.2 million men in readiness and, according to the 1981 edition of *Jane's Armies of the World*, we should add to this 2 million men and women of the militia and paramilitary units. The Vietnamese army is currently, in absolute figures, the third in the world. But compared to its population it is in fact the most

important army in the world. One Vietnamese out of 16 is bearing arms. With 250,000 soldiers in Kampuchea and 60,000 in Laos, Viet Nam is also the country which, compared to its total population, has the largest number of its soldiers on foreign territory. Maintaining such a war machine devours all the material, technical and human resources needed for the development of the country. In 1981, out of an annual national budget estimated at \$11 billion, half, that is, \$5.5 billion, was devoted to military expenditures—that is, \$110 per inhabitant; whereas in 1975 the developing countries in the Group of 77 spent only \$34 billion for military purposes, or about \$15 per inhabitant. It is clear that, as Viet Nam is incapable of satisfying these needs, the deficit has to be covered by Soviet aid, which is estimated at over \$2 billion per year.

209. The devastating effects of the policy of aggression and expansion of the Hanoi authorities on the economic situation of the country are now well known to everybody, and that situation is not caused by any lack of international aid. From 1975 to 1978—that is, before its aggression against Democratic Kampuchea—Viet Nam received from the international community total aid amounting to \$9 billion, \$3 billion of which was from Western European countries, the third world and international organizations. No third world country has benefited so much from foreign aid. But the Hanoi authorities used that aid not to feed the Vietnamese people but rather to fuel their war and propaganda machine in the interest of their expansionist policy. Today, irrevocably bogged down in their war of aggression in Kampuchea, where even the huge Soviet aid cannot suffice, the Hanoi authorities are trying to mislead the international community by claiming that they want to get Western aid in order to free themselves from the Soviet control. In fact, each additional dollar in aid to Viet Nam is transformed into a weapon to kill the people of Kampuchea and to pursue the Vietnamese policy of regional aggression in South-East Asia. It is used to help the expansionists spread their tentacles in South-East Asia and throughout the world.

210. Since 1975 Moscow and Hanoi have on several occasions proclaimed that Viet Nam is a solid and reliable forward position of the socialist camp in South-East Asia. In an attempt to carry out its long-cherished strategy of absorbing Kampuchea into the so-called Indochinese federation and thus forming a greater Viet Nam, Hanoi signed a treaty of alliance with Moscow on 3 November 1978. That treaty is accompanied by five protocols of secret agreements, one of which makes available to the Soviet Union the Vietnamese military bases of Cam Ranh and Da Nang.

211. In May 1979, five months after the invasion of Kampuchea, Soviet warships, including nuclear-powered submarines, entered those bases for the first time. Thanks to those Vietnamese bases, the Soviet Pacific fleet, which has been considerably strengthened since 1978, has been able to extend its sphere of activities towards the south, to several thousand nautical miles from Vladivostok, and thus threaten the sea-lanes to and from the countries of Asia and the Pacific.

212. The peoples and countries of the third world continue to pay the costs and to be the victims of the

conventional arms race. The wars now being waged on all the continents and the intensive deployment of the forces of the big Powers, including the ever-growing forces of the expansionist super-Power, are the result of the conventional arms race, to which four fifths of the world's military budget are devoted. Without having the destructive power of nuclear weapons, those conventional weapons are becoming increasingly sophisticated and extremely deadly and devastating. Since the end of the Second World War, it has not been nuclear weapons, but rather the guns, cannons, tanks, aircraft, warships and other conventional weapons that have killed and continue to kill millions of people and that have devastated many developing countries. It is those conventional wars that destroy the independence of States, threaten the security of peoples, endanger national and international peace and security and risk a world-wide nuclear conflagration. The reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons is thus as important and urgent as is nuclear disarmament. That reduction process must be accompanied by the complete withdrawal of foreign forces from territories occupied by force.

213. The creation of denuclearized zones and of zones of peace in various parts of the world is undeniably an effective measure against the arms race. Democratic Kampuchea firmly supports the creation of such zones in South Asia, the Middle East, Africa, Latin America and all other parts of the world, as well as the establishment of a zone of peace in the region of the Indian Ocean. We also actively support the tireless efforts of the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations to establish a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia, where peace, security and stability would be preserved, enabling all States of the region to devote their national resources to the development of their countries and to the prosperity of their people. But the establishment of such a zone, which is in accordance with the aspirations of all the peoples of the region, is hampered by the presence there of one over-armed country, whose main objective is regional domination and not the well-being of its people or peaceful co-operation among States. In fact, Viet Nam has now become the hotbed of war in South-East Asia and the main bridgehead of regional and global expansionism in Asia. At the Nguyen Ai Quoc Institute, the training centre for the cadres of the Vietnamese Communist Party in Hanoi, there is already serious discussion of the tactics to be used to establish, in the 1990s, the "Union of Socialist Republics of South-East Asia" in the regional Vietnamese orbit.

214. A zone of peace, freedom and neutrality cannot be established without creating an atmosphere of mutual trust among all the States of the region, based on strict respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, on a halt to military invasion and occupation of neighbouring States and on the exercise by all the peoples of the region of their inalienable right to decide their own fate without any foreign interference. Efforts to establish such a zone are part of the struggle for disarmament, which is inseparable from the struggle to regain and defend national independence and territorial integrity against subversion, aggression and foreign domination.

215. The people of Kampuchea in their current struggle for national survival against the war of aggression and genocide of the Vietnamese expansionists stand side by side with the Afghan people in their struggle to regain their independence and territorial integrity, side by side with the Arab and Palestinian peoples in their struggle to regain all the occupied Arab territories and to establish an independent Palestinian State in Palestinian territory, side by side with the Namibian people in their struggle to acquire their right to self-determination and independence. We are in solidarity with all peoples of the world in their struggle to regain, defend and consolidate their national, political and economic independence. All those struggles make an active contribution to the struggle for international peace and security and the struggle for disarmament.

216. In Kampuchea, the struggle of the people of Kampuchea, under the leadership of the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, has completely stopped the Vietnamese invading army, which is hopelessly bogged down. The recent serious defeats inflicted during the last dry season on the Vietnamese invading army have confirmed the fact that the Vietnamese expansionists, despite immense Soviet aid, will never be able militarily to subjugate the people and nation of Kampuchea. During the three and one half years of their invasion of Kampuchea, they have suffered increasingly heavy defeats on all fronts—military, political and diplomatic. However, impelled by their aggressive and expansionist nature, they are no less arrogant or perfidious. Not only have they obstinately refused to implement the resolutions of the United Nations on Kampuchea and not only do they continue to violate the Charter of the United Nations, but they also feverishly seek to establish by all means possible the fait accompli of their invasion and occupation of Kampuchea, in other words, to force the international community as well to violate the Charter. Their manoeuvres are designed basically to bury the resolutions of the United Nations and to divide the peace-loving and justice-loving forces of the world, the goal being to prolong their war of genocide in Kampuchea, hoping that time will change the military situation in their favour and enable them to absorb Kampuchea into the Vietnamese "Indo-Chinese Federation" by the forcible application of some of their various "Vietnamization" measures in Kampuchea which include, in particular, the establishment of many Vietnamese settlements and also measures to exterminate all Kampucheans who resist that "Vietnamization".

217. Through their resolute struggle the people, national army and Government of Democratic Kampuchea have shown that they will never accept Vietnamese domination and that they will fight to the end for national independence, sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the country. They reiterate their gratitude to the United Nations and to all peace-loving and justice-loving peoples and countries that have supported their just cause. They call on them to intensify their support and assistance and to exercise increasing diplomatic, economic and financial pressure on the Hanoi expansionists in order to get them to implement General Assembly resolutions 34/22, 35/6 and 36/5 and the Declaration of the International

Conference on Kampuchea of 17 July 1981.⁹ The problem of Kampuchea cannot be resolved without the complete withdrawal of the Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea and the exercise of the inalienable right of the Kampuchean people to decide their own fate without any foreign interference, subversion or coercion.

218. The war in Kampuchea and the other wars unleashed by foreign aggression and invasion are a violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. They are a threat to international peace and security and they accelerate the arms race. They are a matter of deep concern to the international community. The United Nations, which represents the will of this community, plays a central role. All States must respect that central role and the principles and purposes of the Charter, particularly the principle of the non-use of force, and they must scrupulously implement the resolutions adopted by the Organization.

219. The struggles of the peoples and States that cherish peace and justice and act in solidarity are now bringing about the failure of those acts of aggression, expansion and world or regional domination. They play a very important role in the struggle for disarmament. But the authors of those acts, which are crimes against humanity, continue on the one hand to intensify their campaign of deceit in the hope that they can preserve their conquests through concessions, compromise and diversionary and divisive tactics, and on the other to speed up the arms race with a view to further aggression and expansion.

220. However, past and present events have shown that the vital question of peace or war does not depend entirely on those that carry out these wars of aggression and expansion. It depends also on the resolute struggles of the peoples and the States which have suffered the aggression and on the firmness and solidarity of all the other peoples and States that hold dear peace and justice in this world. Democratic Kampuchea sincerely hopes that this second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament and the Second Disarmament Decade will help to strengthen those struggles and that solidarity, which constitute fundamental factors in averting a third world conflagration.

221. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its first plenary meeting, I now call upon the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Mr. Hans Blix.

222. Mr. BLIX (International Atomic Energy Agency): This special session occurs at a time when cold winds are sweeping over the world and the black smoke of war rises in several places. People everywhere feel anguish about the future, and most of all they fear nuclear war. Huge demonstrations in many countries testify to this anguish. It is for the Governments represented here to respond to the demands of disarmament.

223. Nuclear science has opened new avenues to mankind. Some lead to horror and holocaust, others to peaceful progress. The organization that I represent is dedicated to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and nuclear science and is engaged in an important part of

the effort to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons.

224. The military applications of nuclear science not only in themselves represent mortal dangers to humanity and waste of valuable resources, but in addition raise obstacles to trade and to public acceptance of peaceful uses. This, too, is tragic, for the peaceful applications represent opportunities to reduce the pressure on oil resources and to reduce the strains on the environment produced by our excessive burning of coal and oil. They represent possibilities in the field of food, for instance, through new techniques for plant breeding and new methods of food preservation; and they offer new possibilities in the fields of medicine and hydrology.

225. All these possibilities for the beneficial use of nuclear science are shadowed by the dark cloud of the atom bomb. Nuclear disarmament would allow us to make full use of these peaceful potentials. Apart from freeing us from, or at least reducing, the perils of atomic warfare, nuclear disarmament would release highly specialized manpower and manufacturing capabilities which could be employed for energy production and other peaceful purposes.

226. IAEA, which I have the honour to represent, has much directly at stake in the discussions on nuclear disarmament. It is bound to ask itself whether there is something in its experience and expertise that can contribute to the task of arms control and disarmament. I submit there is, and I shall try to describe what it is.

227. First and foremost I must describe the IAEA role in the efforts to avoid a further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

228. It is generally agreed that more fingers on more nuclear triggers add to tensions and increase the difficulties of managing crises and achieving disarmament. The community of States has undoubtedly a collective interest in preventing further proliferation. That interest will not be satisfied, however, unless the States find it to be in their individual interest as well to forgo the option of acquiring nuclear weapons. Such a conclusion on their part is dependent upon several factors, and above all on their national security situation. To avoid the proliferation of nuclear weapons it is therefore of signal importance that States in general and great Powers in particular genuinely direct their policies towards creating and fostering such political conditions, regionally and globally, that individual States no longer perceive a necessity for nuclear weapons. This political activity is outside the scope of the IAEA's work and falls upon Governments and the United Nations. It is of vital importance today and will remain so in the future, when the knowledge of how to make bombs will be even more widespread than it is today.

229. The vast majority of States have concluded that it is in their own interest to remain without nuclear weapons. Most of those States have made a legal commitment, through acceptance of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], not to acquire such weapons. Some have preferred to make this legal commitment under the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).⁴

Some have declared that they have exclusively peaceful ambitions in the nuclear field but have refrained from entering into legal commitments.

230. There is no doubt, however, that the aim of decreasing tensions, reducing the risk of arms races and creating confidence is much better served by legally binding commitments than by simple policy declarations. While legal commitments certainly can be and have been violated, they do constitute thresholds which States are reluctant to pass. There is every reason, therefore, to encourage further acceptance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The latter treaty has shown that agreement can be reached on banning nuclear weapons throughout a geographical region. This precedent gives hope that nuclear-weapon-free zones can be achieved in other regions. Strictly verified, such zones could contribute much to reducing tension and creating confidence. The greatest weakness of the non-proliferation régimes established by the treaties I have mentioned is undoubtedly that not all non-nuclear-weapon States have yet found it in their interest to adhere to them.

231. Throughout negotiations on arms control and disarmament the question of verification has been high on the agenda. It is a remarkable feature of the non-proliferation Treaties that they do provide for verification that diversion of nuclear material and installations to military uses is not taking place. The safeguards system, in fact, began to emerge some three decades ago, when supplier States were unwilling to deliver nuclear material or installations without verification of the continued peaceful use and States buying these products accepted such verification. During the 1960s the verification functions were progressively transferred to IAEA. It is evident that a well-functioning system of verification gives a very high degree of assurance, which helps to maintain confidence and reduces tension and arms races.

232. The safeguards system is now anchored in bilateral and trilateral arrangements, in the Non-Proliferation Treaty and in the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which are the basis of some 145 IAEA agreements with 85 States, as well as with the European Atomic Energy Commission. The existence of an international system of verification, not just on paper but as a functioning body of inspection, accounting and technical means of control, is a unique feature in international affairs. Over 800 nuclear installations are under safeguards. This represents 98 per cent of the nuclear installations known to the Agency outside the nuclear-weapon States.

233. The success which the international community has had thus far in limiting the horizontal spread of nuclear weapons is to a large extent the result, as I have said, of the fact that non-nuclear-weapon States have concluded that this self-restraint is in their own interest. However, the inability of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held in 1980, to reach a consensus on a final declaration was a warning that all is not well and that the régime which has so painstakingly been built up is a fragile one.

234. I do not need to remind this forum that the philosophy behind the Non-Proliferation Treaty was to bring about an immediate end to the further spread

of nuclear weapons and to begin negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament. Both the nuclear have-nots and the nuclear haves were expected to shoulder responsibility. Little progress has been made, however, on nuclear disarmament, and there is a growing uneasiness on the part of many non-nuclear-weapon States that their commitment to forgo nuclear weapons is worth less and less in a world where the nuclear-weapon States continue their race to produce nuclear weapons of an ever greater variety and precision, from the largest multiple-holocaust bomb to calibres that can be used in artillery and mines.

235. Decisive steps by the great Powers towards nuclear disarmament, a cessation of the production of nuclear weapons, a cut-off in the production of special fissionable materials for weapons purposes and an acceptance of a complete test ban—envisaged in the Non-Proliferation Treaty—would do much to strengthen the dedication of States to the non-proliferation régimes and to bring new adherents to these régimes.

236. Another sign of the delicacy of the present non-proliferation régime has been the controversy over access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Some restrictive measures imposed on the supply of materials and equipment have caused recipient States to feel that there has not been adequate fulfilment of article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which guarantees the inalienable right of all parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and to engage in international co-operation to that end. In this area the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference was close to a consensus, which provided, *inter alia*, that the dialogue be continued in the framework of IAEA's newly created Committee on Assurance of Supply. The ideal outcome of this dialogue would be a generally accepted set of rules for international trade and technology exchange in the nuclear field. The very existence of the active dialogue will, we hope, discourage future abrupt and unilateral changes in supply policies. A successful conclusion of the Committee's work would be seen as demonstrating the viability of article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, would strengthen support for the Treaty and would perhaps convince other States to adhere to it.

237. I have discussed so far the most important steps through which the efforts to prevent further horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons can be strengthened. They are in the hands of Governments. Before turning to the verification system, which is operated by IAEA to maintain full confidence in non-proliferation commitments, I must point to another matter partly related to safeguards that is in the hands of Governments but is of immediate concern to the Agency. I have in mind the necessity that States refrain from attacking nuclear plants.

238. Where a State has legally committed itself not to acquire nuclear weapons and the peaceful character of its activities is verified by IAEA, these factors should strengthen respect for the immunity of its installations against attack. It was against this background that the IAEA's Board of Governors and the General Conference, the United Nations Security Council and the General Assembly condemned the Israeli attack just over a year ago against a nuclear

research facility in Iraq, a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty which had subjected all its nuclear activities to IAEA safeguards.

239. The verified peaceful character of a nuclear installation apart, the Agency's statutory concern for the radiological protection of civilian populations living near nuclear installations requires that we point to the serious dangers of such attacks. It is evident that the rules of international law in this area need to be strengthened. For someone like me who spent many years in the negotiation of these legal rules, it is a sad admission that Additional Protocol I of 1977¹⁰ to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949¹¹ prohibits military attacks only against nuclear power plants; it is silent on the subject of other types of nuclear facilities, for instance stocks of spent fuel. It is encouraging, on the other hand, to note that the disarmament talks at Geneva are already discussing the best way to deal with this fearful and unnecessary lacuna in international law.

240. I turn now to the role played by the safeguards system operated by IAEA to give assurances that nuclear material and installations submitted to verification are used only for peaceful purposes. This vital part of the non-proliferation effort has sometimes been criticized in the past year. It is particularly important that the General Assembly and all who deal with arms control and disarmament have a clear view of the functions, limitations and shortcomings of this system.

241. When operated in fulfilment of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Treaty of Tlatelolco on all nuclear material and installations of a State, the safeguards serve to verify that the State concerned is respecting its commitment under these Treaties. The assurance that such verification gives is in the interest of both the State concerned and the world community. It adds to détente and confidence. It opens the way to trade and the transfer of technology. To be credible and to fulfil this role the verification must obviously be sufficiently thorough and effective to discover any diversion of nuclear material or nuclear plants from peaceful purposes and to report them so that Governments may exercise their influence.

242. There is no doubt that the system operated by the Agency can and should be further developed and strengthened. The Agency examines each year the shortcomings which inevitably arise in this rapidly growing novel activity. Criticism from the outside is helpful and is taken into account.

243. As we examine and try to remedy the shortcomings in this system, a number of points must, however, be kept in mind.

244. First, there must be a sense of proportion. While confidence in the existing non-proliferation pledges may be somewhat improved by improved safeguards, the more serious weaknesses in the non-proliferation effort lie in the absence of such pledges and non-acceptance of safeguards over a nuclear programme or acceptance of such safeguards only on parts of a programme. Thus, the more important shortcomings begin where safeguards end.

245. Secondly, there must be an awareness of what can be asked of the safeguards system and what its

limitations are. No system of safeguards can prevent a State from developing nuclear weapons if it is determined to do so. Moreover, safeguards cannot detect intentions but only nuclear material unaccounted for. What safeguards can do is to ring the alarm bell to allow for political action: to deter diversion by the risk of detection.

246. Thirdly, where verification is accepted by a State on only some of the nuclear installations on its territory, IAEA cannot pronounce itself on more than what it has seen—which in some of these cases is much less than the complete nuclear picture. This is a weakness not in the system itself but in the scope of its application. It might be asked if such partial safeguards are meaningful from the point of view of non-proliferation. In all these cases, their significance is to assure supplier countries that the assistance they have given or the equipment they have sold is not used for the development of nuclear weapons. This is an understandable wish, but it should be emphasized that only full-scope safeguards—that is to say, safeguards over the whole nuclear programme of a country—can provide assurance that all nuclear activities in a State are peaceful.

247. The Board of Governors of the Agency is a forum where any member State can bring forward its concerns about proliferation risks or its suggestions for enhancing the scope of safeguards. Problems do arise and are reported to the Board. Some of our safeguards arrangements call for improvement to enable the Agency to carry out verification with an adequate degree of assurance. Other problems are of lesser magnitude. There is always room for improvement, and it should be in the interest particularly of the States which invite the Agency to carry out safeguards that the methods and mechanisms used should be such as to inspire maximum confidence in the verification process.

248. Since the last special session of the General Assembly on disarmament we have seen qualitative and quantitative improvements in the Agency's efforts to attain its own inspection goals. Over the past four years the number of inspected facilities has increased by more than 50 per cent. Thanks to greater resources and increased Agency capabilities, inspection work increased by 25 per cent in 1981 alone; the number of inspectors has increased from 36 in 1972 to 134 in 1982; new equipment has now become available for routine implementation; computerized safeguards data processing has improved with regard to timeliness and quality; and our training programme has been extended. All this is being done at a reasonable cost. For instance, the total expenditure for safeguards activities planned for 1983 is \$34 million. Safeguards techniques must be continuously developed as industry expands and new nuclear installations are brought under safeguards. It will have to cost more as the safeguarded installations increase in number and complexity.

249. Some of the more difficult problems we shall face relate to sensitive plants—for instance, enrichment plants or reprocessing plants handling large quantities of nuclear material in bulk form. The first of such plants to be safeguarded will become operative in the 1990s, and therefore the Agency still has adequate time available for preparations. Member

States can help us by designing new plants so as to facilitate the application of safeguards.

250. The question which inevitably comes to mind in this forum is whether this unique institution of international verification is capable of serving as a model or inspiration for other arms-control agreements. My own response is one of optimism as long as the limitations are recognized.

251. Obviously, in any area States will more readily accept inspection and verification of a peaceful activity than of a military one. Nevertheless, the current safeguards model could perhaps be used in the development of necessary verification systems, if, for instance, agreements were reached relating to the cut-off of production of nuclear materials for military purposes.

252. Broadly speaking, the safeguards system establishes the precedent of States inviting international observation through, *inter alia*, inspections at agreed points on their national territory, in order to create confidence. The safeguards system is thus in essence a well-developed confidence-building measure. It is all the more interesting as it involves nuclear-weapon States. Agreements on such verifications and inspections exist with the United States, the United Kingdom and France, and I welcome the statement made to the Assembly yesterday by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union [12th meeting] that his country is willing to place under Agency safeguards a part of its peaceful nuclear installations.

253. The acceptance by sovereign Governments, for the first time in history, of international verification of large and sensitive installations in their territories constitutes a breakthrough in the conduct of States. In addition the IAEA safeguards system offers a wealth of practical experience, non-intrusive instruments and techniques, utilization of the State's own system of accounting for nuclear materials, and so on, that might be adapted to other control mechanisms. IAEA is ready and willing to make its experience available to disarmament organs that may wish to make use of it. Another important aspect of IAEA safeguards is the fact that Member States have from the beginning participated directly in their develop-

ment. Each State has had a voice in designing the controls to which it has submitted its nuclear activities.

254. In closing I should like to assure this special session of the General Assembly that the Agency will do everything in its power to play a constructive role in the efforts to prevent a further proliferation of nuclear weapons. It should not be forgotten, however, that the underlying causes of any further proliferation would be mainly political. The continuing nuclear-arms race and regional tensions are by far the greatest threats to the non-proliferation régime. We hope that at this special session the General Assembly will address these problems and adopt a programme that will put momentum into the search for—to quote the Non-Proliferation Treaty—“effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and . . . a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control”. [Resolution 2373 (XXII), annex, art. VI.]

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

NOTES

¹ A/CONF.95/15 and Corr.2, annex I. For the printed text of the Convention and its Protocols, see *United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*, vol. 5: 1980 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.81.IX.4), appendix VII.

² United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1.

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43.

⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.

⁵ See A/CN.10/38. See also A/CN.10/51.

⁶ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.3.

⁷ A/AC.206/14. The report was subsequently issued with the title *The Implications of Establishing an International Satellite Monitoring Agency* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.IX.3).

⁸ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year*, 2335th meeting, p. 27.

⁹ A/CONF.109/5, annex I (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.81.I.20).

¹⁰ A/32/144, annex I.

¹¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, Nos. 970-973.