



Wednesday, 23 June 1982,
at 10.50 a.m.

Official Records

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: This morning the Assembly will hear a statement by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher. I have great pleasure in welcoming her and in inviting her to address the General Assembly.

2. Mrs. THATCHER (United Kingdom): This is the first time I have spoken in the General Assembly. It is an honour to be here and to speak under your presidency, Mr. Kittani, and in the presence of the Secretary-General.

3. The stated purpose of this special session is disarmament. The underlying and more important purpose is peace: not peace at any price, but peace with freedom and justice.

4. As President Roosevelt commented during the last war: "We, born to freedom and believing in freedom, would rather die on our feet than live on our knees."

5. Leaders of countries from every part of the globe come to this session in search of surer ways of preserving that peace, ways that enable the peoples of each sovereign State to lead their lives as they choose within established borders.

6. If arms control helps us to achieve those central aims more surely and at less cost we must pursue it vigorously. But if it is carried out in a way which damages peace we must resist it, recalling that there have been occasions when the known or perceived military weakness of an opponent has been at least as potent a cause of war as military strength. The true definition of disarmament should be the balanced and verifiable reduction of armaments in a manner which enhances peace and security.

7. Discussion on disarmament inevitably turns to the weapons of war. Our generation faces a special responsibility, because the march of modern technology has made ever more deadly the weapons of war. We are most keenly aware of that in the case of nuclear weapons because of their terrifying destructive power, which my generation has witnessed and which none of us will ever forget. However alarmed we are by those weapons, we cannot disinvent them. The world cannot cancel the knowledge of how to make them. It is an irreversible fact.

8. Nuclear weapons must be seen as deterrents. They contribute to what Winston Churchill called "a balance of terror". There would be no victor in a

nuclear exchange. Indeed, to start a war among nuclear Powers is not a rational option. These weapons succeed in so far as they prevent war. And for 37 years nuclear weapons have kept the peace between East and West. That is a priceless achievement. Provided there is the will and good sense, deterrence can be maintained at substantially reduced levels of nuclear weapons.

9. Of course we must look for a better system of preventing war than nuclear deterrence. But to suggest that between East and West there is such a system within reach at the present time would be a perilous pretence.

10. Our task is to harness the existence of nuclear weapons to the service of peace, as we have done for half a lifetime. In that task the duty of the nuclear Powers is to show restraint and responsibility. The distinctive role of the non-nuclear countries, I suggest, is to recognize that proliferation of nuclear weapons cannot be the way to a safer world.

11. Nuclear weapons were a major concern of the 1978 special session, and they must remain so for us. But they may mask the facts about what we sometimes call, too comfortably, conventional weapons and conventional war. Since Nagasaki there have been no conflicts in which nuclear weapons have been used. But there have been something like 140 conflicts fought with conventional weapons, in which up to 10 million people have died.

12. Nuclear war is indeed a terrible threat, but conventional war is a terrible reality. If we deplore the amount of military spending in a world where so many go hungry and so much else needs to be done, our criticism and our action should turn above all to conventional forces, which absorb up to 90 per cent of military spending world-wide.

13. We are all involved—we all have conventional forces. I am convinced that we need a deeper and wider effort throughout the non-nuclear field to see what we can do together to lighten the risks, the burdens and the fears.

14. But in a crucial sense we have not reached the root of the matter. For the fundamental risk to peace is not the existence of weapons of particular types. It is the disposition on the part of some States to impose change on others by resorting to force. This is where we require action and protection. And our key need is not for promises against first use of this or that kind of military weapon; such promises can never be dependable amid the stresses of war. We need a credible assurance, if such can ever be obtained, against starting military action at all. The leaders of the North Atlantic alliance have just given a solemn collective undertaking to precisely that effect. They

said: "None of our weapons will ever be used except in response to attack."

15. Let us face the reality. The springs of war lie in the readiness to resort to force against other nations, and not in arms races, whether real or imaginary. Aggressors do not start wars because an adversary has built up his own strength. They start wars because they believe they can gain more by going to war than by remaining at peace. Few, if any, of the 140 conflicts since 1945 can be traced to an arms race. Nor was the World War of 1939-1945 caused by any kind of arms race. On the contrary, it sprang from the belief of a tyrant that his neighbours lacked the means or the will to resist him effectively. Let us remember what Bismarck said, some 70 years earlier: "Do I want war? Of course not—I want victory." Hitler believed he could have victory without war, or with not very much or very difficult war. The cost to humanity of disproving that belief was immense; the cost of preventing him from forming it in the first place would have been infinitely less.

16. The causes that have produced war in the past have not disappeared today, as we know to our cost. The lesson is that disarmament and good intentions on their own do not ensure peace.

17. There is a natural revulsion in democratic societies against war, and we would much prefer to see arms buildups prevented, by good sense or by persuasion or by agreement. But if that does not work, then the owners of these vast armouries must not be allowed to imagine that they could use them with impunity. But mere words, speeches and resolutions will not prevent them. The security of our country and its friends can be ensured only by deterrence and by adequate strength—adequate, that is, when compared with that of a potential aggressor.

18. I have explained why in general I do not believe that armaments cause wars and why action on them alone will not prevent wars. It is not merely a mistaken analysis but an evasion of responsibility to suppose that we can prevent the horrors of war by focusing on its instruments. Those are more often symptoms than causes.

19. But I have made these points not in any way to decry disarmament and arms control—for I believe in them both—but to make quite clear what they can and what they cannot achieve. Excessive claims and demands have too often been not an aid to practical measures, but a substitute for them. Arms control alone cannot remove the possibility of war. Nevertheless, the limitation and reduction of armaments can still do a great deal. They can reduce the economic burden of military preparation for legitimate self-defence. They can diminish the inhumanity of conflict. They can restrict the military use of advancing science and technology. They can ease tension between States and lessen the fears of people everywhere. To do these things, and to do them in a way that is balanced, verifiable and dependable, is worth sustained and persistent endeavour.

20. Critics too often play down what has already been done through arms control agreements, whether formal or informal: such agreements as those on outer space, the sea-bed and Antarctica, the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer

Space and under Water, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and the various Geneva accords over the years.

21. My country was among the architects of some of those successes. Although a comprehensive test-ban treaty has not been signed and the recent review of the Non-Proliferation Treaty was unproductive, there has been no additional nuclear-weapon State since 1964. We also contributed substantially to the banning of biological and toxin weapons in 1972. We all wish that the achievements had been greater. But to suggest that what has been done so far is insignificant is both inaccurate and unhelpful to further progress. We have a useful foundation on which to build. Now we must go a stage further.

22. In the nuclear field, the hopes of the world lie in direct talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, the countries that have by far the largest arsenals. These could be greatly reduced in a way that would not endanger security. Decisive action is needed, not just declarations or freezes. I welcome the radical proposals made by the United States for substantially cutting strategic weapons and for eliminating a whole class of intermediate-range systems—the zero option. The negotiations deserve the wholehearted support of us all.

23. We are also deeply concerned about the dangers of chemical warfare. When the world community decided in 1972 to ban the possession of biological and toxin weapons [*resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex*] we all looked forward to corresponding action next on chemical weapons. It has not happened. Moreover, there is reason to doubt whether every country that signed the 1972 Convention is observing it. There have been disquieting and well-documented reports, which urgently need investigation, that chemical weapons and toxins have been used in some countries in Asia. The Committee on Disarmament needs to give renewed and determined impetus to a properly verifiable convention banning development and possession of such weapons.

24. I spoke earlier about the huge weight of conventional forces. The biggest concentration and confrontation of such forces anywhere in the world lies in Europe. But it is heavily weighted on the side of the Warsaw Pact. This situation is in itself a cause for concern. But there is the more fundamental question whether the Warsaw Pact can, or wishes to, sustain a stable relationship with the rest of the world. Do not the events in Poland and Afghanistan call this into question, the one by revealing deep disillusion within the Soviet empire, the second by demonstrating the Soviet propensity to extend its frontiers? Both are evidence of an underlying instability. Thus, the need to secure a better balance in conventional arms becomes even more imperative.

25. For nine years we have patiently pursued talks at Vienna on mutual and balanced force reductions. Our diplomats involved in those talks must be the most patient of all, but they know that their work is of vital importance for peace. Fresh proposals are now being made, and we hope that this time we shall see some progress.

26. Britain would also like to see a special effort made to agree on new mandatory confidence- and

security-building measures in Europe. These would be a valuable complement to action in Vienna on force levels.

27. Through all these many negotiations there runs a crucial factor—verification. How can we be sure that what it is said will be done, will be done? Where national security is at stake we cannot take agreements on trust, especially when some States are so secretive and such closed societies. Agreements that cannot be verified can be worse than useless; they can be a new source of danger, fear and mistrust. Verification is not an optional extra in disarmament and arms control; it is the heart of the matter.

28. Differences over verification have often proved a stumbling block in arms control negotiations. But we note that the Soviet Union is now prepared to open part of its civil nuclear installations to inspection by IAEA, a step that the United Kingdom took years ago. I note also that the Soviet Union now seems ready to accept the need for systematic on-site inspection in respect of a chemical weapons treaty. We need to redouble our efforts to bridge the gaps that still remain.

29. Britain's record over the years in work on disarmament and arms control stands up to any comparison. We wish to do more—not by rhetoric, still less by propaganda postures, but by steady, relevant work going step by step through these difficult and complex matters. This is a long, patient and unspectacular business. There is no short cut if we are to retain security and peace. Those are the considerations that I suggest the special session needs to have in mind in considering a comprehensive programme of disarmament and in its review of progress since the first special session on disarmament.

30. The message I bring is practical and realistic. It is the message of a country determined to preserve and spread the values by which we live. It contains naught of comfort to those who seek only a quiet life for themselves at the expense of the freedom of others, or to those who wish to impose their will by force. Peace and security require unbroken effort.

31. We believe that the human values of civilization must be defended.

32. We believe that international law and the Charter of the United Nations must be upheld.

33. We believe that wars are caused not by armaments but by the ambitions of aggressors and that what tempts them is the prospect of easy advantage and quick victory.

34. We believe that the best safeguard of peace lies not only in a just cause but in secure defence.

35. We believe in balanced and verifiable disarmament where it can be the servant of peace and freedom.

36. We believe that the purpose of nuclear weapons should be to prevent war and that it can be achieved by smaller armouries.

37. We believe that a balanced reduction in conventional weapons could create greater stability.

38. We believe we have a right and a duty to defend our own people whenever and wherever their liberty is challenged. My country seeks the path of peace

with freedom and justice. As Abraham Lincoln put it in his second inaugural address, "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right . . . let us strive on to finish the work we are in".

39. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I thank the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the important statement she has just made.

40. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, this is not the first session of the General Assembly over which you have presided, and therefore I do not need to wish you the same success that, owing to your experience, you have enjoyed in the past and are having at this session. I need hardly add that your country and mine are united by genuine friendship, nor need I reiterate to you how honoured I feel that you are presiding over the Assembly while I speak on disarmament.

41. Mr. Secretary-General you also are well aware of the friendship that exists between your country and mine and of our personal friendship; you therefore know that I shall always wish you every success.

42. The special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is meeting at a difficult time for the ideals that the United Nations advocates. Every participant in this meeting knows the problems of our time, and there is no need to search in the distant past to find an international scene altered by acts of war, economies devastated by the war effort, an atmosphere of insecurity and a certain pessimism with regard to the future.

43. I am speaking in this forum with this in mind and with the responsibility of stating the point of view of Spain, which shares with the other peoples the conviction that disarmament affects the vital interests of all and conditions the maintenance of international security and the strengthening of peace.

44. Spain is keenly aware of the universal movements and feelings in favour of peace and arms reduction. My Government is fully conscious of this concern and will make all the efforts necessary to ensure that those desires are not disappointed and that peace becomes a real concept and not a mere rhetorical notion.

45. I emphasize the key word in this basic concept—peace—because I believe that any consideration of disarmament lacks credibility and future unless it is directly related to the problem of peace. The peoples we represent here are anxiously looking for the results they need. None the less, we must recognize that since 1897, when consideration of disarmament began with the convening of the first Hague Conference, the results achieved have been meagre. This is no time to disappoint once again those who have placed such hopes in a life in peace and security, to destroy their faith and further erode the credibility of the disarmament cause.

46. As a consequence of this idea I have just expressed, I feel compelled to reaffirm the strong will for peace that motivates Spain, my country's great desire that international security and the strengthening of the means to achieve it should become a reality and the great anxiety of the people of Spain, which my Government recognizes and which I am expressing

here today, that effective means be found to achieve that objective. Nevertheless we must not lose sight of the fact that in order to achieve peace we must uproot the profound causes of war. The survival of colonial situations, military occupations, interference in the affairs of other States, the threats of the use of force and the violation of human rights are phenomena that unfortunately exist in certain areas of the world and which more than justify our meeting here to try to make progress along the road to disarmament.

47. Disarmament and arms limitation are not to be seen as an end in themselves, but rather as a means to achieve something else: peace and security. To advocate disarmament for its own sake from this rostrum would be not only unrealistic but unacceptable. We must seek disarmament that will contribute to increasing security; a disarmament that led to a lessening of security would be meaningless.

48. In the opinion of my Government, the task which the Assembly must face is to complete, with new specific, balanced and effectively verifiable measures, the agreements reached by consensus in 1978 and to be found in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly [*resolution S-10/2*], which for us is still a complete and valid text.

49. Spain supports the final goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, as proclaimed by the Organization and reflected in the Final Document. However, we recognize that this is an ideal which is difficult to attain and that in the absence of what is best we must insist on what is good; and what is good in this case is to seek arms limitation, to strive for a broad degree of reduction acceptable to the largest possible number of countries. Nevertheless, we are compelled to recognize that together with these expectations there are well-founded doubts regarding the chances of succeeding in containing the arms race. The modest results obtained so far and the difficulties we have encountered justify this caution.

50. It has been repeatedly affirmed in this United Nations forum and in other international forums that the peoples desire peace; that the peoples and the nations are against military adventures, which never resolve conflicts.

51. The road travelled since the first special session devoted to disarmament is not sufficiently encouraging for there to be a genuine cause-and-effect relationship. We therefore have to ask ourselves where the root of the true problem is and how we can achieve effective disarmament. While indulging in groundless hopes is not a good method, neither is stubborn insistence on past methods and procedures which have brought minimum results and are out of tune with today's circumstances.

52. We do not consider it legitimate to speculate with and manipulate the hopes of peoples, as has been done repeatedly whenever disarmament plans that are not viable, that are for propaganda purposes and that are unrealistic have been put forward. The Spanish Government, which is firmly determined to work towards genuine disarmament, distinguishes perfectly well between feasible and realistic proposals

and those which are of a demagogic character and are merely toying with what are in fact legitimate aspirations and concerns of the people. These manoeuvres will never be accepted, and we shall avail ourselves of every opportunity to denounce them.

53. The renewed efforts to achieve disarmament cannot be carried out in a vacuum or on the basis of particular situations; they must be based on solid, basic criteria. Here, in brief, are some of those.

54. First and foremost, we must establish the essential criterion, already mentioned, security. What is at stake at the root of the disarmament question, is the security of each and every one, which no one is prepared to renounce. As a logical consequence, this entails the need to adjust disarmament measures to confrontation and tension. In this context, among the many facets I should like to refer to one which seems to us to be particularly useful. This is the approach to disarmament on a regional scale, taking into account the dimensions of conflicts and their repercussions on global security. In particular, we consider it useful to apply the regional criterion to Europe, given the level of confrontation there. In this connexion, the conference on disarmament in Europe, the plans for which were prepared at the Madrid meeting of representatives of the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, is an example of joint effort to seek a solution to the tensions existing in our continent. This conference, the initial phase of which would deal with a series of confidence-building and security-building measures, as stated by the Western countries in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe—and this has the full support of Spain—thus represents a realistic and hopeful expression of the regional approach.

55. A second possible criterion stems from the consideration that the preparation of measures for the limitation of arms on a rhetorical basis has proved to be an effort that is as facile as it is useless for attaining the proposed goals, its sole consequence being the creation of a climate conducive to mutual reproach and sometimes facile demagogy. Therefore it is the opinion of the Spanish Government that proposals in the field of disarmament should be militarily significant, precise and clearly outlined.

56. The level of political commitment and the freely assumed obligation of States to abide by such commitment constitute an essential condition of disarmament agreements not remaining mere dead letters. This is another condition which, in our opinion, is indispensable and without which the entire arms reduction exercise would be reduced to a simple list of declarations of good intentions.

57. Finally, the Spanish Government believes that as a corollary of the measures to be adopted, the verification of the agreements adopted and the possibility of control are the guarantee on which this process must be based. Confidence is all very well, but control is far better.

58. The four points I have just outlined could constitute a basis for the search for solutions to disarmament problems. The essential criterion of security, accuracy in the specifically military content of the proposals, the political commitment to abide by deci-

sions and the verification of their results are thus the points we must not lose sight of during the development of our work.

59. In efforts to achieve disarmament, priority must always be given to those aiming at nuclear disarmament. In line with this we reiterate our conviction that it is necessary to conclude a treaty on the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests as a first important step towards the goal of nuclear disarmament.

60. The priority we recognize with regard to efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament must not lead us to forget that more than three quarters of total world military expenditures are still allocated to the acquisition of conventional weapons. Accordingly, Spain considers that efforts to reduce the level of conventional armaments in all parts of the world should continue, always, of course, taking full account of respect for the legitimate right to take measures of self-defence.

61. We are not starting our work from zero. There are disarmament forums in the international community which are the result of specific political situations that in their day were created by a combination of two concerns: the threat of a super-armed world and the political will to disarm. None of these forums should be outside our purview; my Government is determined to support them firmly.

62. First and foremost there is our Organization. Its role in disarmament negotiations was clearly established in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session. We must stress its importance and strengthen it as much as possible with the supporting machinery. Four years have passed since that machinery was reviewed, so we can now express some thoughts on it.

63. We should like to refer to three specific aspects. The Disarmament Commission, which was revitalized in 1978, has met with certain difficulties in regard to its methods of work, and we have to recognize that it is going through an identity crisis, as proved by the paucity of the results obtained so far—with of course some exceptions. The Commission must be maintained as a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly with universal participation, but in the light of the experience gained in these past years, it would be appropriate seriously to review the content of its functions.

64. The establishment of the Committee on Disarmament, the democratization of the procedures of the negotiating body and the participation in its work of all nuclear-weapon States are positive aspects which my Government welcomes. The participation in the Committee's work by States not members of that body—although there has been some difficulty in that regard—has enabled interested countries to take part in the activities of the multilateral negotiating organ at Geneva. Spain has done so assiduously and actively. We believe that the time has come for Spain to be able to participate in the Committee's work as a full-fledged member. This special session should review the composition of the Committee, in accordance with the commitment in principle already contained in the Final Document, which has been made concrete and specific in successive Assembly resolutions, all of

which have been sponsored and supported by Spain. A review of the Committee's composition will of necessity have to provide for the admission of new members. And here, on behalf of my Government, I wish to declare formally that Spain is a candidate for membership of the Committee on Disarmament.

65. As regards the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, which in these years has seen a substantial increase in its already important functions, we would have to question whether it would be desirable to reconsider its status within the Secretariat system, so as to facilitate its operations and make them more flexible.

66. The importance of the United Nations role in the field of disarmament should not make us disregard the existence of other forums in which these questions are also being negotiated.

67. In the first place there is the fact of the two great nuclear arsenals. Because of the uniqueness and volume of those arsenals, it seems logical to us that the two States possessing them should keep up a bilateral dialogue. In this respect, we are pleased about the imminent resumption of talks on the reduction of strategic arms between the United States and the Soviet Union.

68. Spain reiterates the urgent need to arrive at substantial reductions in strategic arms, and among them priority must be given to intercontinental missiles. President Reagan's proposals deserve our support; we see in them a viable and reasonable start on the reduction of nuclear weapons, the field in which it is most urgent to reach satisfactory agreements. We therefore view with hope the forthcoming opening of the START talks.

69. We also regard as a positive development the statements of the United States, with the support of all its allies, about talks for the reduction of intermediate-range nuclear weapons. We trust that these talks will lead to formulas which, while increasing security, will allow to the greatest possible extent the elimination of all intermediate-range missiles of the two super-Powers.

70. Further, we hope that the negotiating efforts at the talks on mutual and balanced force reductions in central Europe will continue, so that finally equal collective ceilings between East and West can be imposed.

71. Today the world is enduring an economic crisis which endangers the ideal of growing economic and social development in which so many millions of human beings have placed their hopes for liberation. Yearly, hundreds of millions of dollars are spent on arms that are progressively more complex, advanced, sophisticated and, of course, more costly. If the world were able to proceed to uninterrupted disarmament, vast resources would be released for co-operation for the development of the neediest. All the remarkable efforts made by the United Nations to achieve a better world would be enormously rewarded. This is the ideal which should guide us all in striving to ensure that the second special session on disarmament will produce a formula that will bring about a better, more prosperous and, above all, more just world.

72. Mr. WHITEMAN (Grenada): On behalf of the Grenada delegation, as well as on my own behalf, I extend to you, Sir, our heartfelt congratulations on your unanimous election to the presidency of this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

73. The convening of this special session on disarmament is as much a testament to our undying faith in the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations as it is a historic and eloquent expression of our collective desire to live in peace.

74. This special session offers a great opportunity to focus on the social, political and economic evils of the arms race, with a view to establishing a framework for the reduction of armaments and for enhancing international security. It is therefore a signal honour for me to address this session in the name of the People's Revolutionary Government and in the name of the people of Grenada.

75. The current world situation is characterized by wars, confrontations, threats of confrontations, heightening tensions, a return to the cold war, economic crises, dissatisfaction with the present world economic order and an enormous buildup of armaments. In many respects these conditions are reminiscent of the period of the 1930s. In fact the current world situation differs significantly from even that which obtained at the time of the first special session devoted to disarmament merely four years ago.

76. Just four years ago the statements delivered from this very platform engendered great hope and optimism. However, today, as we reflect on those speeches, we cannot but feel that our most cherished dreams have turned into nightmares.

77. Like so many peace-loving people the world over, the Government and people of Grenada are deeply disturbed by the quantitative and qualitative increase of weapons of mass destruction.

78. As I address the Assembly, modern civilization is at the very brink of an abyss and man, the conqueror of inhospitable jungles, the domesticator of savage beasts, the creator of dazzling and sophisticated civilizations is threatened with self-extinction.

79. Nuclear holocaust is no longer in the realm of the unthinkable. It is today a real evil spectre that is haunting mankind. Is it beyond the capacity of man to use his talents and ingenuity to chart a course that will ensure the survival and security of humanity?

80. Apart from the acceleration of the arms race and the growth in size, sophistication and destructiveness of the nuclear arsenals, we have witnessed the revival of gunboat diplomacy and cold-war crusades.

81. With the assumption of office of the Reagan Administration, warmongering has once more become fashionable in Washington. Senior officials of the Reagan Administration have openly proclaimed that there are several things more important than peace. They are talking about pre-emptive strikes and about limited and winnable nuclear wars. We have even been told that we would definitely survive a nuclear blast if we have an adequate supply of shovels. How reckless. Paranoia has reached such dangerous levels in Washington that a country with the potential to

destroy the world several times over is ludicrously suggesting that the first, and only, international airport now nearing completion in little Grenada constitutes a threat to that country's national security.

82. On the contrary, objective observers reject this distorted Pentagon view. For example, commenting on Grenada's international airport in the May issue of the prestigious *Nation* magazine, Christopher Hitchens wrote:

"Often it is very difficult to separate truth from fiction in allegations of this kind. But in the Grenadian case, life is made easy for the inquiring visitor. I spent some time on the island recently and can say confidently that there is no shred of truth in what the State Department says."

83. This twelfth special session is unhappily silhouetted against a background of escalating tensions in many regions. As we meet here, the prospects for peace with justice in southern Africa, the Middle East, Latin America and the Caribbean are rapidly diminishing. We need to recommence the noble search for peace at a time when the clouds of conflict are gathering, a time when the ugly shadows of war, death, destruction loom menacingly on the horizon of international relations, a time when the Zionist military juggernaut is crushing the martyred people of Lebanon.

84. This is a critical hour for peace because hope and optimism have given way to a measure of despair and disillusionment. In our own region of Latin America and the Caribbean, the oppressed peoples who have endured centuries of colonialist and imperialist domination are waging heroic struggles against bloodthirsty oligarchies that gorge themselves on the wealth of the masses.

85. Of course the quest for peace cannot be separated from the quest for justice. Where there are unjust, archaic and oppressive social structures, there can obviously be no peace. Peace and justice are indivisible.

86. In this context we reaffirm our support for the just and legitimate struggle of the people of El Salvador. We reject any theory that suggests that the genuine revolutionary processes evolving in our region are hatched in test tubes in some parts of the region and then transplanted to others.

87. The People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada publicly endorsed the French-Mexican initiatives for a negotiated settlement in El Salvador. The Government of Grenada has also announced its support of the framework for peace which was unveiled at Managua on 21 February 1982 by the President of Mexico. Recent events continue to demonstrate the bankruptcy of the policies so far pursued and emphasize the necessity for a new approach along the suggested French-Mexican lines.

88. We therefore condemn all attempts to frustrate the legitimate aspirations of the Salvadoran people. We also firmly denounce all attempts to intimidate and destabilize the revolutionary Governments of Cuba and Nicaragua. We fully respect and support the right of both those countries to take proper and adequate measures to defend their sovereignty in the

face of the clear and present danger posed by imperialist aggression.

89. The people of Central America and the Caribbean are in dire need of peace. We fully recognize that peace is an indispensable precondition for independence and development. We, who have for centuries been pawns on the diplomatic chess boards of insensitive colonialists, make this legitimate demand: that we be given a chance to develop our societies in the interest of our peoples free from all forms of outside interference and dictation. Our people do not possess the means to glorify and romanticize war, nor would we wish to do so. Contrary to the views being expressed in certain circles, to us war is not a logical extension of politics, nor is it inevitable. War spells death, suffering and destruction.

90. As we continue the tortuous pilgrimage for peace, the Israeli military machine is pulverizing Lebanon. The Zionist butchers are slaughtering thousands of men, women and children with the connivance and support of their imperialist sponsors. Today we once again are forced to ask aloud: how many more Arab and Palestinian villages must be razed to the ground before Zionist Israel is stopped? How many more innocent children must perish before Israel is punished for its mindless savagery? How many more cultures must be bulldozed before we act in defence of the persecuted?

91. The Grenada delegation believes that we must act now. History warns us that the appetite of fascists, expansionists and annexationists cannot be sated. Only resolute and decisive action can curb their voracious appetites.

92. In the face of Zionist imperialist aggression, we reaffirm our total and unconditional support for the heroic Palestinian people and for its sole, authentic representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization. The latest Zionist imperialist onslaught against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples is further proof that there will be no just and lasting peace in the Middle East until there is a restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people over its national territory.

93. The odious system of *apartheid*, which is a creature of imperialism, constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. The murderous Pretoria clique is intensifying its repression of our black brothers and sisters in South Africa and Namibia as a result of the increased political, diplomatic and military assistance it is receiving from imperialism and zionism. We reiterate our firmest support for the South West Africa People's Organization and for the African National Congress. We reaffirm our total solidarity with the front-line States, and particularly with the fraternal Governments and peoples of Mozambique and Angola, the most frequent victims of South Africa's racist violence.

94. As we look at these areas of crisis and war, what do we find in common? What is the common thread? Whether it is in Central America, southern Africa or the Middle East, we see United States imperialism arming, propping up and buttressing some of the most violent régimes ever known to mankind.

95. My Government remains firm in its belief that détente and lasting peace are attainable. Naturally,

they must be based on the unconditional acceptance of ideological pluralism and respect for the political independence and territorial integrity of all States. We resent the attitude of the self-appointed guardians of democracy who, while piously proclaiming their acceptance of ideological pluralism, at the same time attempt to isolate and destabilize those with whom they disagree.

96. The inequitable international economic order and the distressing conditions of the poorest third world countries pose a serious threat to international peace. Efforts towards international equity in trade and in the international financial system have all but ceased in certain quarters. For two decades the third world countries have pursued the goal of a new international economic order. Various North-South conferences, including the meeting held at Cancun in October 1981, have achieved little beyond the recitation of platitudes.

97. In his message to the world during the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, in 1979, the Chairman of the non-aligned movement stated that the fraternity of 95 countries which he represented was unanimous in its condemnation of "the persistent channelling of human and material resources into an arms race, which is unproductive, wasteful and dangerous to mankind" [31st meeting, para. 59].

98. The awesome increase in the volume and value of arms sales has made that traffic the most fantastically profitable and one with the highest annual increment of all trading in the modern world. This year military expenditures will amount to some \$600 billion. One major Power is expected to spend between \$1.5 and \$2 billion on military activities during this so-called Third United Nations Development Decade. Men of reason experience a sense of outrage in contemplating the picture of some 400 to 500 million people starving and malnourished, side by side with this cruel and wanton waste of resources.

99. Squandering resources of such magnitude on such unproductive and inhuman ends robs man of the necessary tools to satisfy the demands of production for living rather than for death; it generates poverty and accelerates the descent towards a planet polarized still further between the extremes of happiness and despair, of plenty and persistent want, of power and of dependency. The money squandered annually on implements of destruction may become even more significant in terms of its social cost.

100. It was estimated that at 1979 production-cost levels the money spent on the acquisition of instruments of mass destruction would have financed the following: 600,000 schools, with a capacity for 400 million school children, or 60 million homes for 300 million people, or 30,000 hospitals with 18 million beds, or 20,000 factories, or an irrigation system for 150 million hectares of land on which, with the appropriate application of technology, food could be produced to feed more than 1 billion people.

101. In addition, when we consider the positive and far-reaching effects which could result from a redeployment of scientists and technicians away from the manufacturing of war material to food production and agriculture and other areas where science can be used for man's benefit, and when we contemplate the human resources which could thereby be released

for development, we can easily see the enormous difference which disarmament and peace could make to life in the third world, or even among the poor and wretched of many Western industrialized societies. Thus, those multinational corporations and their special-interest groups which profit from the production of armaments and weapons of mass destruction are the real enemies of mankind.

102. In our region, as elsewhere in the world, we have heard of the emergence of the new concept of rapid deployment forces, whereby thousands of military personnel will be mobilized within hours for the purpose of waging aggressive wars. At the same time, in these very regions we know of cases where entire island-States devastated by hurricanes and other natural disasters have had to wait for months, or even years, for the mobilization of even small amounts of disaster relief assistance. Therefore, in place of these so-called rapid deployment forces, Grenada today calls for a special programme of rapid emergency economic relief whereby resources can be hurriedly mobilized and channelled to States which are the victims of natural and other disasters.

103. The People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada is conscious of the responsibility of all countries to assist in creating the necessary conditions for peace and security in Central America and the Caribbean area. To this end, the Government of Grenada has initiated and has consistently promoted measures to ensure that the Caribbean is declared and respected as a zone of peace, independence and development.

104. We urge all countries to recognize the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of the region for the creation of a zone in which, among other things, the introduction of nuclear weapons will be prohibited, in which all aggressive military manoeuvres will be banned, in which all existing foreign military and naval bases will be dismantled, and in which machinery will be established to deal with all forms of aggression, including assassinations, destabilization propaganda, diplomatic and economic sabotage and mercenary invasion.

105. We note with deep interest the peace proposals made by President Brezhnev at the twenty-sixth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Moscow last year. We believe that those proposals can provide a basis for constructive dialogue and discussion. We also take note of the Soviet Union's pledge a few days ago in this very forum to renounce the first use of nuclear weapons [12th meeting]. We see that as a constructive step. We are prepared to support any initiative from any quarter that is genuinely designed to reduce the levels of armaments in the world and to foster peace, justice and security. In this regard, we fully support the world-wide peace movement, which is gaining momentum on all continents of this globe.

106. As modern man stumbles perilously close to the edge of the ultimate precipice, we believe that it is not enough merely to desire peace. It is our fervent hope that this special session will give all of us the confidence to persevere, the fortitude to forswear war and the courage to disarm and to work steadfastly towards lasting peace.

107. It is our fervent hope that this session will lay the foundation for the realization of specific and concrete formulas, in order to achieve a balanced and progressive reduction in armaments throughout the world. Let us continue to work towards the creation of a safer world with a brighter future for all mankind.

108. Mr. LEMOS SIMMONDS (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Perhaps at no other time have we, the transient representatives of our peoples in international forums, received a more explicit mandate than we have received now. The horror of war—which is no longer waged with the rudimentary implements that used to limit it to localized confrontations between professional armies, but which is now waged with weapons of total devastation which endanger the very existence of the human race and even the integrity of our planet—is today more present than ever before in the minds of those who inhabit every one of our nations.

109. Mankind, which has matured so much since the time when it was made up of a loose set of violent tribes with more daring than brains, does not seem to have progressed beyond the barbarous stage when it comes to savageness, except in the ominous sense of having made its capacity to kill more effective in a kind of geometric progression of lunacy. That is what brings us together today, frightened by our own destructive power and certainly somewhat ashamed of having used our ingenuity to develop and increase that power.

110. None of our nations—and of course none of us—wants war. Asked whether we would be ready deliberately to start a war, we invariably reply with an eloquent appeal for peace. Unfortunately the gulf between our words and our deeds is growing greater, and our deeds seem to be more in accord with our dangerous inclinations than are our utterances. With an incredible lack of responsibility, as though we were unaware of our foolishness and thoughtlessness, we accumulate arms, we glorify those who produce them, we enrich those who trade in them and we create a deadly rivalry to possess the greatest number of the most lethal weapons, blind to the obvious: that that frenzied and most burdensome race can lead only to our destruction—or at best to bankruptcy.

111. Of course, we are not short of pretexts to justify this barbarity, or to conceal it. One such tactic is to meet from time to time in order to disguise the tragic evidence behind tens of thousands of words of goodwill, words in which the sceptical masses no longer believe and which we ourselves utter with little faith and with countless reservations.

112. There can be no doubt that the record of all the assemblies, conferences, rounds of talks, meetings and agreements on disarmament is a deplorable one. I do not know if that record, in all its distressing futility, has been drawn up by someone who has undertaken the enormous task of compiling a precise ledger of human foolishness. But if something should make us persevere, in spite of recurrent failures, in insisting on the desirability of holding gatherings such as this one, there will be another record: the fearful record of arsenals and the even more terrifying one of their growing efficiency. That is a record that has been well documented; so well, in fact, that we

know, for example, that one of the two greatest Powers on earth could destroy the other 20 times over, but that at the same time the other could "only" cause the total destruction of the territory of the first 13 times over.

113. But it is the very irrationality of those figures—figures which are ironically described as a guarantee that peace is safe—that should lead us to believe that we went over the brink of madness a long time ago and that we must turn back from the stormy road of suspicion, hostility, arrogance and cynicism which has led us to the absurd position of seeking terror as the pointer on the scales of the precarious balance between life and death. Yet I do not believe that the unpostponable task should be left in the exclusive care of the great nuclear Powers and that the rest of the nations should confine themselves to urging those Powers to dismantle their dreadful devices or reduce their number, as though those of us which have not attained—nor do we wish to attain—the dubious honour of membership of their gloomy club had nothing to do, and to do promptly, to put an end to the escalation towards the annihilation which will surely be the punishment for the intransigence of our species if we do not control ourselves.

114. As I read or listen to—with the respect and interest they all deserve—the excellent statements which have been made here, I note that almost all of them place justifiable emphasis on nuclear disarmament. But I very much fear that it is not only from there that springs the peril which looms over mankind if the irrationality of force is not met with an elementary act of sanity which can save us.

115. In fact, in the delicate play of tensions that might lead to nuclear war and the circumstances that might set it off, world public opinion exercises healthy and permanent control. Although regrettably, no one can predict when or under what pressures a prudent statesman will become a pitiless aggressor or a powerful nation will commit the irreparable error of placing its fate and the fate of others in the hands of a dangerous bully or a fanatic without scruples, the monstrous nature of nuclear war creates the impalpable mechanisms of inhibition that have so far preserved us from catastrophe.

116. But the same is not true of what—in one of those pathetic euphemisms in which we have become expert—is called "conventional war". For this type of action and the weapons with which it is waged there is no verification or control; nor do indignant multitudes go out into the streets to warn us of their risks. Those wars continue to be as notorious and as frequent as in the past, and those who decree them or direct them enjoy, even though transitorily, the same alarming renown as that enjoyed by those captains and conquerors in respect of whom we have in our proverbial idiocy created an undesirable cult. And yet such wars and weapons are the most deadly, the most cruel and the most generalized of those that have upset the international order even in recent times.

117. What is more, if we are to be forthright, the nefarious statistics of conventional wars cannot even be compared with the statistics of the use of atomic devices. A single battle in the First World War—Verdun, for example, or any of the Ypres campaigns—

left a larger number of dead, mutilated and homeless and more irreparable scars on the thin skin of politics than the Hiroshima and Nagasaki explosions.

118. But as long as the mere possibility that this instantaneous dual holocaust might be repeated arouses alarm, consternation and, logically, rejection, the routine criminality of conventional wars or the lucrative trade that makes them possible are not so energetically decried.

119. But, what is worse, as though all this brutality were insignificant compared with the far greater atomic carnage, such wars are considered reasonable calamities and even a legitimate recourse to settle those interminable, stormy and almost always extravagant disputes to which our vanity or our intolerance commit us. That is why they are occurring every day, in the most absurd causes, for any reason and in the most unexpected places, supported by the childish excitement of those who are to die in them.

120. Mankind must guard against this danger, which is perhaps less notorious but much more immediate, in the first place by not permitting the militant anxiety—of marches and protests reflected in the so sadly prophetic death masks with which the young express their despair—to be limited to the denunciation of nuclear madness when there is another madness much closer and much more bloody and of which there are victims every day on every continent with alarming regularity in the midst of the unexplainable indifference of accomplices. Secondly, reviewing the situation in the light of less simplistic circumstances than global imposition by a hegemony that nobody wants and that, furthermore, is impossible, there is the supply of arms. In this respect the responsibility of the big Powers is very great, and in addition there is an ominous idiocy: accustomed, as they are, to having not friends but interests, they supply arms to those they think they can use as policemen in the bloc rivalry in which they are engaged, without realizing that the benefits of such disastrous largess can also establish, and usually do, the real differences between possible friends and interests.

121. This mistaken perception, which is not corrected despite its recurrence, is what has produced in the post-war era the large number of armed conflicts that have cast shadows over what should have been for us all a period of peace and wise, serene and fruitful coexistence. Furthermore it takes us ever closer to a nuclear cataclysm.

122. Asia, Africa, the Middle East and, somewhat more recently, Latin America have suffered the consequences of this short-sighted policy, which does not recognize that a policeman may become an aggressor and even a conqueror, encouraged by vicarious power which should never have been placed in its hands.

123. Perhaps I am about to attempt nothing other than the useless exercise of wishful thinking. But I believe that if the great Powers were to abandon their self-centredness and were to try to understand us better; if the dialogue we wish to establish with them were not, as it has been so far, a dialogue of the deaf; and if they were to learn from the many lessons of their troubled histories, which they do not, perhaps they would realize that enormous risks for their own existence are involved in the senseless arms race

which they encourage under a triply immoral pretext: that of using us as guarantees against their own excesses, that of strengthening their own industrial economies, and the argument that in any case someone else would sell arms to buyers if they refused to do so.

124. Be that as it may, whether we understand each other or not, whether the great Powers calculate the intensity of our conflicts as they seek and even demand that we measure the enormous dimensions of theirs, whether they stolidly persist in not doing so, the fact remains that we must all take concrete steps to end the deadly rivalry that is quickly pushing us towards the abyss.

125. Naturally, the first condition for that ought to be another kind of disarmament: disarmament of our minds. But it would not be wise to harbour too many illusions about this elementary priority.

126. So far, under every ideology and even under the calm rule of the most merciful doctrines, man has proved to be a choleric and untrustworthy creature. His infernal temperament must be controlled in some way so that he will not, as is customary, create a tragedy out of a minor incident, and he must be prevented from self-destruction in the heat of anger. Man, who, strangely enough, can be as intemperate as he is wise, has created legal institutions in order to resolve the immemorial tragedy of his quarrels and his rugged relationships with others.

127. An essential part of these rules which assuage our intemperance and protect us are defence systems, agreed to in good faith, which are sufficient, if correctly interpreted, to prevent attacks. These alliances have the advantage of allowing the maintenance of a relatively low level of armaments in every State which has signed the agreement in that all the nations of the alliance come to the defence of the country which has been attacked. On the continent to which Colombia belongs that machinery was established in the Inter-American Treaty for Reciprocal Assistance¹ which, if properly implemented, constitutes an optimum guarantee for preserving intact the integrity of our countries in the event of unprovoked aggression.

128. My nation firmly believes that as regards our hemisphere, the reciprocal assistance system agreed to at Rio de Janeiro should be maintained and even strengthened, not only because each time it was applied without distorting its meaning it proved to be effective, but also because it is the only way to prevent an arms escalation among us, as is already beginning to occur, which would be reverting to the régime of law of the strongest.

129. Strengthening international juridical institutions, therefore, making them more active and flexible, and above all not to ignore them or disfigure them would be the second possible condition for creating a climate of understanding which would make aggression unnecessary, intimidation useless, all differences reconcilable and offences punishable. Under these fair rules—and we have no other recourse—we could eliminate the balance of terror because we would have re-established the rule of reason, as we have always wished to do.

130. The task is not an easy one, but it is indispensable. And we must begin it at once in total honesty.

What is more, my Government believes that it is the weak nations which must devote themselves to it first and foremost so that the exercise of their independence will not be conditioned by inequality generated by rivalry in terms of terror.

131. Unfortunately, our insistence on law as the only legitimate means of settling disputes has not always been correctly understood. But we prefer the risk of that temporary lack of understanding to making the doubtless irreparable mistake of investing acts of force with a legitimacy they lack, among other things because, if we were to oppose that conduct, we could not participate with authority and a good conscience in a forum such as this, a forum of peace.

132. I said at the beginning of my statement that each of us has brought here an explicit mandate. We were given it in the streets, in the squares, in the intimacy of our homes by hundreds, thousands, millions of people who live—and we are partly to blame—in discouraging uncertainty. We cannot, without disappointing what could be their last hope, be less than equal to this mandate which is supported by their faith, but also by their anxiety. This session cannot be yet another in the sad series of those which have already been held to no purpose.

133. We cannot once again produce a document full of rhetorical vagueness which disguises not so much our lack of ability as our lack of courage. We have already talked and the time has come for action. This is what is expected of us, because the rest is mere verbiage.

134. Mr. TUENI (Lebanon): The representative of Lebanon will certainly be understood and, I trust, excused if today he has nothing to offer on the subject of universal disarmament but the pious prayer that it should happen soon enough for his country to survive.

135. While this second special session on disarmament has been considering issues of the highest importance for the fate of the human race and of our planet, a small nation, a nation the world has always loved, has been allowed to be martyred and crucified.

136. Can we, then, realistically expect Lebanon, or any other peace-loving nation of similar size, to listen with trust and confidence to discourse on how to prevent an atomic holocaust while the dynamic of war continues on its implacable course?

137. The atomic holocaust of tomorrow becomes a problematic danger, remote and almost unreal to those who are experiencing an actual holocaust: the holocaust of their mother earth, of men, women and children physically destroyed together with the cities they built and loved.

138. It is more than a choice between security and anguish. It is a choice between today and tomorrow, between escaping immediate death and thinking—but only thinking—of preventing ultimate destruction.

139. No nation in the world, no nation in history, can ever be expected to overcome such a present trauma, such a cataclysm, and to stake its existence on what is still much less than a promising blueprint.

140. Yet my people are said to derive their historic name from the legend of a sacred bird, the phoenix, which could always rise from the ashes. And so our

ancient cities, many times destroyed and burned to ashes, were able to rise again and flourish and bring to the history of humanity their eternal message of liberty and love. Those cities have names that now haunt us every hour of every day: Tyre, 6,000 years ago the capital of an empire—not of war, but of dialogue, of trade and learning; Sidon, beloved by the gods; and Beirut, or Berytis, the city of laws.

141. But “the countenance of Lebanon” is not today what Solomon described in the Song of Songs, “excellent as the Cedars”. Now the ashes of the phoenix cover “the lions’ dens . . . the mountains of the leopards . . . the fountain of gardens . . . the well of living waters and streams” [*Song of Solomon: 5:15 and 4:8 and 15*].

142. We are not here to lament, but to hope. My people will know how to heal their wounds. Soon the scars of our earth shall be dry and covered with flowers and trees. Houses and factories shall be built again soon where instruments of destruction and death are now displayed with insolence and where bodies are buried under the rubble of civilization.

143. Soon we shall be strong again.

144. But is the world community really interested in a strong and healthy Lebanon? If so, the following principles of national policy must be allowed, without hesitation, to govern Lebanon’s future: first, Lebanon should never again be the arena, the battlefield, where friends and foes alike find it convenient to wage their wars; secondly, Lebanon should never again allow its liberty to be taken hostage by those to whom it was extended; thirdly, Lebanon should be capable of defending not only its liberty, the liberty of land and people, but also its free democratic institutions; fourthly, Lebanon should have a strong national army, not merely as a protection against further destabilization and conquest, but as a catalyst, integrating a traditionally pluralistic society, capable of absorbing and containing present fragmentary forces; fifthly, the safety and security of Lebanon, the defence of its territorial integrity, the protection of its sovereignty, and the assertion of its independence should not remain contingent upon extra-territorial considerations of any sort, whether regional or international.

145. There are many who are now proposing to redraw our map for us, rewrite our constitution, and even renegotiate, on our behalf, our new national compact. To all of them, friends and foes alike, may Lebanon say that its future shall be only what the Lebanese, and the Lebanese alone, decide for themselves. Not in the shadow of guns—all the guns, the guns of murder and destruction—will Lebanon be reconstructed, but by the general will of the Lebanese, all the Lebanese, to whatever community they belong, brought together once more, not in a mere social contract, but in this more everlasting historic contract: a covenant between generations, past and present, and generations to come.

146. Rejecting the ancillary role of strategic accessories, the Lebanese are now determined to achieve peace in Lebanon not independently from, but certainly without waiting for, the just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East question. Lebanon, we feel, has waited far too long and paid too high a price. Immediate peace in Lebanon is not only a moral

imperative for the Lebanese; it is also a pragmatic necessity for regional and international security. Indeed, the events of the past two weeks are proving beyond doubt what we always feared: that the war in Lebanon was becoming a danger not to Lebanon alone, but to others as well, and probably to the entire world.

147. This, however, should not be construed to mean that Lebanon is in any way or manner resigning its Arab responsibilities. Quite the contrary; we are more than ever determined to assume fully our regional and international role completely unhampered.

148. Our reservations, past and present, concerning Palestinian military activities in Lebanon do not undermine our solidarity with the Palestinian cause and our commitment to support the Palestinians’ legitimate right to their national State, in their own homeland. Just as we rejected in the past any settlement of the Palestinian question at the expense of Lebanon, we shall in no way accept today, as a consequence of Israel’s war against the Palestine Liberation Organization, a settlement of the Palestinian question that will force the half million Palestinians now in Lebanon, armed or unarmed, to relinquish their right of return. Furthermore, the Israeli invasion does not reduce Lebanon’s sovereign right to exercise, solely and exclusively, all political as well as military authority over all of its territory, and freely determine its own destiny.

149. It may be necessary, in this context, to emphasize that Lebanon’s determination to consolidate the restructuring of its armed forces will release the Arab deterrent forces from the role that they now assume in Lebanon. This determination is not new, and it will not be altered by recent developments. It was officially conveyed to the appropriate Arab councils over a year ago, and was emphatically stated in our address on 5 October 1981 to the 26th meeting of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Hence, in practical terms, the so-called cease-fire between Israeli and Syrian forces that have been engaged in combat in Lebanon can be viewed only as a purely transient and technical measure. Consequently, no cease-fire arrangements and no cessation of hostilities on Lebanese territory can give any non-Lebanese forces any rights over Lebanese territory, nor can any party then be allowed to evoke so-called security claims or concerns by virtue of temporary presence inside our internationally recognized boundaries. Need we add that we are particularly concerned lest the notion of symmetrical withdrawal be used as a pretext for a prolonged symmetrical presence.

150. In asking for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon, and the re-establishment of the sole and exclusive authority of the Lebanese army over all of Lebanon’s territory, we are depending on the dual support of the United Nations and of the League of Arab States. We are reassured that the most eloquent and indeed effective expression of Arab support came, as expected, from a geographically remote Arab capital—Riyadh—said to be too concerned with another war to care about our fate. Speaking with the utmost clarity, King Fahd of Saudi Arabia warned that his country would take the lead in fulfilling its historic responsibility in the defence of Lebanon by all the means at its disposal. King Fahd also warned that the invasion of an Arab capital,

Beirut, "will invalidate every political effort and Arab endeavour".

151. Equally reassuring are attitudes taken by leaders and Governments even farther away: offers to respond to any Lebanese appeal, such as that by President Mitterrand of France; active involvement, such as the relentless American diplomatic effort; a warning to the enemy, such as that from Moscow; and innumerable expressions of solidarity from everyone else, everywhere. This universal attitude towards the Israeli invasion is embodied in the unanimous resolutions adopted by the Security Council, in particular resolution 509 (1982).

152. We know that resolutions are not solutions. We know how shattered is the authority of the Council. But we also know the value of such an instrument of international law as resolution 509 (1982), which clearly and unequivocally establishes the criteria of Israeli withdrawal: that it should be both immediate and unconditional.

153. Israel's continued defiance of that resolution does not weaken our determination to pursue its reaffirmation and to insist that our friends in the world community should deploy, and continue to deploy, in the name of international legitimacy, every possible effort to enforce what, by virtue of the Charter, is a binding, executive decision of the Organization.

154. The Security Council has also adopted a resolution which confirms a United Nations physical presence and concrete responsibility in Lebanon. I am referring to resolution 511 (1982) of 18 June, which renewed the mandate of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon [UNIFIL] for an interim period of two months, despite the very adverse conditions in which the peace-keeping force now finds itself.

155. The past performance of UNIFIL and its present dramatic situation make it necessary that we reiterate here what we have often said in the Security Council. UNIFIL was entrusted with a most challenging dynamic mission, for which it was given only static prerogatives.

156. The very future of peace-keeping operations is now at stake. Should peace-keeping continue to depend on what is termed "co-operation of all the parties concerned"? Or are the small nations entitled to expect that peace-keeping forces should be enabled to defend them against aggression, "restoring international peace and security", and "assisting" their governments—as explicitly stated in Security Council resolution 425 (1978) of 19 March 1978—"in ensuring the return of [their] effective authority"?

157. To many in the Assembly this may be a question that can be examined at leisure and through endless debates. To us in Lebanon it is a question of great and grave urgency. Within two months my Government will have to make an existential, not an intellectual, choice. Do we need a United Nations force? And if we do, what United Nations force can credibly confirm the withdrawal of an invader and assist us in restoring our sovereignty over all of our territory?

158. If, on the other hand, such a force cannot be expected from the United Nations, then what other

force must we resort to? Should we seek assistance in the probably more debatable frameworks of regional or multinational peace-keeping? And what effect will this have on the future of the United Nations and its role in the settlement of disputes and the establishment of international peace and security?

159. This question was not born today. Four years ago, during the general debate at the tenth special session, my delegation supported an old idea, which has since lost currency: the creation of a permanent international peace-keeping force capable of guaranteeing, in a concrete and operative manner, the independence and territorial integrity of those smaller nations that are unwilling to invest in armaments and illusory security at the expense of their more vital needs, such as development and progress. The question is still entire and poignant to countries such as mine that are the constant and perpetual victims of external threats and internal destabilization.

160. In that same debate on disarmament we also suggested a concept of international neutrality "applicable to countries where external conflicts have projected and may still project into internal divisions, and where internal structures inevitably project into external, as well as civil wars" [16th meeting, para. 29].

161. Many events during the past four years have demonstrated, at tremendous cost, the need for such internationally guaranteed neutrality and for a United Nations prepared, as we pleaded then, to "assume a new responsibility—that of providing international shelter for the weak against the powerful, for the poor against the rich, for the underdeveloped against the overdeveloped, for the peace-loving against the aggressive" [*ibid.*, para. 30].

162. Instead of seeking peace through the just settlement of disputes, the Israeli delegation treated the Assembly to an old proposal, invoked here in the most ludicrous manner: namely, a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Can we really be expected to take that proposal seriously while the Middle East is witnessing not only the most savage war in years, but a competition between conventional armaments developed to reach a maximized destructive capacity, and while many have been so obscene as to state that the invasion of Lebanon is offering a unique opportunity to test sophisticated technological progress? If that is not the ugliest form of the armaments race, what could ever be uglier and more cynical?

163. Before establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, let us put an end to aggression and its consequences for the future of man and polity. Let us freeze the race for conventional armaments and let us use no cluster bombs. Let us freeze a race that bleeds us all, the poorest as well as the wealthiest. Even those societies that now feel secure through an illusion of strength might soon become impoverished, breeding their own violence. The pursuit of war and external terror will become but an expedient for absorbing internal terrorism and revolution.

164. Need we remind the Assembly that the atomic option now available to Israel alone in the Middle East, as a mark of its so-called qualitative edge, may one day become a commodity of international ter-

rorism? Nuclear gangsterism, as it is called, today a feature of political fiction, should not be allowed to become tomorrow the possible and frightening reality of a new radicalism created by frustration and the logic of despair.

165. Armaments, whether conventional or nuclear, are not the problem. They are but an extension of the problem. The real problem is and remains political. It is the question of peace.

166. In simple and direct terms, let us solve the Lebanese question and reach a just and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. Then there will be no arms race in that vital area of the world, nor will the international order continue to be shattered as it is by the spectres of war. My country, now a martyr of both war and peace, appeals to all representatives. Let us not allow the Assembly to be diverted by abstract testimonials to peace and no less abstract analyses of the causes of war. Concerned as we all are to ensure halting the race towards the atomic holocaust of tomorrow, let us remember the no less apocalyptic realities of today.

167. The PRESIDENT: Under the decision taken by the Assembly at its first meeting, I now call on the next speaker, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme, Mr. Bradford Morse.

168. Mr. MORSE (*United Nations Development Programme*): It is a uniquely high honour for me to address this great Assembly under your leadership, Mr. President, in this general debate, to express the commitment of UNDP to the desperately important goals of this special session. I come here directly from a critical meeting of the UNDP Governing Council at Geneva and with the perspective of one who has just crossed the bridge between development and disarmament, of one who knows what a dramatic difference in the lives of all humankind will result when the international community makes true progress towards the achievement of the purposes for which this historic session has been convened.

Mr. Mrani Zentar (*Morocco*), Vice-President, took the Chair.

169. At Geneva, the Council of UNDP—the largest development co-operation organization ever created by the nations represented here—has been in session since the beginning of this month, with an agenda that provides more than one link across that bridge. The simplest linkage of all, but one we must not overlook, is that UNDP has this year begun its third five-year development co-operation cycle with a disastrous shortfall in its financial resources for its services to 154 developing countries and territories, as compared to the planning target for such resources endorsed by this very Assembly less than two years ago.

170. Because UNDP works exclusively in the development of human resources and institutional structures in developing countries and in supporting the pre-investment planning of those countries, its programme expenditures are relatively modest in monetary terms. Their multiplier effect, however, has the highest ratio of any factor in the economic and social advancement of a nation, and that basic, undeniable fact provides an ironic and bitter twist to the figures I bring here

from the other side of the birdge that connects the development needs we have been discussing at Geneva and the disarmament imperatives you are discussing here in New York. For I come here not with abstract disarmament-to-development calculations, but with figures that represent incalculable, perhaps irreparable, damage to actual development programmes and projects. Yet they are figures that are dwarfed when considered in relation to expenditures on armaments.

171. All the technical co-operation UNDP has been charged to provide to developing countries over the next five years will cost less than the sum that will be consumed in world armaments expenditures in the next four days. And the shortfall which I must currently project against that five-year target represents the equivalent of what will be consumed in armaments expenditures in the next 28 hours. Across the developing world, if our estimates are not corrected by increased contributions, between now and the end of this cycle hundreds of thousands of people will not acquire new skills for food production and health services, will not secure safe water to drink, will not have available to them even minimal schooling for their children, will not start work after training for expanded industry and trade for want of a sum the equivalent of which will be poured into the world's warships and battle tanks, missiles and jets, bullets and bombs, between this moment and the close of your meeting tomorrow.

172. I have had to report to the Governing Council a necessary reduction in programme expenditures for development throughout the developing world just for this current year. It is equivalent to the sum that will be consumed in making instruments for human destruction in less than the next three hours. And, lest these comparisons between the currency of development and the coinage of devastation are not readily understood, let me be more specific and provide one specific example. For this day and all of the remaining days of this year there will be no UNDP assistance for the benefit of the people of half the districts of Gikongoro in Rwanda to improve their food production and to avert soil erosion through an originally planned UNDP co-operation project, because that project has had to be cut back by an amount equivalent to world arms expenditures in the last 12 seconds.

173. The study entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*, annexed to the report of the Secretary-General² before this special session, is a document of commanding importance. Its comprehensive, compelling analysis makes it irrefutably clear that non-productive expenditures on armaments make no economic sense in any country. The Group of Governmental Experts led by Inga Thorsson has punctured many of the myths that have prevented well-meaning, concerned parliamentarians from resisting escalating levels of military spending and has presented in stark relief the inevitable economic and social deprivation world-wide, for rich as well as poor nations, that results from such spending. In my view, this masterly survey closes a chapter in the history of this century in which we did not know enough, we did not know it clearly enough, to face squarely the choices which will determine the destiny of humankind.

174. When the nuclear-arms race began and the conventional arms spiral that was supposed to ensure that nuclear weapons would not be used was unharnessed, few among us could have foreseen the self-sustaining, ever more rapid, ever more costly chain-reaction in the application of technology to armaments, the insatiable quest for a new counter-weapon to the counter-weapon to the counter-weapon in the demonstrably vain hope, at each stage, of finally achieving equilibrium. We simply did not know what we had embarked upon, in terms of either the destructive power that would steadily accumulate or in the astronomical public expenditures that would be required to acquire it, or the paralysing effect that this parasitical process would have on peaceful pursuits, both economic and social, from which it cruelly diverts critically needed financial resources, productive capacity and, most tragic of all, human genius.

175. On the other hand, when the process began we had only the most imperfect knowledge of the total economic and social and environmental condition of our planet. The general poverty of two thirds of humanity was vaguely perceived and the nations were far-seeing enough to embody in the Charter of the United Nations the promotion of economic and social progress for all people. But it is really only in the last 10 or 12 years, from the succession of world development conferences convened by the Assembly, that there has been assembled a full picture of the magnitude of poverty, the intricacy of the development process, the impact of the geometric escalation in the numbers of humanity and the inescapable interdependence which all nations, now locked into an international economic system that is serving no one well, have come to acknowledge.

176. And so I submit that with the report on disarmament and development now added to our knowledge, this special session closes the chapter of contemporary history during which it could be claimed that we did not know enough to perceive what we were threatening to do with our precious heritage. At this chilling moment in the human adventure, when we know we are capable of annihilating ourselves, we also know for the first time the urgent needs of humanity and the fragility of the ecosystem in which it must live.

177. We know that we have today stored and poised against each other more explosive power, measured in pounds per person, than we have stored in food reserves. The point was brought home with great force and great clarity by the Secretary-General at the opening of this special session when he reminded us that every living citizen on this planet has been allocated 3 tons of high explosive as his share of the destructive power that has been devised, manufactured and installed throughout the world. Can any among us justify this perversion of human progress?

178. We know that the cost of one launching receptacle for an intercontinental missile, ironically called a silo, is the equivalent in public funds of a sum that would provide thousands of small farmers with real silos to protect their harvests, up to 25 per cent of which they lose every year to vermin and to fungus. Just as we no longer have the excuse that we did not know the appalling daily toll of human lives from diseases for which we still lack efficient

counter-weapons, so we no longer have the excuse that we do not know the appalling cost in funds, precious materials and scientific genius of trying to devise yet another generation of counter-weapons of destruction.

179. It is now that we have the ability once and for all to juxtapose these two sets of assembled global knowledge that the insult to the dignity of humankind which our indifference has encouraged becomes so terribly clear.

180. Give the United Nations development system \$30 million, for example, and a small fraction of it will be lost in arduous trial and error in our struggles on the frontier of finding better, quicker, more culturally appropriate responses to the needs of the peoples of developing countries. Development is not as exact a science as designing a guided missile. But most of that \$30 million will go directly to build lasting, self-multiplying stocks of human skills and to make realistic, attainable plans for effective investment, with the additional multiplier effect.

181. Yet in all of UNDP's accumulated experience, with all of its trial and error, there is not the most remote equivalent in wanton waste to that which occurs when an equivalent sum, in whatever currency, invested in just one jet fighter, disappears in the sky in a ball of fire.

182. It need not be said that every country will continue to have minimal national security requirements while issues of territory, resources or ideology remain among us. But we are racing through the outer reaches of our moral territory on an uncontrolled trajectory of arms escalation that long since left the concept of minimal national security far behind it. We must build upon the new awareness so evident in this Hall and beyond so that this flight can be braked and ultimately reversed.

183. Disarmament has been on the international agenda for generations, and most of the efforts made to achieve it are shrouded in failure. Yet never before has there been such an understanding of the waste of armaments expenditure as compared to the value of productive investment in development.

184. Sad though it is, it is not likely that national Governments will chart new directions in the short run. But could not the Assembly render once a year a "development implications" study accompanying a report on the year's world armaments expenditure? It would be tremendously persuasive—an annual report to the General Assembly on what could have been done for the world economic and social development, with only the world's net additions for the year to its armouries, and what could have been done with the financial investment that evaporated in wars, wherever they occurred in the same year. The Assembly could thus maintain a vigil and sustain reason and compassion against the day of real conversion.

185. The Thorsson report has admirably assembled and analysed the cumulative record of ideas and proposals for conversion and redeployment of resources released for military purposes through disarmament measures for economic and social development purposes. This dividend approach has obvious advantages.

186. It is not my function to compare the various options, but I can pledge to the Assembly that if in a chosen scheme there is a place for UNDP and were it to be named as a channel for financial resources thus released—this has in fact been proposed—marvels would be witnessed in the acceleration of progress for the benefit of the peoples of developing countries everywhere.

187. I have provided my personal estimate of the current exchange rates, as it were, between the cost of the delivery of destruction through instruments of death and the cost of the delivery of development through an instrument of peace and for enhancement of life established by the Assembly—the United Nations Development Programme. In UNDP one has a mechanism in place, at work, to channel redeployed resources. At this moment of renewed hope for global negotiations, a decision to proceed with more detailed study of a resource redeployment scheme would surely provide an additional inspiring moral dimension for those negotiations. We in UNDP stand ready to assist in whatever way and at whatever stage the Assembly may request.

188. Although progress towards disarmament which will lead across the bridge to development will inevitably take time, there may be steps involving different kinds of redeployment that could be taken more quickly. It might be suggested, for example, to consider the establishment of a United Nations food corps, a United Nations health corps, a United Nations education corps, or a United Nations energy corps, organized completely under the auspices and supervision of the United Nations, or the relevant specialized agency, to which willing countries might second highly skilled and experienced non-combatant individuals with technical training from their military forces who might assist a developing country—under United Nations auspices and supervision—which chose to avail itself of the service in helping to meet its development needs through the acquisition of greater skills by its people. Obviously, it would be only at the invitation and with the full agreement of the developing country that any such United Nations corps would be received.

189. A variation of this concept has been utilized in the past in the United Nations system when specially trained units drawn from the military of one country have been dispatched to a country which has been struck by a natural disaster to assist in meeting the emergency—always, of course, with the consent of the receiving country.

190. If such a system as I have suggested were to find approval in the Assembly and obtain the endorsement of Member States, it would have the effect of transferring relevant technical skills and knowledge, supported by military expenditures, to help developing countries meet their development requirements. Modest though the transfer might be, it might point to more ambitious arrangements.

191. At all events, let us agree that there are many good wars, clean wars, to be fought—against hunger, against illiteracy, against suffering, against those intractable diseases still stalking the people in the southern hemisphere, against the steadily approaching energy deficit of this planet—problems which could

receive an exponential acceleration towards solution if but a fraction of the scientific and engineering research talent now engaged in devising destruction were devoted to them. And without victory in these good wars, these clean wars, wars against all the unjust conditions in which hundreds of millions live this very day, there can be no real security anywhere. Because we in UNDP work every day throughout the developing world at the volatile interstices of internal development and international economic relationships, I appeal to the Assembly to examine particularly the profound significance, the deep meaning of paragraph 398 of the Thorsson report, which states:

“... there exists an array of intensifying non-military factors aggravating the security problems of States in the form of (a) a widespread reduction in prospects for economic growth, (b) impending physical constraints—notably in the field of energy and selected non-renewable raw materials but also severe stress on the environment and a growing world population—and (c) the morally unacceptable and politically hazardous polarization of wealth and poverty and insufficient development in the developing countries.”

192. The North-South dimension is crucial to real, true security, if only because of the critical mass of hundreds of millions who refuse to continue to exist on the margin of survival. All the investment put into the deployment of nuclear missiles across the northern hemisphere will not solve this ultimate problem of the real security of this planet.

193. We have to make a leap of understanding, a conscious effort, to transcend an inherited historical perspective in which everything perceived as important in the affairs of something called the world happened within, and by negotiation or war between, the nation-States of the northern hemisphere. Perhaps the most important message to be drawn from the Thorsson report is that we had better realize how this archaic perception has corrupted our thinking. We must look again at the relevance of armaments expenditures—for arms will be useless in meeting the anger and frustration of two thirds of humanity over the conditions in which they are forced to live.

194. The Governments of the world are represented in this Hall as the unprecedented advance over the scattered interplay between nations at war or peace that was achieved through the Charter of the United Nations. No decision affecting the welfare or well-being of humanity is remote from this place. All nations, North, South, East and West, have sought to be represented in this institution in spite of its deficiencies.

195. When you the representatives to this special session gather to deliberate on so momentous an issue as disarmament, you do so as the organized repository of human aspirations and human fears. You have it within your competence and your power to guide the destiny of our planet and our species.

196. No one can say to the children, “We were not there”. No one can say to the children, “We did not have a voice”. No one can say to the children, “We did not know; we did not understand”.

197. The facts are before you. The stark contrast between the military wars no one will win and the good wars which everyone can win has been exposed in this Hall. The proposition that there is no attainable security for any nation, rich or poor, through the acquisition of arms, and that there is no realizable security while a faltering economic system and unacceptable and unjust social disparity exist among nations has been laid before you. It is unchallengeable.

198. Let us therefore make a declaration of the good war. Let us mobilize our forces for that battle, for victory in the good war will require all the skills of strategic and tactical planning, all the co-ordination and the assembly of all the right human and material resources. The difference is that in the war against want, we shall enrich life, not destroy it. Our goal

will be the attainment of a better life for all people, not the acquisition of the power to annihilate them.

199. We must begin the process that will divert funds now invested in mass destructive power into funds to advance mass creative power. There will be no greater victory in the annals of our species.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 21, No. 324 (a), p. 93.

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