



President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: This morning the Assembly will hear a statement by the Vice-President of the State Council and of the Government of the Republic of Cuba, Mr. Carlos Rafael Rodríguez. I have great pleasure in welcoming him and inviting him to address the General Assembly.

2. Mr. RODRÍGUEZ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is with mixed feelings of anger and melancholy that we address the Assembly today. While this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was being opened, while there was talk at the United Nations of peace and arms reduction, a brutal and criminal war was being imposed on two peoples. Those peoples have had to face the enormous military superiority of the attacking forces of colonialism and aggression, which in both cases had the United States as an efficient ally and supplier of scientific technology.

3. The Malvinas and Lebanon scenarios serve as a dramatic backdrop to the aspirations to peace that brought about this special session of the General Assembly.

4. Four years ago we met with a certain restrained hope in the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That hope had arisen because after long years of proposals and persistence, which met with the stubborn rejection of some, it had become possible to place disarmament, and hence peace, at the core of our international concerns. The position assumed by the non-aligned movement—to which Cuba is honoured to belong—since its inception in 1961 and unswervingly maintained thereafter contributed in no small measure to that end.

5. At the same time, what we then termed “limited but perceptible progress” in the strategic arms limitation talks had taken place. The leaders of the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany, Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev and Helmut Schmidt, in their joint statements advocated demands for “concrete measures to halt the arms race... with the purpose of achieving general and complete disarmament under effective international control”.

6. Thus, encouraging signs emerged in the midst of an international situation fraught with tensions. Our hopes, however, were tempered by the bitter certainty that there were dangerous tendencies in international

politics, particularly in the United States, to favour confrontation over détente, to seek security not through negotiation, the end of threats and gradual arms reductions, but rather through a possible military superiority—the root of more serious and insurmountable contradictions.

7. The 1978 special session devoted to disarmament made it possible to confirm that the world wants peace. Not only did many heads of State and representatives of developing countries say here at that time that there was no alternative to peace and that peace and development were the fundamental issues of our time, but the representatives of the major Powers used the wise language of understanding and the search for solutions.

8. At that time we heard here a coherent and relevant speech by Comrade Andrei Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, and analytical and sober words from Chancellor Schmidt and also, it must be admitted, from the then President of France, Giscard d'Estaing.

9. Although insufficient, the decisions of that special session opened a path, and the international community believed it had made a contribution to disarmament, thus taking a step toward peace.

10. Nevertheless, the fears that tempered our hopes were unfortunately all too soon confirmed. The Vice-President of the United States had delivered a speech in the General Assembly [*2nd meeting*] whose aggressiveness clashed with the language of peace and understanding that prevailed in the Assembly. And, at the same time as the international community was proclaiming the need for disarmament and for gradual arms reduction, the United States, at a meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] in Washington, just a few miles from our own Headquarters, forced the member countries of that bellicose organization to increase their military budgets by 3 per cent.

11. Since then, the international atmosphere has steadily deteriorated. The agreements of the General Assembly on disarmament were cast aside as so many useless papers.

12. We certainly did not imagine, however, that those difficult days of 1978, 1979 and 1980 were soon to appear idyllic and full of possibilities of peace compared with the international situation that has prevailed since the moment the present Administration took office in the United States. The limited though promising dialogue that then existed was replaced by a violent and stubborn decision not to negotiate. The rate of arms buildup, which already worried the Assembly in 1978, was multiplied by the present Administration. The United States military budget, which was \$105 billion when we met in 1978, has now, at the

time of our 1982 meeting, more than doubled; and within four years, according to the plans already announced, it will almost double again, making it four times that of 1978.

13. A so-called programme for the “modernization of strategic forces” was launched at a cost of more than \$180 billion, at the same time as the Secretary of State, Mr. Alexander Haig, announced the demise of the SALT II agreements, which were regarded by many as a limited but necessary and meaningful step towards the future reduction of nuclear arms.

14. The ominous neutron bomb has once again been revalidated under the pretext of its effectiveness and in spite of its intrinsically repulsive significance. In what was a spontaneous expression of his intimate thoughts rather than a slip of the tongue, President Reagan acknowledged as “natural” the possibility of a nuclear war limited to the European theatre.

15. This entire trend, which day by day takes us further away from the possibilities of negotiated agreements and gradual arms reduction and plunges us into a dangerous and frenzied armaments buildup leading to confrontation, becomes all the more senseless when it is based on two premises that escape all rational analysis: first, that the United States will negotiate only from a position of military superiority, which it therefore seeks and demands; and, secondly, that all the developments of our time are conditioned by the contradictions—regarded as insuperable—between East and West.

16. The proclamation of military superiority inevitably provokes an arms buildup. This is why Leonid Brezhnev and Helmut Schmidt were right when they declared in their conversations on the eve of the first special session devoted to disarmament, four years ago, that no one should strive for such military superiority and clearly stated “approximate balance and parity are sufficient to ensure defence”.

17. To mankind—which we should regard as the main protagonist in this Assembly—it does not much matter which of the great Powers has a greater number of nuclear warheads at present, or which has incidental superiority in numbers of missiles or the type and number of strategic bombers. All of this must be discussed seriously and responsibly. But mankind is aware that there are over 60,000 nuclear weapons in the world and the equivalent of 4 tons of explosives for each person; that the nuclear arsenals have a capability that is one million times greater than that of the bombs that killed 300,000 people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. To the numbers of nuclear weapons is linked the qualitative element which entails the replacement of men by electronic devices and makes it inevitable that political decisions—which should be adopted calmly in order not to provoke a nuclear catastrophe—are subject to an element of uncertainty and surprise, thus bringing us constantly to the brink of an irreparable accident. When we realize that the Pershing missiles which the United States is trying to deploy in Europe would take only six minutes from launching to the destruction of vital points in the Soviet Union, it is easier to understand why the prevailing “launch on warning” doctrine keeps us on the verge of such a disaster.

18. It is reported in specialized publications that in recent years there have been nuclear accidents at the rate of one every three months, most of them registered in the United States. This has made it possible for the American press to affirm that technical development has caused the risk of nuclear accident to go “from possible to probable”.

19. The demand for real steps towards arms reduction does not mean hampering the defence capability of any country or favouring any political or social ideology. No one is attempting to hide the fact that the socialist and capitalist systems are intrinsically contradictory, and that they advocate different and opposed solutions to the social and political problems of our times, but to turn this ideological contradiction into an inevitable military confrontation, to interpret the struggle born of the aspirations to social justice as a mere instrument of great-Power policy, to attempt to record each political and social development anywhere on earth as a mere episode in a magnified battle between East and West, is to ignore the course of history.

20. It is a pity that Mr. Reagan forgets his position as President of one of the Powers that today decide the course the world will take and clings to the criteria of a past that seemed to be dead and buried. His thesis, which attempts to reduce everything to the East-West contradiction, cannot hold up, for no one will convince the Salvadorian peasants who take up arms, made desperate by long decades of poverty, oppression and humiliation and spurred on by hunger and maltreatment, that their struggle, begun 52 years ago with a popular uprising in which over 23,000 men and women died, is a consequence of the emergence some hundreds of miles from El Salvador of a socialist Cuba, that is manipulating them at the behest of the Soviet Union, which would be acting at a distance of 8,000 miles from the Salvadorian scene.

21. Can the tragic episode of the Malvinas possibly be explained as stemming from the rivalry between Powers? On the contrary, its origin must be found in that philosophy of plunder that President Fidel Castro denounced here in the United Nations over 20 years ago. In the seemingly distant days of the cold war the peoples of Latin America were forced to accept the role of camp followers in the East-West confrontation. The so-called Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of 1947¹ was organized to save America, it was alleged, from the sinister threat of communism fostered by the Soviet Union. This Treaty was made to give the appearance of a defence against any extracontinental threat. And now, to the bitter surprise of Argentina and the rest of the Latin American countries, when an extracontinental Power refuses to realize that colonialism is outdated in our time and attempts to recover by force what it is not entitled to by right, the United States—which was the pivot, promoter and orchestrator of this defence Treaty—turns its back on its continental duties and, in the name of its alliance within NATO, helps Great Britain to carry out its obstinate colonialist decision to crush the resistance of the Argentines struggling for their dignity and their land.

22. But this philosophy of plunder is not found only in the remote Antarctic lands of the Malvinas. The strategic alliance between Washington and Israel

has allowed the aggressors in the Middle East to carry out their unspeakable invasion of Lebanon, in an attempt to destroy the authentic representatives of the Palestinian people, the heroic fighters of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the thousands of women and children accompanying them in a heroic resistance that has universal sympathy. It is nothing but a mockery that the rulers in Washington, who have armed and abetted Israel, now dare—after allowing Palestinian and Lebanese people to be massacred with impunity for several days—to assume the role of false appeasers of an aggression of which they are also guilty.

23. The Indian Ocean, which the coastal States of the area wanted to make a zone of peace, is studded with warships, and new military bases are emerging that add to the insult of Diego Garcia. In Africa, the South African racists—condemned by the international community in this United Nations setting—are receiving new support from their United States allies and feel free to attack Angola, Mozambique or Zambia and to negotiate a transition to neocolonialism in Namibia. In Central America and the Caribbean, Cuba, Nicaragua and Grenada are threatened; there is intervention in El Salvador; and intimidating naval manoeuvres are taking place.

24. That is why the developing countries, most of which have chosen the path of non-alignment, have an additional interest in peace and disarmament.

25. For we must recall that the arms buildup, in addition to being fraught with tragic dangers, also diverts from the world economy a torrent of material and financial resources that are used in unproductive and sinister ways, while the desperate situation of hundreds of millions of human beings demands that they be invested instead in development.

26. Never has the vulnerability of military equipment been so clearly evident as in the war in the Malvinas. Equipment costing billions is lost in the ocean in a matter of minutes after being fired on, dragging human lives in their wake and rendering precious resources useless. The mitigation of crises through military production has become a comprehensive economic thesis for the military-industrial complex. But, as we pointed out four years ago at the first special session devoted to disarmament, one forgets that if those resources were allocated to development not only would hunger and disease among hundreds of millions of human beings be eradicated but the promotion of development derived therefrom would decisively contribute to balancing the international economy, thus achieving an anticyclical effect that cannot be brought about by military production.

27. In his statements before the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, the Ministerial Conference of the Group of 77 and other forums, Fidel Castro has explained, with irrefutable comparisons, how the more than \$520 billion spent each year in unproductive military budgets could be used to fight epidemics, build schools and hospitals, fertilize lands and train professionals and scientists.

28. This means, then, choosing between nuclear annihilation and the survival of a world which will have to be—must be—very different from our own:

a world without poverty or backwardness, free from terror, genocide and oppression. The peace to which we aspire is something more than the mere absence of world war. It is peace not only for the economically and militarily powerful but also for the small, the weak and the disinherited. Moving towards disarmament and achieving that peace will be the first step towards that world that we have set as a distant goal.

29. That is why this quest for peace which binds all peoples is a task for all States and Governments and must be the work of the international community as a whole.

30. The vocation and determination for peace of the medium-sized and small countries is evident. It is expressed in the repeated decisions of the non-aligned movement and can be noted day by day in the words of its representatives.

31. We are all convinced that this presence of ours in the peace efforts is necessary but that it is not sufficient. The resources for war and the stockpiles of conventional and nuclear weapons which could bring about a conflict of global dimensions are concentrated today in a number of Powers, particularly in two of them: the Soviet Union and the United States. With both of them lies the essential responsibility. To them go the fervent desires and appeals of all peoples.

32. We should like to be able to say here that both Governments are acting in accordance with their responsibilities, but fairness and decency prevent us from doing so.

33. We have already emphasized that the positions and the activities of the United States Government not only have provoked and accelerated the arms race but also foment dangerous focal points of war. On the other hand, even irreconcilable enemies of the Soviet Union have had to stop and consider the sensible and realistic proposals of Leonid Brezhnev, who, rejecting the concept of military superiority of one country over another and of one group of States over another, has proposed "seeking mutually acceptable magnitudes" on the basis of "parity and equal security" and has actually suspended the installation of medium-range missiles in Europe and proceeded unilaterally to decrease their number as well. The Soviet Union is one of the many countries that defend the maintenance of SALT II. We hail here the message of Leonid Brezhnev communicated here yesterday [*12th meeting*] that the Soviet Union commits itself, in a unilateral and immediate way, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

34. For many months these offers were ignored by the United States. The intention was not to hold any talks until it put into motion the process of weapons expansion and modernization it deemed necessary to achieve the position of military superiority from which it would talk. All the influence of its mass media was concentrated on sowing the idea that the Soviet Union had tilted in its favour the required military and nuclear parity. But neither the deft manipulation of statistics nor the sensational display of supposedly secret information allowed the leaders of the United States to escape the judgement and pressure of international public opinion or even of its own public

opinion. Members of Congress, social activists, scientists, cardinals and simple priests, union leaders and feminists began joining their voices in protest to condemn the dangerous idea of Reagan and his associates that they should arm first in order to negotiate later. No propaganda trick can substitute for truth. The United States citizens knew the facts and recognized, in addition, that they would be made to pay socially and financially for the policies that endangered their lives.

35. In the face of the persistence in accusing the Soviet Union of being guilty of fostering nuclear imbalance, George Kennan, a prominent United States politician who for decades has been in the very centre of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, recalled with all the weight of his authority that

“It has been we Americans who at almost every step of the road have taken the lead in the development of this sort of weaponry. It was we who first produced and tested them; we who were the first to raise its destructiveness to new levels with the hydrogen bomb; we who introduced multiple warheads; we who have declined every proposal to establish the principle of refusing to be the first to use them; and we alone, God help us, who have used the weapons in anger against others, and against tens of thousands of helpless non-combatants at that.”

36. It could be said that all our arguments belong to the past and that we run the risk of turning, like the character in the Bible, into pillars of salt because we look backwards, since President Reagan has repeatedly stated in recent weeks his willingness to negotiate and has fixed dates for the beginning of Soviet-American discussions and for his very necessary meeting with the highest Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev.

37. But in a forum such as this, where reflection must prevail over passion, we must ask ourselves this question: does Mr. Reagan's offer constitute a serious step, or is it only a propaganda manoeuvre, a temporary concession to public opinion in the United States and throughout the world? The first would make us very happy, for a serious step, even though it be only a first step, would indicate a possible route. But the facts lead us to think that so far this is just a rhetorical retreat under enormous pressure from within and from outside the United States.

38. If the United States Government took a sensible attitude to negotiations, it would begin by accepting the proposed nuclear freeze, which in itself, because of its content and its meaning, would bring peace of mind to all the peoples clamouring for it. It would give satisfaction too to the 72 per cent of United States citizens who, according to the polls, have said that they are in favour of such a freeze.

39. We should like to be wrong in doubting the honesty of this intent to start negotiations, but it worries us to see a President of the United States possessed of such primitive ideological hatred as that reflected in Mr. Reagan's words before the British Parliament.

40. Furthermore, we are disheartened by the circumstance—which could be accidental but which

would not then be less significant—that on the two occasions when the General Assembly has met on disarmament the leaders of NATO, for their part, have called special meetings in which they have reaffirmed their decision to increase armaments. What happened at Bonn a few days ago shows that the reservations of certain European members of NATO with regard to United States aggressiveness are not sufficient to deflect that Organization from its armaments course.

41. Cuba strongly, and at the same time with all modesty, advocates immediate negotiations. Those negotiations should give no advantage to either side. They should lead to the “approximate balance” to which Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Schmidt referred. To achieve that, advantage must be taken of everything already negotiated in SALT II, and the prohibition of all types of new weapons must be assured.

42. The creation of the “rapid deployment forces” has been directed principally against the developing countries, and those countries would see in the disappearance of those forces the first sign that the United States was renouncing the role of international policeman of imperialism which it has arrogated to itself and which the peoples fear and reject.

43. Listening to our words, some might ask if this is Cuba speaking in the General Assembly against the instigators of the arms race, calling for the reduction of weapons and advocating the path of negotiations; if this is the same country about which it has been said that in 1981 it received quantities of weapons that neither the importance of the country nor the size of its territory could justify. Let us explain.

44. Yes, in the past few months Cuba has received what many might term huge quantities of modern, sophisticated weapons. That fact certainly contrasts with our words and, above all, with the decision taken by Fidel Castro and his revolutionary comrades when, at the time of the victory in 1959, they closed military camps and turned garrisons into schools. Why have we strengthened our military capability, almost doubling it in one year? Why have we now added to the strength of our modern and efficient armed forces, whose quality is internationally respected, over half a million men and women, who, unable to join our regular or reserve troops, now form part of the troops of the territorial militia?

45. It is a question of a defensive activity that cannot be postponed.

46. In this regard Fidel Castro, the President of Cuba, in his well-known letter to Mr. López Portillo, the President of Mexico, said:

“Cuba's need to maintain adequate means of defence, which entails harsh economic sacrifices for us, can be clearly explained to Latin American and world public opinion in the light of the aggression against Cuba carried out since 1959 by the successive Administrations of the United States of America. In pursuing this policy of antagonism, which is as unequal as it is unjust, the Reagan Administration is determined to be the most aggressive. The tone of its threats rises daily, while the campaign of lies and slander against our country reaches unprecedented heights, and its foremost officials persist in refusing to rule out military attack

as one of the options which they claim, illegally and without the slightest respect for international law, to have available to "punish" Cuba and destroy it, if that were possible, because of its irreversible decision to be independent. Thus, it is the legitimate, sacred and undeniable right of self-defence which has led the Cuban people to organize and prepare themselves militarily in a massive way."

47. The experience of the Malvinas and Lebanon shows that criticism of smaller countries for contributing to the arms race by their purchase of weapons is not always right. To arm oneself in order to attack one's neighbours is reprehensible; to arm oneself in order to exercise the "legitimate, sacred and undeniable right of self-defence" spoken of by Fidel Castro is necessary in the face of the philosophy of plunder.

48. But, as President Castro said in that same letter to President López Portillo, the fact that Cuba is arming itself to defend itself is no contradiction of its aspiration to peace. He went on:

"Cuba has repeatedly expressed its desire for peace. No people of our America need fear Cuban weapons, for they will never be used for fratricidal aggression... We are prepared to offer the fullest guarantees to all in this respect."

49. We said at the beginning that we were speaking with mixed feelings of anger and melancholy. We would be deceiving ourselves as well as this audience if we did not confess that. Nothing in the course of this special session devoted to disarmament—certainly after hearing certain speeches made here—allows us to expect that the peace we need and that the world demands could result from our deliberations, which seem destined to be fruitless.

50. However, this does not mean that our faith in the cause of peace has to weaken. Those of us who come together at this Assembly with a genuine desire to promote negotiation and achieve détente have good reason for a historic optimism. In all parts of the world a common cry is now beginning to rise, saying "No" to the arms race, "No" to nuclear deployment, "No" to the nefarious invention of new weapons of mass destruction and calling for clear, honest and realistic negotiations requiring, as a first step, a freeze on nuclear weapons.

51. The great universal wave that helped stop the holocaust in Viet Nam is now reappearing with even greater impetus. The hundreds of thousands of demonstrators in Bonn and West Berlin who marched in defence of peace and disarmament during the visit by the President of the United States were expressing their hatred not for a man, and much less for a country, but for all that stands for fostering the spirit of war and ignoring what is needed to halt the course towards catastrophe.

52. Our conviction that peace can be preserved is affirmed by our having been able to witness last Saturday the largest public demonstration in the entire history of the United States. Almost a million citizens paraded along the streets of New York to rally in Central Park. They represented, as has been said, all strata of American society. There were children and elderly persons. We saw whites, blacks and Indians, Puerto Ricans and Chicanos together,

scientists, artists, workers and even soldiers, men and women from all parts of the United States and even beyond, from the most remote regions of Asia and Africa.

53. But it was above all the young people who laid their own imprint on that impressive demonstration, young people who proclaimed their right to live, young people who refused to be plunged day after day in the despair of being unable to fulfil their aspirations, by the fear that a simple order to fire the first shot or, even worse, a technical error, might condemn them to die consumed by nuclear fire. We bear a responsibility towards those young people.

54. Mankind must be able to go on living. It is not possible that everything that man has created since the early days of the first cultures that left their marks, that the monuments that tell us of the splendor of Assyria and Babylon, Greece and Rome, that the fruits of science and technical expertise that have succeeded in taking man into the cosmos and in revealing the mysteries of the single cell, opening up for us such infinite prospects, should remain at the mercy of a maniacal obsession with predominance, of a stubborn ideological position.

55. Just a few days ago, the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries ended at Havana. This movement today represents the will of the majority of human beings. It comprises 97 countries, where almost 2 billion men and women live. The Bureau, with the unanimous approval of its members, decided to call upon the General Assembly to support its disarmament objectives and to adopt concrete measures for the resumption of dialogue and the restoration of the process of détente. The Bureau's voice is a powerful one, and it constitutes a symbol of hope that the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General, both representatives of third world countries members of the movement, are guiding the work of this special session and that you, Comrade Kittani, one of the most distinguished figures of the movement of non-aligned countries, have the responsibility of presiding over it and are receiving this firm appeal from the non-aligned nations to the international community.

56. Over and above this powerful manifestation by the States and their Governments, however, there is a stronger and more decisive force. Peace is now in the hands of the peoples. It matters not that in this very Assembly one hears the voice of those who refuse to accept the nuclear freeze and that those who refuse to stop atomic testing bring the glare of atomic explosions even into this Hall. It does not matter. It is we, and not they, who are right. The peoples of the world need food, schools, medicines, hospitals, factories, and not tanks, battleships and nuclear arsenals. Let us then join all peoples in condemning those harbingers of death, the same ones who for centuries have taken advantage of the peoples' misery. If we persist, it will be possible to impose upon them the decisions that today remain ineffectual and mere useless papers. And persist we must, confident that behind us, awaiting our leadership, throughout the entire world stand hundreds of millions ready to wage this battle for disarmament and for peace.

57. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I thank the Vice-President of the State Council and of the Government of the Republic of Cuba for the important statement he has just made.

58. Mr. CHŇOUPEK (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the important post of President of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I wish you, as well as the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, every possible success in the fulfilment of your difficult and highly responsible mission.

59. For the second time in the history of the Organization, the General Assembly is meeting for the sole purpose of discussing the broad spectrum of disarmament issues. We seek an answer to the most important question of the present time, namely, will mankind proceed along the road of peace, strengthening international security and fruitful co-operation among States, or will it allow unending confrontations to push it to the brink of a thermonuclear abyss?

60. We heard the answer to that question yesterday in this Hall, and together with us, millions of people throughout the world heard it as well. It was contained in the message of the highest Soviet leader, L.I. Brezhnev, to our session, which included the solemn declaration that the Soviet Union assumes, with immediate effect, the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. We attach high value to this newest Soviet initiative as a concrete step along the road to averting a nuclear catastrophe. We are convinced that, if all the other nuclear Powers follow that example, the possibility of the outbreak of a nuclear war will be practically eliminated.

61. The importance of this significant declaration resides above all, in our view, in the fact that it is fully in keeping with the vital interests of all peoples, of all mankind. After all, in the period since the tenth special session alone, the arms race has acquired such a tempo and scope—through no fault of socialism—that no historical parallel can compare. The impetus from the United States military-industrial complex for perfecting the means of mass destruction testifies to ever more twisted logic based on contempt for the lives of hundreds of millions. Is not this danger enhanced by the ever newer concepts of imperialism, expounding the admissibility of the use of nuclear weapons? Do not the technical parameters of the new types of such weapons lead a potential aggressor into the temptation to launch a first strike? Is he not the author of the doctrines of the first strike and a limited nuclear war? Does he not deceive peoples, and in the last analysis himself, by illusions of victory in a nuclear conflict?

62. Such plans can hardly be called defensive. And it is entirely impossible to agree with what we were again told recently—that “military strength is the basic prerequisite of peace”. It is this kind of policy, based on increasing tensions throughout the world and on acquiring unilateral advantages, which reduces the threshold of the outbreak of a nuclear catastrophe, raises even higher the pyramid of wasted billions of dollars and consequently poses a threat to world peace. This policy and nothing else—not some kind of a “threat from the East”—is the true cause of the

deteriorating international situation and of the feverish arms race.

63. Our position on these key issues is totally unequivocal. The President of Czechoslovakia, Gustáv Husák, said recently, “We are convinced that at present there is no task more urgent for mankind than the struggle for the safeguarding of peace and for disarmament”.

64. As a direct participant in practically all multi-lateral disarmament forums, my country sincerely strives for a constructive course of action and fruitful results. There are no talks—not a single item on their agenda—to which we would not take an active approach with a sincere desire for positive results. We are duty bound to this position by our socialist foreign policy, which strictly respects and consistently implements the Leninist principles of peaceful co-existence.

65. Such was our position also in the preparation of this special session. While we were working for an objective assessment of the implementation of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session [*resolution S-10/2*], including its principles and priorities, it was our aim that this session should result in concrete recommendations and decisions for the all-round activation of all disarmament negotiations. As co-ordinator of the group of socialist countries in the Committee on Disarmament, Czechoslovakia contributed effectively to the elaboration of a realistic draft of the comprehensive programme of disarmament, which should not end with its adoption and the allocation of a registration number in the United Nations archives.

66. Such efforts are precisely in keeping with the most vital interests of all peoples of the world. It is only natural that they are turning to this session, as was eloquently demonstrated by the spontaneous actions of advocates of peace and disarmament.

67. Let us therefore pay heed to the requirements of the day and move on to concrete deeds. Let us be guided by the principle: the fewest possible general proclamations, solemn promises, bombastic statements; and the largest possible number of concrete measures that will actually lead to the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, to peace, to disarmament. A programme of such measures already exists: it is the large set of peace and disarmament proposals and initiatives of the socialist countries, which is based on the Soviet Peace Programme for the 1980s and which is constantly being developed and expanded. At the same time, we are ready, as we have repeatedly stated, to consider constructively any reasonable and realistic proposal for the limitation, reduction or prohibition of any type of weapon on an equitable basis.

68. We take encouragement from the fact that, despite the deteriorating international situation, the efforts to halt the arms race are not abating. On the contrary, a new interest has emerged in issues which heretofore were not discussed. We value the activity of the non-aligned countries and other States. We also appreciate the positions of those Western representatives who, basing themselves in many respects on political realism, believe that not confrontation but only negotiations and agreements on how to rid man-

kind of the burden of armaments can lead the world out of the impasse.

69. We must not forget the oath taken by the peoples on 9 May 1945 that they will do everything in their power for ever to prevent another war. This timeless appeal was inscribed on the banner of our most universal international organization at its birth. Let us therefore make use of all its prestige in systematic and active endeavours with one common denominator—the irrefutable certainty that there can be no winners in a third world war, and that the fourth one, as Albert Einstein, once a professor at Prague University, once tellingly remarked, would be waged with stone axes.

70. Let us therefore denounce the inhuman doctrines of the first, or preventive, nuclear strike as the gravest crime against humanity. Let us with all responsibility support yesterday's appeal by Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to the States Members of the United Nations to consider most attentively and support the set of proposals for the strengthening of peace contained in the Soviet Union's memorandum entitled "Averting the growing nuclear threat and curbing the arms race" [A/S-12/AC.1/11 and Corr.1, annex]. Let us comply with both the spirit and the letter of the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe [resolution 36/100] proposed by the Soviet Union and supported by the entire authority of the General Assembly. Let us condemn indifferent or even negative attitudes to its principles. Let us revive a fruitful dialogue and further develop the policy of détente. Let us prove that delegates at conference tables can outdo the manufacturers of weapons.

71. As for us, Czechoslovakia, a country where the historical tangle of territorial, economic and political interests of the whole of Europe in the past was always resolved by devastating wars and where the Second World War had both its prologue and its epilogue, we have literally the most vital interest in living in peace in a world free of weapons—all the more so since today we are located at the very epicenter of the largest military concentration in the world.

72. It is our intention conscientiously to take part in the implementation of every proposal or set of measures on disarmament based on the principle of equality and equal security. What is needed, however, is for all States to take an active and constructive part in disarmament negotiations, co-operate honestly with other States, display political will to search for mutually acceptable solutions and make a concrete and adequate contribution to their attainment. They should refrain, on the other hand, from creating artificial obstacles to such negotiations.

73. Those are some of the principles embodied in the Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament [resolution 34/88], adopted on our initiative at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly and reaffirmed at the thirty-sixth session [resolution 36/92 D]. Its importance and timeliness stand out especially against the background of the current situation. That is why we believe that it should be reflected in the final document of this session. To that end we submitted in the Preparatory Committee a paper entitled "Principal objectives of international co-operation for speedier practical progress

of disarmament negotiations" [A/AC.206/11/Rev.1, annex].

74. Czechoslovakia, on whose territory not a single nuclear weapon is stationed, together with other socialist countries, actively participates in efforts for the speedy erection of a barrier to as many channels of the nuclear-arms race as possible. At present this applies in particular to the elimination of any further increase in the danger of a nuclear confrontation in Europe. However, the decision taken in December 1979 by NATO to manufacture and deploy new American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe runs counter to these efforts. Also, the most recent summit meeting, at Bonn, showed that NATO's primary goal is to achieve military superiority and to destroy the approximate parity of forces that, at a certain point in time, became one of the real bases for the process of détente.

75. The risks for Czechoslovakia arising from such a step by the West are particularly ominous. After all, the time it would take these most destructive weapons launched from the territory of a neighbouring State to reach Czechoslovakia's space would be measured in mere dozens of seconds. We resolutely oppose the idea of any war being waged, at the expense of the Europeans and in favour of foreign interests, in which our continent, along with others, would be consumed in a nuclear apocalypse. We therefore welcome a moratorium and the already initiated considerable, unilateral reduction in the number of medium-range missiles by the Soviet Union. We see in this a clear peace-loving gesture and proof of the Soviet Union's goodwill which deserves to be imitated and which should not remain without a response at the Geneva talks now under way. We are also in favour of a "zero solution"—but not as an optical illusion in which the Soviet Union would liquidate its medium-range missiles while the United States would merely renounce the deployment of new ones, fully preserving the entire existing NATO arsenal of nuclear missiles.

76. Of decisive importance for the reduction of the threat of war is the halting of any further quantitative and qualitative growth in strategic arsenals. We therefore welcome the agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to open official talks at Geneva on 29 June on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms. We are in favour of preserving all the positive gains already made in this field. The adoption of the Soviet proposal for a freeze on the levels of strategic arms of both sides and for the maximum limitation of their modernization as soon as the talks get under way would, in our view, in itself represent a significant step. At the same time, it would undeniably contribute to the success of those talks and lay the ground for a radical limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear weapons in all their aspects.

77. We welcome the concrete proposal by the highest Soviet leader, L. I. Brezhnev, for holding a well-prepared Soviet-American summit meeting this coming autumn. This is one more convincing piece of evidence of a sincere endeavour to solve important international problems by the tested method of constructive political dialogue.

78. We advocate reaching an agreement on halting the production of all types of nuclear weapons and on the stage-by-stage reduction of stockpiles of them until they are completely eliminated. We fully agree with the view that as one of the first stages it would be appropriate to settle such questions as the halting of the production of fissionable materials for the manufacture of various types of nuclear weapons. With the same purposefulness, we should strive to halt the development of new types of nuclear systems. In that regard vigorous efforts are needed for the prohibition of the barbarous neutron weapon.

79. An effective measure for curbing the nuclear-arms race would, in our view, be a general and comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. At the same time, we support all steps that are aimed at strengthening the system of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, strengthening the security of non-nuclear States against the use of such weapons, the non-stationing of nuclear arms on the territory of States where such weapons are not yet stationed and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world, especially in Europe.

80. We are seriously concerned by the delays in the talks on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons. We condemn the malicious propaganda campaign about the alleged use of these weapons by one or another of the socialist countries. This is nothing but a farce, considering that even today, after more than 10 years, vast areas and considerable numbers of inhabitants of Indo-China are still cruelly marked by the use of American chemical weapons. Can it be that those who possessed such weapons at that time have now been able to obtain an even more sophisticated type, the binary chemical weapon? It is precisely these horrors of yesterday and a realistic idea of the limitless risks for tomorrow that make it today a categorical imperative to conclude as soon as possible a treaty on the prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling of all types of chemical weapons and on their destruction, as provided for in the constructive and concrete draft convention submitted at the 12th meeting by the Soviet Union [see *A/S-12/AC.1/12 and Corr.1, annex*].

81. We are unequivocally in favour of reaching a similar agreement on all new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, in particular radiological ones. After all, it is much easier to prohibit what has not yet emerged from the laboratories than something that has already been included in the arsenals of States and become a constituent element in the weaponry of their armies.

82. As a peace-loving country, one of whose citizens has taken part in a space flight, we are firmly in favour of the earliest possible preparation and conclusion of an international agreement prohibiting the emplacement of any kind of weapon in outer space.

83. There remains another major problem, that of conventional weapons. We believe that the solution of this problem is urgently necessary and admits of no delay. That was why we took an active part in the preparation of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.²

84. One of the most important areas of disarmament efforts is in our view the halting of the feverish increase of arms on a regional basis. In this context, in February of this year, at the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, we submitted, together with our allies, a compromise draft of a universal and balanced agreement on the first stage of such a reduction. Unfortunately, in spite of signs of readiness to begin a dialogue, reactions from the West have so far been held up by the absence of any sincere interest in bringing about a just agreement. Nevertheless it is our belief that we have by no means exhausted all the possibilities of at last breaking the deadlock in the Vienna negotiations, and that consequently the level of concentration of armed forces and armaments at the very centre of our continent of Europe can be lowered, to our mutual advantage, without disrupting the balance of forces in that area.

85. We also attach great importance to the holding of a conference on strengthening confidence and security and disarmament in Europe, a decision on which should be taken at the Madrid meeting of representatives of States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Such a conference would be the first all-European meeting of its kind and would make a major contribution to the preservation and strengthening of the Helsinki spirit.

86. It is our firm view that the situation in Europe can in no way benefit from other States being drawn into the NATO military bloc or from the extension of NATO's sphere of activities to further geographical regions.

87. We most vigorously condemn the massive military invasion of Lebanon by Israel, the purpose of which, as we stated on 8 June, is to deal a crushing blow to the Palestine resistance movement and the patriotic forces of Lebanon. It is quite clear that the Government of Israel would never have ventured to undertake such an aggressive act without the consent and encouragement of the forces of world imperialism, headed by the United States of America.

88. We reaffirm our solidarity with and support for the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, and we demand that Israel immediately cease its aggression and withdraw its troops from Lebanon.

89. A serious threat to peace and international security is presented by the demonstrations of force in Latin America, be they the military exercises by the United States around Cuba, threats aimed at the people of Nicaragua, support for the dictatorial régime in El Salvador or even the use of crude military force in the South Atlantic in the spirit of colonialist pretensions.

90. We believe a positive contribution to the improvement of the international situation would be made by the limitation and reduction of the level of military activity in the world's oceans and the extension of confidence-building measures to the seas and the oceans. We condemn the obstructive behaviour of the Western Powers as a result of which the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean is being delayed.

91. We whole-heartedly support the proposals of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries concerning

political and international legal guarantees of the security of States, including proposals for the adoption of measures of this kind in the regions of the Persian Gulf, the Mediterranean, the Far East and South-East Asia.

92. We value very highly the participation of the broad masses of the people and many non-governmental organizations in the struggle for peace and against the danger of war and the arms race. We are convinced that a contribution to their efforts will be made by the world congress of the forces of peace to be held at Prague, Czechoslovakia, in 1983. We warmly support the proclamation of the World Disarmament Campaign.

93. I should like to assure the Assembly that Czechoslovakia is ready to do everything in its power to ensure that the work at this session is successful and that it provides a further powerful impetus to all the negotiations on disarmament issues being conducted in various forums and at various levels. We want to see it promote the development of fruitful dialogue and co-operation among States and, last but not least, facilitate the convening of a world disarmament conference.

94. These are undeniably complicated and daunting tasks, but our responsibility in carrying out the mandate entrusted to us by the peoples of the world and which is solemnly inscribed in the Charter is also great—namely, to do everything possible to save present and future generations from the scourge of war.

95. Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, we wish to associate ourselves with those speakers who have sincerely congratulated you on your election to the high post of President of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We share the hope that your rich experience in the work of the United Nations will lead to a successful conclusion of the work of this important forum.

96. Our delegation wishes Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar success in his important and responsible activities as Secretary-General of the United Nations.

97. The twelfth special session of the General Assembly represents in its way a response to the growing anxiety of the world community about the present aggravation of the international situation. The situation is indeed tense. The main danger lies in the increasing threat of nuclear war—the threat to the very existence of mankind and its civilization. The Mongolian delegation therefore considers the mandate of this session to consist in the elaboration of specific measures to safeguard the right of peoples to a peaceful and creative life and social progress. This great responsibility requires on the part of all States the demonstration of political will and the readiness to conduct constructive negotiations based on reason and realism.

98. The most aggressive circles of imperialism and hegemonism have set themselves the adventurist goal of obstructing progressive world development. They have pronounced an anathema against the policy of détente and peaceful coexistence and are attempting to unleash a frenzied offensive against existing socialism and the forces of national and social liberation.

99. This was most recently manifested by the outcome of the meeting of the leaders of States members of NATO held at Bonn. The declaration adopted at this meeting is imbued with the cold war spirit and is replete with distortions of the peace-loving policy of the socialist States and with fabrications concerning the non-existent threat on the part of the socialist community.

100. The United States and other imperialist and reactionary circles are intensifying their policy of blatant military interference in the internal affairs of the developing countries, increasing their political pressure and carrying out insidious designs in order to exhaust economically those countries which are not to their liking.

101. The forces of reaction and war are seeking to upset the existing strategic equilibrium and to gain military superiority over the socialist world. In the United States, the militarization of foreign policy is being accelerated, and the use of force in international relations is being turned into a fetish.

102. To this end, the militaristic circles of the leading NATO Powers, primarily the United States, are unleashing an unprecedented arms race and creating new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. The American Administration has adopted a so-called comprehensive programme of rearmament, envisaging the development, production and deployment of new first-strike nuclear missiles. The United States is openly formulating concepts of so-called limited and, more recently, so-called protracted, nuclear war.

103. In the struggle against the forces of peace, national independence and social progress, American imperialism is entering into collusion with the hegemonistic forces in Asia, Zionist reaction in the Middle East, the racist régime in South Africa and the anti-popular juntas in Latin America. Characteristically, the Bonn meeting of NATO leaders, under United States pressure, has not dared even to reproach Tel Aviv for its new barbaric aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinian people. The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic and the Mongolian people strongly condemn this act of direct conspiracy and affirm that Israel and its patrons should not be allowed to profit from the fruits of aggression—that is, occupation of the territory of a sovereign State. We express our sympathy and solidarity with the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples.

104. Attention should be drawn here to the highly dangerous nature—dangerous for all—of the United States military and political strategy aimed at ensuring global supremacy for American imperialism. This imperial ambition is impregnated with Yankee chauvinism to such a degree that the United States is disregarding the vital interests of even its closest allies, not to mention other countries. The intention of the United States to turn Western Europe into a theatre of nuclear war and a testing-ground for new types of weapons of mass destruction, such as the neutron weapon, is an example of this.

105. In speaking of the dangerous trends in international life, my delegation has no intention of indulging in pessimism.

106. The world has enough forces able to block the way of those very fond of military adventurism. A

decisive role is played by the countries of the socialist community. The Peace Programme for the 1980s, which embodies the purposeful foreign policy of the socialist community, has a stabilizing influence on the international situation. It should be underlined here that the proposals and initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, put forward in pursuance of this Programme, are in full accordance with the aims and tasks of implementing the basic provisions of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly.

107. The non-aligned and other peace-loving States play an important role in the struggle for peace and against the danger of war. The anti-war movement of peoples, increasingly embracing new strata of population in all corners of the earth, is gaining strength. But there is no place for complacency. The situation calls for a further intensification and combining of the efforts of all peace-loving and sober-minded forces.

108. The Mongolian delegation expresses the hope that the twelfth special session of the General Assembly will give a new impetus to the struggle of the world community to strengthen universal peace and security, halt the arms race and take effective disarmament measures.

109. The most important contribution of the General Assembly should be to adopt measures for removing the danger of nuclear war. In the view of the Mongolian delegation, the primary duty of the present session is to reaffirm the General Assembly Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe, in which the first use of the nuclear weapon is condemned as the gravest crime against humanity. We consider that, in the spirit of this Declaration, the Governments of all nuclear-weapon States should officially declare their renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons, as was done by the Soviet Government in the message of L. I. Brezhnev to the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament [12th meeting]. This unilateral obligation, which became effective on 15 June this year—the day it was made public from the rostrum of the General Assembly—is a vivid manifestation of the consistent efforts of the Soviet Union to help prevent the threat of a nuclear war and to put nuclear disarmament negotiations on a practical basis. This example of historic significance, if followed by other nuclear-weapon Powers, would in fact mean the total prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and thus create favourable conditions for furthering the cause of disarmament.

110. The Mongolian People's Republic has welcomed the announcement of the start of Soviet-American negotiations on limiting and reducing strategic armaments on 29 June this year. We are also following with special attention the negotiations of these countries on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe. The positive steps taken at these negotiations will undoubtedly be of decisive importance in eliminating the danger of nuclear war and could open the way to nuclear disarmament. In particular, such steps could pave the way to the implementation of measures for gradually reducing nuclear-weapon stockpiles and the means of their delivery until they are completely destroyed.

111. My delegation would like to emphasize that for the negotiations to culminate in positive results, they should be conducted honestly and with a genuine desire to reach agreement on the basis of respect for the principle of equality and equal security.

112. The Soviet Union has demonstrated its constructive approach by proposing a moratorium on the quantitative increase and qualitative improvement of these types of weapons simultaneously with the beginning of negotiations on strategic armaments. It has also taken concrete practical steps that could create favourable prerequisites for the success of the negotiations on the reduction of nuclear missiles in Europe. Not only has a unilateral moratorium been declared on the deployment of medium-range missiles in the European part of the territory of the Soviet Union, but also a certain reduction of such missiles in this region is already under way.

113. On the other hand, statements by officials of the American Administration, often accompanied by new actions in the military and strategic field, by no means testify to a constructive approach on the part of Washington to the aforementioned negotiations on these vitally important problems. Such important negotiations should not be used as a means of manoeuvring and misleading public opinion.

114. Our apprehensions have been confirmed, *inter alia*, by United States actions aimed at spreading weapons of mass destruction into outer space. This is in fundamental contradiction to the spirit of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [resolution 2222 (XXI), annex] and provokes a new dangerous round of the arms race.

115. My delegation expects that the present session will take steps aimed at the speedy conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space, the draft of which was proposed by the Soviet Union at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly³. It favours the early commencement of negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament for the prevention of the arms race in outer space. With a view to promoting this aim, Mongolia introduced at the last session of the Committee a working paper containing a draft mandate for the *ad hoc* working group to conduct negotiations.⁴

116. The development and production of ever more appalling types of weapons of mass destruction, such as the neutron, radiological and binary weapons, is further increasing the danger of war. The Mongolian delegation calls upon the permanent members of the Security Council and other militarily significant States to accept the proposal of the Soviet Union and to make similar declarations on the renunciation of the creation of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction at the present session and to submit them to the Security Council for its approval.

117. The problem of banning the production of new types of weapons of mass destruction is closely linked to the achievement of an agreement on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. The Committee on Disarmament should speed up its work in this vitally important area. In view of the continuing nuclear-arms race, strengthening the régime

of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons acquires special importance. My delegation proposes that the Assembly at this session pronounce itself in no uncertain terms in favour of making the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] universal. The Assembly should favour the speedy initiation of negotiations on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons in the territories of those States where there are no such weapons at present.

118. At this session the Assembly should also support efforts aimed at expanding the nuclear-weapon-free zones, including the creation of such zones in those regions where such weapons are already deployed.

119. The problem of eliminating chemical weapons occupies an important place in the context of banning weapons of mass destruction. It is necessary to exert active efforts in the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament in order to complete, as soon as possible, the elaboration of an international convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of their stockpiles. In our view, the draft document entitled "Basic provisions of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction" [*A/S-12/AC.1/12 and Corr.1, annex*], introduced by the Soviet Union at this session, will give a new impetus to these efforts. This document, which constructively reflects views and suggestions of other States, serves as a good basis for reaching an international agreement at an early stage. It is important that States refrain from any action which could impede reaching an agreement in this field and specifically refrain from the production and deployment of binary and other new types of chemical weapons in those States where there are no such weapons at present.

120. The United States, having taken the course of an unprecedented increase in the production of toxic chemical substances, is resorting to various manoeuvres in order to justify its actions which endanger mankind.

121. The representatives of the Pentagon do not even hesitate to spread the most ill-intentioned and false reports about the involvement of the Soviet Union in alleged violations of the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.⁵ The Mongolian delegation emphatically condemns such indecent tactics.

122. The Mongolian People's Republic, as a consistent proponent of general and complete disarmament, also gives due attention to measures pertaining to the reduction of conventional weapons, military budgets and armed forces.

123. My delegation reports with satisfaction that the instrument of ratification by the Presidium of the Great People's Khural of the Mongolian People's Republic of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects² was recently transmitted to the Secretary-General.

124. As to the question of the machinery for disarmament negotiations, my delegation believes that the

effectiveness of any negotiating organ depends, primarily, on the political will of all participants and their readiness to reach concrete results. We are not inclined to exaggerate the organizational side of the question. It should be borne in mind that unjustified organizational experiments can only divert attention from the solution of the main problems of disarmament.

125. In this connexion, my delegation wishes to point out that the participation of all nuclear-weapon States in the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament is a positive factor. Unfortunately, however, owing to the growing obstructiveness of certain members of the Committee, its work of late reveals a tendency to get bogged down in unnecessary discussions of a procedural nature.

126. The Mongolian People's Republic is making consistent efforts aimed at ensuring implementation of the provisions of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly [*resolution S-10/2*] concerning the strengthening of international détente and the creation of an atmosphere of trust among States. The proposal put forward by my Government in 1981 on the conclusion of a convention on mutual non-aggression and the non-use of force in relations among the States of Asia and the Pacific⁶ represents a concrete manifestation of these efforts. This initiative is fully in line with paragraph 26 of the Final Document, which stressed the special importance of refraining from the threat or use of force for the maintenance of international peace.

127. The message of Comrade Y. Tsedenbal, Chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Khural of the Mongolian People's Republic, of 21 September 1981, addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations,⁷ gives a detailed substantiation of the necessity for such a convention and its importance in strengthening peace and security in Asia and throughout the world. There is hardly any need to emphasize that the initiative of Mongolia is closely linked to the question of concluding a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations which is now being worked out in the Special Committee of the General Assembly. Mongolia takes an active part in this important endeavour.

128. Our initiative is prompted, *inter alia* by the troubled state of affairs on the Asian continent, which is incessantly torn by military conflicts and whose different regions are, in addition to all this, openly declared objects of imperialist intervention. The situation is further aggravated by the intensification of the military and political collusion of imperialist, hegemonist and militaristic forces in Asia, which constitutes the main threat to peace and security on that continent. A particularly dangerous tendency is the fact that, with the deployment of American nuclear weapons in Asia, especially in its eastern part, the concept of "limited nuclear war" has of late acquired an Asian aspect.

129. The Mongolian People's Republic is exerting active efforts in order to help prevent the further deterioration of the international situation on the Asian continent.

130. My Government has resolutely supported the new initiatives of the Soviet Union, put forward

by L. I. Brezhnev at Tashkent on 24 March this year. They open up a realistic path for strengthening mutual trust and developing good-neighbourly relations among the States of Asia and the Far East. We also support the joint initiatives of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea, as well as the proposals of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, aimed at strengthening peace, international stability and co-operation in the regions concerned and in Asia as a whole.

131. The Mongolian People's Republic considers of special importance, given the situation prevailing in Asia, the provisions of the Final Document on the inter-relationship of peace, disarmament and the socio-economic development of countries. My country pursues, in its bilateral relations and in international forums of the region, a course of actively searching for ways of devising measures which take full account of these objective realities.

132. The Mongolian People's Republic welcomes the rapid growth of the public anti-war movement, especially in Europe and the United States. This demonstrates the people's growing awareness of the danger looming over the world and their determination to prevent nuclear catastrophe.

133. The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, as early as during the preparations for the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, held in 1978, advocated the need to combine the efforts of the United Nations with public movements in the struggle for peace, international security and disarmament. My delegation suggested in its statements that representatives of public organizations advocating peace and international co-operation should be invited to participate in the work of that session. Therefore, we welcome the participation of the representatives of many non-governmental organizations in the work of the present special session. Their number would have been greater if it were not for the discriminatory approach of the United States Administration vis-à-vis certain organizations.

134. As a specific means of combining the efforts of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace with the public struggle for international security and disarmament, the Mongolian delegation proposed at the tenth special session that an international week devoted to fostering the objectives of disarmament should be observed annually [8th meeting, para. 76]. Today this Week has become a large-scale regular campaign for mobilizing world public opinion in favour of disarmament and maintaining and strengthening international peace.

135. The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic suggests that this special session should support still wider observance of the Week devoted to fostering the objectives of disarmament. It is important that proposals should be put forward for widening the scope and enhancing the effectiveness of measures carried out during the Week. My delegation will offer its comments at an appropriate time and will possibly present them in the form of a working paper of this session.

136. The Mongolian People's Republic supports the World Disarmament Campaign and the collection of

signatures in support of measures to prevent nuclear war, curb the arms race and achieve disarmament.

137. The Mongolian delegation, like many others, stands for confirming at this session the validity of the Final Document. The main provisions of this Document retain their forcefulness and importance. In the view of the Mongolian delegation, the comprehensive programme of disarmament which this session intends to work out will, in essence, concretize the main provisions of the Final Document in the sense of further elaboration of priority measures and establishing time-frames for their stage-by-stage implementation.

138. The Mongolian delegation believes that the elaboration at this session of a balanced and realistic programme would provide a concrete prerequisite for the convening of a world disarmament conference which would be capable of adopting binding decisions on the vital problems of disarmament. We believe that, having elaborated a comprehensive programme, this special session would be fully in a position once again to endorse the early convening of such a world forum and to specify the date.

139. In conclusion, the Mongolian delegation expresses the hope that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will make a major contribution to the cause of curbing the arms race and bringing about disarmament and strengthening international peace and security. My delegation will spare no effort to facilitate the achievement of concrete results at this session.

140. Mr. OYONO (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): We learned with deep emotion of the death of His Majesty King Khalid of Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia has lost a very wise leader and the international community an apostle of moderation and conciliation. I should like to repeat here the condolences my Government has already addressed to the family of the deceased and to the Saudi Arabian Government and people.

141. My delegation is pleased at your election, Sir, to preside over the work of this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We are familiar with your excellent qualifications and we are convinced that under your guidance our work will be successful.

142. We wish also to take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, for his efforts at this particularly difficult juncture in the international situation to find mutually acceptable solutions to the many thorny problems facing our world.

143. It is ironic that this special session of the General Assembly should be held at the very time when, in addition to the real threat of a nuclear holocaust weighing over mankind, armed confrontations of all kinds are raging throughout the world, resulting in innumerable losses of human life, material destruction, suffering and untold misery.

144. Whether in the Middle East, Africa, Asia or the South Atlantic, one would tend to lose hope in the face of such a situation were it not for the fact that in contrast to that tragic turmoil, the voice of the peoples—regardless of what has been said on that

subject—without distinction as to geographic location, race or ideology, has suddenly been raised, demanding their right to peace and to life.

145. But what are the origins of this serious distortion between the disquieting state of the world and the desire for peace and peaceful coexistence felt by the members of the international community?

146. There is no denying that ever since the end of the Second World War and the formation of the two well-known opposing military alliances, and despite *détente*, the major Powers have continued to step up their arms race, especially in the field of nuclear weapons, in order to secure for themselves control and domination of the world.

147. For many years we have constantly deplored the steady deterioration of the international situation, but this dangerous trend seems to have become even more marked since the tenth special session of the General Assembly, in 1978.

148. Indeed, the solution to the major bloody conflicts disturbing the world since the establishment of the United Nations seems more distant than ever. It is so with the elimination of *apartheid*—that policy which is a crime against mankind—with the constant confrontation between the Arab countries and Israel and with the illegal occupation of Namibia, where the colonial racist régime of South Africa continues to sow terror through blind and brutal repression. We remain in a dangerous impasse.

149. Furthermore, we wait, powerless, for the emergence of new hotbeds of tension because of the propensity of certain States to act outside the law and resort increasingly to the use of force to settle their disputes. Here again, South Africa is in the forefront with its many acts of aggression against neighbouring States and its attempts at destabilization by any means, including the use of mercenaries, as happened in the aggression against the Republic of Seychelles.

150. In South-East Asia, South-West Asia, Latin America and the South Atlantic, conflicts persist in spite of appeals for peace and efforts made by our Organization and many others such as the non-aligned movement.

151. But it is certainly Israel which deserves the prize for the use of force as the only means of settling disputes with its neighbours, and this despite the condemnations of the General Assembly and the unanimous injunctions of the Security Council. The attack against the Iraqi nuclear research centre, the ferocious repression of the inhabitants of the Arab territories occupied by force since 1967, the many incursions into southern Lebanon, despite the presence of United Nations peace-keeping force, which it has not hesitated to fire on—all these actions show the Israeli Government's utter disregard for the Charter and the norms of international law. The latest act of aggression against Lebanon has aroused the particular indignation of world public opinion not only because of the cynical violation of Lebanese sovereignty, the high cost in human lives, set at 9,500 persons, and the damages inflicted upon civilians, of whom 600,000 are now without shelter and 16,500 have been wounded, but also because of Israel's apparent desire to bring about the extermination of the Palestinian people.

152. My delegation believes that to understand the fundamental cause of the regional crises shaking the third world we must place them in the broader context of the rivalry between the two blocs which are the most important militarily. The South has become the stake in that rivalry, because of its enormous human potential, its raw materials and its geostrategic position.

153. For the small countries, particularly those of Africa, Asia and Latin America, this has very unfortunate consequences for their stability and their economic and social development.

154. As we noted during the tenth special session, in 1978, it is no accident that third world countries have found themselves involved in more than 130 devastating wars since 1945, while the North has remained a haven of peace and prosperity despite the increase in East-West antagonism and the existence of two heavily armed military alliances.

155. In addition to having to struggle to overcome underdevelopment in an international environment dominated by the selfishness of the rich countries, the countries of the South are often forced to sacrifice their resources because of wars which are instigated and stirred up from abroad. It is significant that the countries of the third world, in waging these wars, face only minor difficulties in procuring weapons, while the granting of the smallest loan to those countries for economic development purposes gives rise to interminable negotiations, intolerable pressures and even sometimes humiliating blackmail.

156. By causing and sustaining conflicts in the third world, the two blocs vying for hegemony assure themselves of clients and allies, both political and military, while making considerable profits in the economic sphere. Indeed, while this year world military expenditures are estimated at more than \$600 billion, the total devoted to arms purchases by third world countries exceed \$118.7 billion, which will go to the weapons industry, 95 per cent of which is located in the northern hemisphere.

157. Only conventional weapons have been used in conflicts since the end of the Second World War; they have brought about more than 25 million deaths. We have just mentioned their disastrous effect on the lives of the peoples of the third world, which serves as a dumping-ground and a testing ground for the arms manufacturers. There is no doubt that the production and procurement of these weapons must be limited to the level strictly necessary for the security needs of each State.

158. The greatest urgency and the highest priority, however, must be attached to nuclear disarmament. Thus, as stated in paragraph 18 of the Final Document,

“Removing the threat of a world war—a nuclear war—is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation.”

159. That warning is more relevant than ever, for over the past four years the continuing stockpiling and qualitative improvement of the most terrifying nuclear weapons has speeded up at an ever more frantic pace.

160. In spite of the partial nuclear test-ban Treaty of 1963,⁸ the frequency of such tests has increased in those four years to 50 a year, as against 37 in 1978. But we believe that the 1,300 tests carried out in the past 36 years should have provided the nuclear Powers with more than sufficient data to carry out their programmes.

161. World-wide military expenditures have grown from \$400 billion in 1978 to more than \$600 billion; 75 per cent of that total is accounted for by only six countries, which, in addition, have in their service nearly all the 500,000 scientists employed on military research. The number of people at present in uniform has reached 50 million, including 25 million members of paramilitary forces.

162. Those indications give only an approximate idea of the formidable military power of the two most heavily armed States, a power which could, according to the insane plans they are brewing, enable them to destroy all life on our planet several times over and for several generations to come.

163. In his opening statement the Secretary-General eloquently described the consequences of a nuclear war. Above all, he stressed very pertinently that "An all-out nuclear confrontation would affect the entire world, the entire ecosystem" [*1st meeting, para. 42*].

164. For all peoples and all countries, then, disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, is an imperative need and has the highest priority. The anxiety of the peoples increases as the possibility of a so-called limited nuclear war becomes the core of strategic concepts and doctrines, thanks to the appearance of miniaturized nuclear weapons, some of which—like the well-known "Davy Crockett"—with a power of a quarter to half a kiloton, can be carried on a man's back.

165. This development is all the more dangerous and senseless since conflicts feed on their own dynamics, and a nuclear confrontation could not but follow the logic of all wars, the unyielding logic of violence, escaping the control of the protagonists.

166. For the rest, we see clearly that what yesterday were deterrent forces and could have been considered a stabilizing factor have today become a direct threat to all mankind. In fact, it is confrontation that today dominates the world situation and determines its dynamics, confrontation between the two main opposing military alliances, and the hegemonic rivalry between East and West.

167. Thus, the dangerous logic of militarism is pushing the two super-Powers towards open confrontation. Neither of the two parties wants war, but both want victory—an impossible victory, for we know that in the case of a nuclear war there would be total annihilation, there would be neither victor nor vanquished. Those who triggered such a catastrophe would not even have the time to regret not having paid more attention to the warnings of the United Nations, which today some consider to be unrealistic, than the Trojan strategists paid to the prophesies of Cassandra.

168. There is still time for reason to prevail and for the desire for survival to prevail over the taste

for suicidal adventure such as the armaments race represents. There is time to come back to the principles and ideals of the Charter on which we have based our collective security, namely, tolerance, good-neighbourliness, the peaceful settlement of disputes, respect for the equal rights of peoples and for the right of peoples to self-determination and, lastly, the quest for well-being for all.

169. Of course, we recognize that every nation and every people has a legitimate right to its own security. However, the question arises as to whether or not the arms race contributes to that security. The response given in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session is in the negative. Further, as was stated in the Declaration of the Holy See in 1976, the arms race even when it is the result of a concern for self-defence, is in fact, because of the nature of modern weaponry and the global situation, a danger, an injustice, a mistake, a sin, and madness.

170. Therefore, we cannot help but rejoice at the announcement of the forthcoming resumption of negotiations on the limitation and simultaneous reduction of nuclear weapons to a reasonable level compatible with national and international security. We urgently appeal to the Powers concerned to conduct those negotiations in a serious manner, free from any propaganda, in order to reach agreements acceptable to all and accompanied by effective means of control.

171. Such agreements would be a first positive step towards general and complete disarmament, which should, in the view of my delegation, continue to be our common goal.

172. That is why we are asking that simultaneously with such bilateral talks, the multinational negotiations that have been going on for years in the Committee on Disarmament lead at last to the adoption of acceptable and verifiable conventions.

173. We are thinking in the first place of the draft agreements that the Committee has been asked to submit to the Assembly at this second special session devoted to disarmament: first, a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty; secondly, a convention for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all types of chemical weapons and on their destruction; thirdly, a treaty prohibiting the development, production and use of radiological weapons; and, fourthly, effective international arrangements to guarantee non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

174. Despite the fact that the Committee has had those various items on its agenda since the end of the tenth special session and that it has received many useful suggestions, no substantial progress has been made owing to the lack of political will on the part of the great Powers.

175. We are aware of the complex nature of those problems, and we know that the process of disarmament is a long and difficult one. Nevertheless it is necessary that bilateral, regional and multilateral negotiations achieve positive and progressive results in order to meet the concern of the world public opinion, which is becoming increasingly pressing. Here, we would emphasize the importance we attach

to what have been called negative guarantees. We cannot be satisfied with unilateral declarations in which some Powers commit themselves not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. It would be better if all nuclear Powers demonstrated that will and confirmed it by the adoption of a legally binding instrument on the subject.

176. Such a measure, in our view, would encourage respect for the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which, although adopted by the vast majority of States, continues to give rise to questions and reservations because of the refusal of the nuclear Powers to commit themselves firmly to disarmament, notwithstanding the fact that it is clearly understood that the Treaty does not interfere with the inalienable right of States to access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

177. We are concerned by the growth in the number of States that believe that the only way to gain international credibility today is to join the nuclear Powers' club. It is estimated that during the 1980s some 30 countries will achieve nuclear capability and that that figure may double before the end of the century.

178. Such a development can only jeopardize the creation of zones of peace and nuclear-free zones, which are also positive elements in the achievement of general and complete disarmament.

179. We wish to express our pleasure at the ratification of the Protocol to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).⁹ On the other hand, we deplore the problems that are delaying the creation of nuclear-free zones in the Middle East, the Indian Ocean, South Asia, the Nordic countries and the Balkans.

180. As for Africa, which was declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity in 1964, it is being threatened by the great-Power ambitions of the racist Pretoria régime. We condemn most strongly acquisition of nuclear capability by the *apartheid* régime, since we are aware of its total lack of scruples and of respect for human dignity and life. We also condemn the nuclear co-operation certain States have entered into with the supporters of *apartheid* despite United Nations resolutions.

181. Once again we call upon the Security Council to adopt without delay and in the interests of peace, for which it has been given responsibility, the enforcement measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter in order to compel South Africa to co-operate with our Organization.

182. In this latter part of the twentieth century, when man has conquered space and trodden lunar soil, it is inadmissible that almost 800 million people, particularly in the developing countries, should still be living in a state of absolute poverty, that 430 million people are seriously undernourished, that a billion people are badly housed, that a billion and a half people do not have access to safe drinking water, that 814 million adults are illiterate and that 123 million children of school age are being deprived of education and training.

183. The first two United Nations Development Decades have yielded limited results, especially for the

developing countries, with regard to the creation of conditions likely to bring about the changes that can lead to the establishment of a new world economic order that will promote growth and well-being for all peoples.

184. It is one of the most shocking scandals that despite this alarming situation, the militarily powerful blocs and countries devote enormous human, financial and technical resources to increasing and improving deadly weapons for our common destruction.

185. It is significant that the cost of one of the latest models of strategic bomber has been estimated at more than \$300 million, whereas in 10 years WHO has spent less than that to eradicate smallpox from the world.

186. Research devoted to military products is 20 times more intensive than that devoted to the manufacture of domestic products. If the present cost of the military-industrial complexes and their logistical support continues to increase, we may find military expenditures exceeding \$900 billion in the year 2000.

187. During this time official development assistance in all its forms has been gradually shrinking. In their last report, for the year 1981-82, the members of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination stressed "the deteriorating situation facing all organizations of the system with regard to the declining level of concessional resources in real terms available for international technical co-operation and other development activities."¹⁰ They also said, "Of equal concern to members of ACC was the dangerous erosion of the system of multilateral co-operation and its replacement by an inward orientation of national action."¹¹

188. The many initiatives taken recently by some developed countries to ensure negative growth in the administrative budget of the United Nations are significant in this connexion.

189. It is of the utmost urgency to reverse the arms race, and primarily the nuclear-arms race, and to re-direct all the human, financial and technical resources thus released towards economic and social development activities. The problems of transition and conversion that may arise in the process are not insurmountable obstacles if there is true political will for international co-operation.

190. Cameroon firmly supports the idea of creating a special disarmament fund for development, whose resources would come from money released by the reduction of military budgets and the armaments industries.

191. We are beginning the Second United Nations Disarmament Decade in a climate of great uncertainty but also of great hope, resulting from the mobilization of world public opinion in favour of peace and international security. The recent big protests all over the world, one of which we witnessed with great emotion right here in front of the Organization's Headquarters, clearly reflect the will of the peoples—with mankind's deeply rooted instinct for survival and happiness—to oppose resolutely mankind's progress towards its own holocaust, which may be brought about by the arms race and over-armament.

192. We do not have the right to dash that ardent hope. We must take the opportunity offered to us to

give a new thrust to the process of disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, and to the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, with the co-operation of all men of goodwill in the parliaments, the trade unions, the churches, the universities, the mass media and so on.

193. That means that the Organization must become "a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of...common ends", in accordance with the terms of the Charter. It also implies that the Security Council must play its role fully as defined in the Charter, which means that it should be enlarged to be more representative of the various political feelings in the contemporary international community, bearing in mind the matters that concern the young States, and that the Security Council's members should abide by the principles and purposes of the Charter in approaching questions before the Council, transcending their immediate concerns and working towards the higher interests of the whole international community. In that way we shall avoid the misuse of the right of veto, which paralyses the Council and seriously undermines the authority and credibility of the Organization. For, as President Ahmadou Ahidjo, Head of State of Cameroon, has said:

"The great works of mankind retain their inspirational value and lead to permanent commitment

only if men, beginning with those responsible for the creation of those works, surround them with devotion and remain faithful to their deep meaning."

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

NOTES

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

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

³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 39 to 56, 128 and 135, document A/36/192, annex.

⁴ CD/335, Appendix II/vol. II, document CD/272.

⁵ League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138, p. 65.

⁶ A/36/388.

⁷ A/36/586, annex.

⁸ Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43).

⁹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.

¹⁰ E/1982/4, para. 15.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, para. 8.