



President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: This morning the Assembly will hear a statement by the Prime Minister of Ireland, Mr. Charles J. Haughey. I have great pleasure in welcoming him and inviting him to address the General Assembly.

2. Mr. HAUGHEY (Ireland): Sir, I should like to congratulate you, first of all, on your election to the office of President of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We are very happy that the Assembly will be guided in the coming weeks by a man of your exceptional skill and experience in international affairs. It is a further source of pleasure to us that the President of the Assembly should be a representative of a country with which my country has such close and cordial relations.

3. Earlier this week, the representative of Belgium, Foreign Minister Leo Tindemans, spoke on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, and Ireland subscribes to the views he expressed on that occasion.

4. It is just four years since world leaders met previously in this Hall for the first special session on disarmament. Hopes were high; world public attention was engaged; speeches were made; proposals were outlined; and an important document on disarmament emerged.

5. What has happened since? In those four years world expenditure on armaments has increased by over \$200 billion. The number of nuclear warheads has increased to some 40,000. And the hands of the clock of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, which monitors the dangers of nuclear war, have moved appreciably closer to midnight.

6. Now we meet again for the second special session on disarmament. For the next few weeks public attention will focus on this Hall. Speaker after speaker will come to this rostrum to advocate disarmament. Concerned about a rising tide of popular concern in each of our countries, we will each speak movingly of the waste of resources and the growing dangers arising from world armaments.

7. When it ends, this special session too will have produced a document—a comprehensive programme of disarmament. It may be the result of many difficult compromises. But it will no doubt be a worthy document, one fit to take its place as the latest in

a sequence of other worthy documents and pacts, beginning with the Hague Conventions of 1899, all directed to reducing armaments and outlawing war.

8. But will anything change in the real world? Will there be one less nuclear weapon, one less missile, one less tank, rocket or gun? Will the wealthy and powerful countries and the major alliances take any real or serious step to halt, if not to reverse, the arms race between them? Will third world countries show any less willingness to divert their resources to a buildup of armaments for prestige reasons or because of regional rivalries? Will any of us begin to act as we speak? Will we conform our policies to our rhetoric?

9. The record so far is a melancholy one. Throughout this century there have been countless disarmament conferences, disarmament committees, disarmament commissions and disarmament negotiations. Various pacts and treaties have been signed. But this century has seen the two greatest wars in human history, and today we are poised for a third, which, if it ever happens, promises to be the last.

10. It is perhaps paradoxical, but the capacity of ordinary men and women to understand the situation in which the world now finds itself has been numbed by repetition. Conferences, speeches, articles, books and television describe our situation—but does it really sink in?

11. To make the facts sink home, one would almost have to imagine what a visitor from elsewhere would report on our planet if he studied our present condition. He would first report that the dominant species on this planet seems to have an innate capacity for war. He would describe the political organization of the planet, divided as it is into some 160 sovereign States. Some are large and powerful, some are small and weak. They group themselves in various ways—East, West, North, South, but each claims to be sovereign as against all the others. He would note that these sovereign States, either individually or in groups, have a tendency to frequent conflict and that consequently they tend to distrust each other and to believe that their security can be assured only if they constantly prepare themselves for possible conflict.

12. He would have to report, however, on a strange paradox. The preparation for conflict which no one wants increases mistrust and makes it more likely that conflict will occur. Every nation preparing for possible conflict is convinced that it is thereby adding to its security. But the overall effect of these efforts by each to add to its own security is an immense increase in the insecurity of all.

13. Our imaginary traveller would report a second great puzzle about our world. Human need is great, and resources and wealth are very unevenly dis-

tributed. But our planet can nevertheless devote a very great part of these resources to weapons of destruction.

14. But there should be no need to imagine such an outside observer to understand fully our present situation. The stark facts are available in many recent reports. Let me cite three such points which describe clearly the peril of our situation. Total world expenditure on armaments is now over \$600 billion. This is the highest total in human history. The nuclear weapons now available and poised for use have an explosive power more than one million times that of the bomb which destroyed Hiroshima, killing 150,000 people, in 1945. I repeat: today there could be one million Hiroshimas.

15. The two major nuclear Powers between them probably now have more than 15,000 strategic nuclear warheads. This is three times what they had 12 years ago, in 1970.

16. It can only be because our senses have been numbed by repetition that humanity has come to accept these chilling facts as a normal part of life on our planet today. The irony is that we describe as "realists" those who study and plan and produce theories relating to the development and use of these weapons. Those who would reject this reality and seek to change it or who would regard it as monstrous and unacceptable are, strangely enough, called "idealists".

17. How is it that humanity has come to accept this? Why is there such a discrepancy—one might better call it a gulf—between what political leaders, and I include all of us, say on disarmament on occasions such as this and what we do in the real world about armaments?

18. The easy answer is for each of us somehow to distance himself from the steady growth in armaments, to speak of the arms race as if it were an evil force which existed in its own right. In this way, each of us can conveniently speak of an evil process, detached from ourselves, which endangers the world. But the reality is that it is not some separate process or evil force which has led us to where we are, but rather the sum total of the measures taken by each of the 160 sovereign States to protect its own security. The consequence is the most fearful insecurity of all.

19. But even if we see that the steady buildup in armaments is not an impersonal force but the sum of a series of separate human decisions by nations in search of security, we still want to lay the blame elsewhere: on the "other side". East blames West, and West blames East. Small countries speak of the super-Powers, poor countries of the industrialized world. Industrialized countries in turn point to regional rivalries and the arms buildup in less developed countries, where many of the wars of recent decades have taken place.

20. It is precisely that kind of thinking which has brought us to where we are. Every country thinks its own subjective intentions are good, but it believes it has good reason to mistrust the intentions of others.

21. Unless we recognize this paradox and try to deal with it, our rhetoric will remain for ever divorced from reality. Every country will continue to display its good intentions in speeches made here about disarmament.

But because of its suspicions of the intentions of potential opponents, each country will continue to act differently in the real world in order to build up its own security.

22. Even then, as it builds up armaments, each country continues to believe in its own good intentions, and each fails to see why its potential rivals should be suspicious. But there is often a great gap between a nation's view of its own intentions and the way in which those intentions are perceived by potential opponents. It is there that the human dilemma—the dilemma of disarmament—really lies. I believe that the greatest need at present is to recognize this dilemma and to try to find ways to deal with it. Otherwise, our speeches and our good intentions about disarmament will for ever remain divorced from reality.

23. Let me emphasize this point: we have been brought to where we are not because of some abstract or evil force, but because of inherent feelings of mistrust, fear and insecurity between nations in a world of sovereign States. Mistrust leads to a buildup of armaments. A buildup of arms in turn increases mistrust. The result is a spiral the direction of which is always upward. Step by step, the process acquires a dynamic of its own. The arms buildup and the growth of mistrust between nations are mutually reinforcing. From this, I believe, two important consequences follow.

24. First, both aspects of the problem must be tackled in parallel. On one hand, we need serious and sustained efforts to negotiate disarmament. On the other hand, we need a corresponding effort to build and strengthen international institutions through which the rule of law among nations can be promoted and developed, and insecurity and mistrust decreased.

25. Secondly, if each step taken to build up armaments increases mistrust, then it follows that each step, however small, to reduce armaments could help to ease mistrust. In other words, if the direction of the spiral could once be reversed, the same dynamic interaction between the level of armaments and the level of trust among nations would still apply. Then each step, even a small step showing restraint by one side, could evoke a corresponding step towards restraint on the other.

26. But these are general points. How do we apply them in practice? In particular, how can we use this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and the immense interest it has generated among the public around the world, to begin at last to take actual steps towards disarmament?

27. I would suggest that, first, we must use the occasion of such a major conference and such public interest to confirm in the broadest way the general commitment of the nations of the world to the concept of disarmament. This should naturally include the ideal of general and complete disarmament already endorsed by the General Assembly over 20 years ago. However distant that ideal might now seem, it must be retained as the ultimate goal of disarmament efforts.

28. Secondly, we need a comprehensive programme of disarmament as the outcome of this session. Such a

programme would give coherence to the various disarmament discussions and negotiations now under way in different forums and would set realistic goals for those discussions.

29. Thirdly, a general goal and a programme for working towards it are not enough. We badly need some first steps. If the programme is not to remain something on paper only, like so many proposals and agreements in the past, then some practical first steps must now be taken to give it life and impetus.

30. As to the first of these points, the goal of general and complete disarmament, no doubt this aspiration will be reflected suitably as the ultimate goal in the document adopted at the end of this session. On the second point, the comprehensive programme for disarmament, considerable work has already been done, and the next month of discussions in the Assembly will, I hope, bring that programme to fruition.

31. What I would like to do here, however, is to concentrate on the third point, that is, the series of steps which I believe need now to be taken to give credibility to the programme and offer hope to the world. These steps should be taken by each country according to its capacity and its role in the growth of the armaments which have so far endangered our planet.

32. This means above all the nuclear-weapon States, whose buildup of nuclear armaments is most dangerous. I would offer a list of points on which I believe the nuclear Powers should now be ready to act.

33. First, they need to recognize and accept that, as one important recent article put it:

“The one clearly definable fire-break against the world-wide disaster of general nuclear war is the one that stands between all other kinds of conflict and any use whatsoever of nuclear weapons. To keep that fire-break wide and strong is in the deepest interests of all mankind.”

I believe that the nuclear Powers need to consider seriously what methods or agreements they might work out to provide against the first use by any of them of nuclear weapons.

34. Secondly, I believe that the nuclear Powers should take account of the many public calls for a freeze on nuclear weapons at least to the extent of agreeing on such a freeze or moratorium for, say, an initial two-year period. This would mean agreeing not to add to the existing number of warheads or of delivery vehicles for nuclear weapons on either side over a two-year trial period when serious negotiations such as the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks [START] are under way. Of course, if this two-year moratorium should increase trust on either side, it could be extended year by year while real and substantive disarmament measures are being worked out.

35. Thirdly, the world absolutely needs a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water,¹ which was signed by three of the nuclear Powers, is clearly insufficient. In the period since the Treaty was signed in 1963, some 800 nuclear tests have taken place. That is significantly more than the total of 500 tests which had occurred in the whole period from 1945 to 1963.

36. Fourthly, the SALT II agreement, which both sides now abide by, should be ratified. If they can abide by the treaty in practice, as they seem to be doing, why should they not ratify the treaty and thus increase confidence somewhat on both sides?

37. Fifthly, we welcome the efforts to get the so-called START talks under way. We hope that all of the nuclear Powers can eventually be brought to participate in such talks and that the proposals made will be serious and well intentioned and not merely designed to win over public opinion around the world.

38. Those are five basic steps which, I believe, the nuclear Powers need to take and take urgently. But just as the buildup of armaments extends beyond the nuclear Powers, so too the steps which now need to be taken must cover more than nuclear weapons.

39. In particular, there is an urgent need to address the insidious problem of other weapons of mass destruction. As long ago as 1925 the use of poisonous gas was banned by international agreement. Furthermore, bacteriological weapons which are designed deliberately to spread the very diseases which mankind has struggled for centuries to defeat or control have more recently been prohibited. None the less, the threat of chemical weapons still remains. There are still huge stockpiles of nerve gas in existence, and no effective agreement has yet been reached on destroying them. In fact, the major Powers still appear to be actively engaged in research on and development of those weapons.

40. Other weapons of mass destruction are contemplated or are being developed, for example, radiological weapons which pervert the life-saving discovery of X-rays to destructive ends. In addition, concern has been mounting in recent years that weapons for use in outer space may be developed. Such weapons are already on the drawing-board and money is being spent on research. Experience shows us that if we wait until the weapons actually appear there is very little possibility that they will be negotiated away.

41. In the field of conventional weapons, I believe the greatest need is to work out methods for calculation of military budgets and expenditure on armaments on a common, universally accepted basis. If this could be done, the next stage would be to work out agreements to reduce those budgets on all sides on a graduated basis.

42. These are all important first steps in the area of arms control and disarmament. Each is practicable, and given the necessary will it should be possible by carrying them through to give the spiral that vital downward turn.

43. But what of the other side of the question—the distrust and tensions among nations which stimulate and are in turn reinforced by the arms race? It is vital to address that question through efforts to strengthen international security which should both complement and reinforce disarmament measures. This is surely evident at present. As the Assembly meets here to discuss disarmament, we are all uneasily aware that at least four wars are raging in the world at present. None of those wars, at the moment I speak, shows much sign of being easily checked.

44. Wars may once have been the only method of settling disputes among nations. But as Pope John Paul II said recently, expressing the hopes of hundreds of millions the world over, "Today, the scale and the horror of modern warfare, whether nuclear or not, make it totally unacceptable as a means of settling differences between nations." In our time we have evolved instruments and procedures—in particular, the United Nations and its institutions and procedures—which should have made war obsolete. These institutions badly need to be strengthened and made effective, and the nations of the world must learn to use those instruments and procedures rather than seeking to vindicate their rights by resorting to war.

45. An important step to show confidence in these institutions could, I believe, be taken if the five nuclear Powers—which as it happens are also the permanent members of the Security Council—would use the Security Council and its procedures to give binding security guarantees to the non-nuclear States which would ensure that no nuclear Power will ever use nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear Power. This would give an important fillip to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*—that essential dike against the spread of nuclear weapons.

46. But more than any single step of this kind it is important, in my view, that the nations of the world make use of this Organization, the United Nations, which is almost universal in its membership. It provides procedures and a code of conduct to govern relations between nations which if properly used can play an important part in easing mistrust and creating a respect for law between States.

47. This will mean restraint and respect for these procedures by all States. It will mean too that States must constantly make a deliberate choice—to use the instrumentality of the United Nations and its institutions to the full, rather than resorting only to their own strength to vindicate the principles which they rightly want to uphold.

48. We live in a time when, for better or worse, the human species on this planet has entered a new era. We know now the limits of our planet and its resources. We are a single human community to an increasing extent in our global travel and global communications. But what is most significant and frightening is that at this stage in its long history, humanity has at last uncovered the fearful power through which it can destroy itself and extinguish much of the other life on this planet. As Arthur Koestler has said, man has always had to live with the prospect of his death as an individual, but today mankind has to live with the prospect of its own extinction.

49. And just at this moment in human history, however, humanity has also created, however falteringly, an assembly in which virtually every nation on earth is represented, an admirable code of conduct for relations between nations and a family of international institutions grouped around the United Nations which provide many useful procedures and provisions for settling disputes and promoting co-operation between them.

50. In other words, at the moment of the greatest peril in all of human history, when distrust and sus-

picion between nations and peoples have led to a massive arms buildup which now threatens our very existence, we have at hand, however weak and ineffectual it may seem at times, the very instrument we need to establish and maintain the rule of law and assure the security of nations large and small. It is vital that we use it.

51. It has been said that wars begin in men's minds, and long before the first shot is fired fear and distrust have prepared the battleground.

52. Peace has no meaning and no value if it is only to be a time in which we prepare for further wars. The peace we enjoy now is fragmented and vulnerable and could so easily be lost. As none of us could escape the consequences of another general war, none of us should try to evade our responsibility. Public opinion around the world is mobilized. The Palme Commission report entitled "Common security—a programme for disarmament"² will be helpful and useful. The launching of the World Disarmament Campaign is also welcome and can support these efforts. It is now for those who carry the responsibility for national decisions to face those responsibilities.

53. Every country, whatever its size or importance, must do what it can to help ward off the catastrophe threatening all humanity. Those who are militarily powerful have the primary responsibility to disarm. Others—countries like my own, which are not directly involved in the arms race—have the responsibility to do all in their power to help resolve conflict, to relieve tension and to build up an irresistible force of public opinion against the use of force in international affairs and to do everything we can to remove war from men's minds.

54. It is my earnest hope, therefore, that this special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which is being attended by so many world leaders and which has evoked such hope around the world, will be a new beginning. We need a new commitment to the long-term goal of general disarmament. We need a coherent and comprehensive programme through which we may hope to get there. We need some important first steps in practice to give substance and reality to that programme. And we need a new commitment to use the United Nations and its family of institutions to the full, to strengthen them and to make them more effective so that nations may begin to find the justice and security they seek—not in a wasteful, futile and dangerous buildup of armaments but in the increasing application of the rule of law among nations.

55. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I wish to thank the Prime Minister of Ireland for the important statement he has just made.

56. Mr. TOLENTINO (Philippines): My delegation extends its congratulations to you, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly at this second special session devoted to disarmament. Your record of performance in guiding previous sessions of this body gives us every hope and confidence in the successful conclusion of our deliberations in the next few weeks. To this end it shall be the endeavour of my delegation to contribute to our work and co-

operate with you in your weighty task and responsibility of leadership.

57. We are engaged once again in the consideration of the problem of disarmament, which is one of the most vital issues on the agenda of the General Assembly. As everyone knows, disarmament has been a matter of the utmost priority in the work of the United Nations ever since its inception. The Organization has devoted considerable time and effort to the problem because it is truly relevant not only to international peace and security but also to international economic and social development.

58. In the past there have been many attempts to move towards arms control by way of treaties and agreements. To mention a few, there is the partial test-ban treaty of 1963, banning nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere and under water; the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, which bans the emplacement of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in orbit around the earth; the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968, which bans the transfer of nuclear weapons from nuclear-weapon States to non-nuclear-weapon States; the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction; SALT I, of 1972; and the 1973 agreement on the prevention of nuclear war, which provides that the United States and the Soviet Union will take all action necessary to preclude the outbreak of nuclear war.

59. But all these notwithstanding, the world seems to be further away from arms control and disarmament than ever before. The past few years have witnessed the development of increasingly devastating weapons systems; military expenditures are on an upward trend, running currently at well above \$600 billion annually; and the nuclear arsenals of the super-Powers are said to have accumulated around 50,000 warheads, enough to kill every man, woman and child several times over in a single holocaust.

60. We meet today in an atmosphere of great stress and strain. To cite a few examples: there is the undeclared war going on in the South Atlantic; hostilities also occur daily in the Middle East and in southern Africa, with great cost in human lives; and we very frequently hear and read about acts of international terrorism, which are vivid signs of tension everywhere.

61. It is debatable, of course, whether or not this atmosphere of stress and strain is salutary and beneficial to disarmament efforts. While it may be contended that these happenings could militate against disarmament because States and individuals fear for their security and survival, the same atmosphere could, on the other hand, instil fears in all of us that these small wars, regional conflicts and bloody incidents might suddenly erupt into a world conflagration. History, sad to say, is replete with precedents in this respect. It is the view of my delegation that this great danger to us all should be a prime inducement to spur us on to redouble our efforts towards disarmament.

62. The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session [*resolution S-10/2*], in 1978, was an achievement of great magnitude. It was the culmination of valiant efforts in the process of give-and-take, in making concessions and in deferring to compromises. Having been approved by consensus, that Final Document was a signal victory for the first special session on disarmament. Yet, four years have elapsed since its adoption and, as stated by so many, not a single weapon has been destroyed voluntarily since then.

63. Nevertheless, in the view of my delegation, it is our bounden responsibility to reaffirm and uphold the validity of that Final Document. The principles, the goals and the objectives set forth in it should remain as guidelines to which we should adhere.

64. I should like now to turn to what I consider could be the main objective of the present session. The Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament exerted sustained efforts for several months to create a smooth and favourable atmosphere for this session. The Committee on Disarmament, the First Committee of the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission also worked hard to define and identify the main goal to be achieved by this second special session on disarmament. In our view, the tangible effects of all these preparations should result in the adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, which should be the centre-piece of our labours during this session.

65. The Committee on Disarmament, thanks to the efforts of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group, was able to provide us with a document on the comprehensive programme of disarmament [*A/S-12/2, appendix I*], which is before us. However, the programme is not a finished draft instrument. This special session faces the greater challenge of developing and perfecting the details of this document before adopting it as the main achievement of our deliberations. If and when the comprehensive programme is adopted, it is our view that the General Assembly must give it due importance and value, assigning to it a status above that of a resolution or declaration adopted by the General Assembly. It must be given legal binding effect instead of being regarded as a mere recommendation.

66. There can be no disarmament without international security. No nation will reduce or limit armaments unless it feels its existence and integrity will remain secure. A most valuable study entitled *Relationship between Disarmament and International Security*³ has been submitted to this special session of the General Assembly. This study is the result of the intense and continuing efforts of a ten-member Group of Experts from June 1979 to November 1981. My delegation is particularly proud to note that the chairman of that Group of Experts is none other than Mr. Carlos Romulo, former President of the General Assembly and Foreign Minister of the Republic of the Philippines for the past 14 years.

67. The main point stressed in the report is that the measures to strengthen institutions for maintaining peace and for the settlement of international disputes by pacific means would facilitate further progress in disarmament and that the achievement of a state of reliable and lasting peace and security must include

the full implementation of the security system of the Charter of the United Nations and general and complete disarmament.

68. During the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, Mr. Romulo presented the report to the First Committee, at its 36th meeting, for transmittal to the second special session on disarmament. He noted that the Group of Experts emphasized the following:

“Progress in disarmament and in the strengthening of international security must be looked upon as parallel means in the effort to preserve peace and prevent war.”

He added:

“The report is only a first effort by the United Nations membership to come to a clearer understanding of the security and disarmament relationship. It can only be regarded as a first general review of this difficult but rewarding question. In my view, it is imperative that these efforts be pursued particularly at a more technical and detailed level, now that the general principles have been essentially agreed upon . . . We need to know more about what kind of United Nations security system will prove acceptable and adequate to assure compliance as disarmament proceeds, and sufficiently effective to assume the burden of maintenance of peace as arms are dispensed with.”

69. Disarmament is a matter of growing concern not only to Governments, but more so to peoples. Thus we have launched, on the first day of the session, the World Disarmament Campaign. The objective of this Campaign is to increase popular understanding of the growing threat of the arms race to international peace and security, to provide information and education on and generate greater mass support for the goals of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

70. In the view of my delegation, the World Disarmament Campaign is a vital component or complement of our work on disarmament, because it is obvious to us that to succeed we must have world public opinion on our side. The costs of the Campaign should be infinitesimal indeed compared to the more than \$600 billion now being spent annually on armaments.

71. It is common knowledge that although the United Nations from its inception has been involved in the problem of disarmament, during almost four decades there has not been much to show by way of accomplishments. My delegation believes the greatest stumbling-block to disarmament is the lack of political will among States, a malaise which can be attributed to a number of factors, such as the consciousness and perception of State security, national prestige, domestic profit and the compelling influence of science and technology. These are to my mind the driving forces behind the arms race which tend to negate a political will for disarmament. They are powerful forces, but it is the considered opinion of my delegation that the lack of political will on the part of Governments can be overcome by sane, insistent public opinion in favour of a peaceful world.

72. It is a happy development that as we hold this second special session on disarmament, the minds of people all over the world are being rudely awakened

to the imperative and universal need for disarmament owing to the dangers arising from the nuclear-arms race. We hear and read every day of symposia and seminars, of protests and demonstrations against nuclear weapons. These events are becoming so widespread that leaders of Governments may in time have to listen to the voices of their own people—scientists, doctors, lawyers, religious leaders and others from all walks of life. This movement must be developed into a universal force working side by side with the United Nations towards the goal of universal and complete disarmament under effective international control. Thus the timeliness and utility of the World Disarmament Campaign.

73. In response to the world public clamour, my delegation submits that we should, on our part, most seriously address ourselves at this session to concepts that could begin the process of preventing nuclear war, such as the following: the prohibition of the use or threat of nuclear weapons, the principle of the non-first use of nuclear weapons, and credible security guarantees against the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. These are priority measures, but, considering that the ultimate goal in this context and in the language of the Final Document of 1978 is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, we should also move towards other goals, namely, a total halt of nuclear and thermonuclear tests, the cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear-weapon systems, the non-stationing of nuclear weapons where there are none at present, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, the cessation of the production and development of fissionable material for weapons purposes and of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery and, at the earliest possible time, the adoption of a comprehensive phased programme with agreed time frames whenever feasible for the progressive and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear armaments.

74. China has taken the lead by its declaration that it has adopted the principle of the non-first use of nuclear weapons, that it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time or under any circumstances. We welcome that assurance.

75. But the world looks to the nuclear-weapon States, and in particular to the two super-Powers which each possess a devastating array of nuclear weaponry, to respond to world public opinion. Happily the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to resume their talks on nuclear disarmament, and it is reported that their talks on the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons will commence on 29 June at Geneva. I believe that I interpret the views of one and all in the Assembly when I say that we all desire and hope most fervently for the success of the nuclear talks between these two super-Powers. President Reagan has made proposals on arms reduction in statements since Eureka; this is an encouraging sign.

76. Experience has shown, however, that people are not satisfied with statements and proposals. There is usually a wide gap between announcement and accomplishment, and often the deed does not match or may even contradict the words. The world wants action, not speeches.

77. Whether the negotiations are held within the forum of the United Nations or bilaterally between the super-Powers, we submit that time is an essential element.

78. Rapid and tremendous advances in technology, military research and development are accelerating the arms race at a faster pace than that of diplomatic negotiations. The more advanced the race becomes, the harder it will be to reach agreement involving the dismantling of weapons and reduction of stockpiles. A point of no return may be reached, when arms control and disarmament negotiations may indeed become futile.

79. I do not wish to sound like an alarmist, but I want to emphasize the urgency of accomplishing our mission at this special session. The thin barrier that keeps the world from the abyss of total destruction grows more fragile with each day of delay in attaining our goal of complete and general disarmament under effective international control.

80. We must adopt at least a legally binding comprehensive disarmament programme at this session.

81. Let us not allow time to run out on us. Let us not fail humanity, whose expectant eyes are focused on us.

82. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Mr. President, allow me first of all to offer my sincere congratulations to you on your election to the office of President of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I express the wish that this session will achieve positive results under your guidance.

83. While we are discussing the question of disarmament at this special session, the situation in the Middle East is seriously deteriorating as a result of Israel's flagrant invasion of Lebanon. We strongly condemn Israel's armed aggression and firmly support the heroic struggle of the peoples of Lebanon and Palestine against Israeli aggression. We consider that the United Nations must take prompt and effective measures to halt Israel's aggression.

84. The second special session devoted to disarmament is being held under the spotlight of world attention. The non-aligned countries and many small and medium-sized countries have done commendable work for its convocation. Thanks to their initiative and unremitting efforts over the years, the question of disarmament is no longer under the control of the super-Powers and has become a matter of common concern involving the participation of all countries of the world.

85. This question has undoubtedly become more urgent since the tenth special session. Peace-loving people all over the world are waiting to see what positions various Governments will take on disarmament and whether they can adopt some practical and effective measures at this session with regard to such pressing issues as halting the arms race and preventing a nuclear war. In this sense, the current session is not only a forum for the discussion of disarmament, but a place to test the good faith of each Government towards disarmament.

86. Acting upon the instructions of the Government of the People's Republic of China, the Chinese delegation has come to take part in the session in good faith. We are ready to join the representatives

of other countries in a serious exploration of the major issues related to world disarmament, and we hope that the session will contribute to a reasonable solution of the question of disarmament and to the maintenance of world peace.

87. A central task of the Assembly at this session is to review the international situation and what has been achieved in disarmament over the past four years. No objective and unbiased observer can deny the fact that there has been sustained international tension during these years. This has been mainly due to the acts of expansion and aggression by the hegemonists and to the intensified arms race and fierce rivalry between the two super-Powers. One super-Power has been pressing forward to expand its sphere of influence. Not wishing to be outdone, the other super-Power has exerted its utmost to build up its strength and to try to regain its former position of world supremacy. The two have been contending for world hegemony. Their rivalry extends to all parts of the globe, thus threatening the independence and sovereignty of small and medium-sized countries as well as world peace and security. As a result, more hot spots have been created, thereby aggravating the already tense international situation. Throughout the 1970s the two super-Powers vied with each other for global hegemony, and the people of the world fought against hegemonism. Wherever hegemonism rears its ugly head, there is bound to be a struggle against it. The world has been beset with mounting contradictions and conflicts since the beginning of the 1980s.

88. In the past four years, no real progress has been made in disarmament despite the unceasing struggle waged by the people of the world. The objectives set forth in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session remain mere words on paper. This is because the two super-Powers are not at all sincere about disarmament and have instead stepped up arms expansion. They have started a new round of the arms race, each striving to improve or upgrade its own strategic and theatre nuclear weapons in order to gain superiority over the other. At the same time, they have been developing conventional armaments, vying for the control of strategic areas and stepping up war preparations. Each tries to justify its own arms expansion by that of the other, and this has led to mutual recriminations and accusations. It is only natural that their intensifying arms expansion and war preparations, which threaten international peace and security, have aroused strong world-wide opposition. In recent years the people of Europe, Japan, the United States and elsewhere have launched a mass movement against the nuclear-arms race of the two super-Powers and for preventing nuclear war. We fully understand and sympathize with their concern for peace and for the prevention of war.

89. As the arms race intensifies and the menace of war increases, the third world and other small and medium-sized countries demand all the more strongly that progress be made in disarmament and that results be achieved at this session. They are fully entitled to do so because they are always the first to suffer from the two super-Powers' rivalry and from the aggression and expansion by the hegemonists. For their own security they have had to expend scarce resources and meagre funds to strengthen their defence

capabilities, thus adding to their economic difficulties. They have raised their voices in calling for disarmament and have put forward many positive proposals and reasonable ideas, some of which have been incorporated in the draft comprehensive programme of disarmament before us. It is our opinion that these should be seriously considered and studied in the course of our deliberations.

90. Under the pressure of world public opinion against nuclear threat, the two super-Powers, even while starting a new round of the arms race, have repeatedly professed willingness for disarmament and come up with all kinds of proposals or programmes. How should we view such a phenomenon? Historical experience tells us that a party which gains the upper hand in an arms race would seek to freeze the *status quo* and maintain its superiority, while the party in an unfavourable position would try to change the *status quo*, catch up with the other and redress the imbalance. Now, one super-Power stresses that an arms freeze should come first, while the other insists on priority for arms reduction. They appear to be talking about the need to maintain a balance of arms, but in fact each side wants to attain supremacy and to strengthen its own position in the contest for world hegemony by means of a new round in the arms race.

91. In this regard, the posturing on the part of one super-Power is particularly noteworthy. Every year it produces an assortment of proposals or plans which are merely variations on the same theme. But what concrete actions has it really taken? None.

92. One is bound to ask the following questions.

93. Is it not ironic that the super-Power which pledged at the tenth special session that it "has never unleashed war, and . . . will never do so" [5th meeting, *pcra*. 58] turned around only one year later to send 100,000 troops to invade and occupy Afghanistan? Surely these troops were not sent there on a sight-seeing tour.

94. Why is it that this super-Power which talks glibly about prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons has always refused to undertake unconditionally to renounce the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States?

95. If this super-Power is truly willing to implement confidence-building measures in Asia, why does it not establish its credibility by withdrawing its troops immediately and unconditionally from Afghanistan and stopping its support for the aggression against Kampuchea?

96. This super-Power has been describing détente in such glowing terms. Why, then, has it effected such a dramatic increase in its nuclear and conventional armaments precisely during the so-called decade of détente? Either it was trying to promote détente by means of arms expansion, or it was carrying out arms expansion under the camouflage of détente.

97. Any cursory comparison between this super-Power's pronouncements and its actions will provide the right answer.

98. People often say that this super-Power is launching a "peace offensive" when it strikes a posture in favour of disarmament. We have a saying in China: it is the mark of a swindler always to present a respect-

able façade to cover up his misdeeds. The fact that this super-Power is so fond of such "peace offensives" does not mean it is genuine about disarmament, or that it is prepared to turn over a new leaf and abandon its policy of aggression and expansion. It is merely trying to cover up the truth, deceive the people of the world and divert their attention from the objectives of disarmament so that it can press on with its hegemonic policies of nuclear arms expansion, blackmail and war preparations.

99. The Chinese Government and people have always stood for genuine disarmament and made positive efforts towards progress in disarmament. Since the 1960s, the Chinese Government has put forward on a number of occasions its views and proposals on disarmament and on strengthening international security. We have always opposed the arms race and the threat or use of force in international relations, and we are against any country's carrying out aggression or expansion by means of superior military strength. We endorse the holding of talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on nuclear arms. We hope that they will adopt a serious and responsible attitude in the negotiations and produce an agreement that will genuinely help to curb the arms race and prevent the threat of a nuclear war. We hope they will not repeat the pattern of their past negotiations, which left them plenty of room for further improving and developing their respective nuclear arms instead of cutting them back.

100. In recent years, Chinese representatives have expounded the basic principles of the Chinese Government on disarmament issues at various disarmament meetings. I wish to take this opportunity to reaffirm them as follows.

101. First, efforts for disarmament cannot be separated from those for the maintenance of international security. They must be combined with those for the maintenance of world peace and security. In order to create a favourable climate and conditions for disarmament and to achieve real progress in this field, it is essential to uphold the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international relations. No country is permitted to seek any form of hegemony anywhere in the world. The use or threat of force against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of any State should be strictly prohibited.

102. Secondly, the two super-Powers should take the lead in reducing their armaments. Because they possess the greatest nuclear and conventional arsenals and because their rivalry and arms race are threatening international peace and security, they bear the primary responsibility for disarmament and should be the first to reduce their armaments. After they have substantially cut back their armaments, the other nuclear States and militarily significant States should join them and reduce their armaments according to a reasonable proportion and procedure.

103. Thirdly, nuclear disarmament should be carried out in conjunction with conventional disarmament. It is certainly important to take effective measures to achieve the objective of nuclear disarmament in view of the grave threat to mankind posed by nuclear war, but one should not overlook the fact that conventional arms are used in committing aggression

against or otherwise threatening other countries. Only a combination of measures for both nuclear and conventional disarmament can help reduce the danger of war. Simultaneously with nuclear and conventional disarmament, all other types of weapons of mass destruction should be banned.

104. Fourthly, small and medium-sized countries are all entitled to take what measures they deem necessary to maintain their defence capabilities for resisting aggression and safeguarding their independence. The measures and steps decided on at different stages of disarmament must not prejudice or endanger the independence, sovereignty and security of any State.

105. Fifthly, disarmament agreements should provide for strict and effective international verification. For the sake of building trust and ensuring full compliance by the signatories, such agreements should include effective verification measures. Sanctions should be applied in the event of any violation of the agreements.

106. Sixthly, all States may participate in the settlement of disarmament issues on an equal footing. As disarmament has a bearing upon the security and interests of all States, big or small, nuclear or non-nuclear, militarily strong or weak, every State is entitled to participate on an equal footing in the deliberations and negotiations on this matter and in supervising the implementation of the agreements reached.

107. In view of the strong demand of the people of the world for halting the arms race and preventing a nuclear war, and in conformity with my Government's consistent position on disarmament and the basic principles I just outlined, I should like to put before the Assembly the following essential measures for an immediate halt to the arms race and for disarmament.

108. All the nuclear States should reach an agreement not to use nuclear weapons. Pending such an agreement, each nuclear State should, without attaching any condition, undertake not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States or nuclear-weapon-free zones and not to be the first to use such weapons against each other at any time and under any circumstances.

109. The Soviet Union and the United States should stop testing, improving or manufacturing nuclear weapons and should reduce by 50 per cent all types of their nuclear weapons and means of delivery.

110. After that, all other nuclear States should also stop testing, improving or manufacturing nuclear weapons and should reduce their respective nuclear arsenals according to an agreed scale and procedure.

111. Conventional disarmament should be effected simultaneously with nuclear disarmament. As a first step, all States should undertake not to use conventional armaments for intervention or aggression against, or for the military occupation of, any country.

112. In our view, in order to achieve real progress in disarmament, it is essential to proceed from the present world armament levels and identify the main orientation, targets and objectives of disarmament and to take fair, reasonable and practical measures towards this end.

113. As the nuclear-arms race is continuing unabated and the stockpiling of nuclear weapons has reached a dangerous level of overkill and over-saturation, it is unrealistic to try to achieve general and complete nuclear disarmament overnight. Therefore, the first step in nuclear disarmament should be the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, to be followed by their progressive reduction and ultimate destruction. Since nuclear weapons are developed, tested and deployed for possible use, the danger of nuclear war will diminish if all nuclear States undertake not to use them. If the nuclear States refrain from threatening non-nuclear States and undertake unconditionally not to use nuclear weapons against them, then these States will have no need to possess nuclear weapons or seek foreign nuclear protection. If a nuclear State does not first ask itself whether it is posing any threat to non-nuclear States, but holds them responsible and demands that they undertake not to threaten it, would that not be as absurd as putting the cart before the horse?

114. It is certainly not sufficient just to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons. The possible use of nuclear weapons cannot be precluded merely by prohibition without taking further steps to reduce and finally destroy them altogether. This is why, in our opinion, the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons must be linked with their reduction and destruction.

115. It is our view that conventional disarmament should be effected simultaneously with nuclear disarmament. Given the immense destructiveness of a nuclear war and its grave threat to the security of mankind, it is understandable that people focus their attention mainly on opposing the nuclear-arms race and preventing the threat of a nuclear war. But one can assume only two circumstances in which a nuclear war may break out: either the nuclear Powers engage each other in a nuclear war from the very beginning, or they may begin by a conventional war which may escalate into a nuclear conflict. If we direct our efforts solely towards the prevention of a nuclear war and relax our vigilance against a conventional war, that may still leave open the possibility of the outbreak of a nuclear war. The super-Powers often use their conventional armaments as a means of aggression and expansion. Obviously, if we neglect conventional disarmament, we will not be effective in preventing the hegemonists from carrying out aggression and expansion by means of conventional arms.

116. Furthermore, we are of the opinion that priorities should be set for both nuclear and conventional disarmament. The two super-Powers should be the first to reduce their arms substantially, for they possess the biggest arsenals in the world, and only they are capable of waging a nuclear war. Since countries vary in size and military strength, should we require the stronger States to reduce their armaments so as to ensure the security of the weaker ones, or demand equal and simultaneous reduction of arms by all countries? In our view, the threat of war can be reduced only when the two super-Powers take the lead in substantially cutting back their nuclear and conventional armaments. This principle applies particularly to nuclear disarmament.

117. The views I have just outlined indicate the obligation China is prepared to undertake for disar-

mament. In point of fact, the Chinese Government has over a long time repeatedly pledged to the world that at no time and under no circumstances will China be the first to use nuclear weapons and that it undertakes unconditionally not to use such weapons against non-nuclear States. This amply shows the good faith of the Chinese Government on the question of disarmament. I would like to announce here that, if the two super-Powers take the lead in halting the testing, improving or manufacturing of nuclear weapons and in reducing their nuclear weapons by 50 per cent, the Chinese Government is ready to join all other nuclear States in undertaking to stop the development and production of nuclear weapons and to reduce further and ultimately destroy them altogether.

118. The basic principles of the Chinese Government concerning disarmament and the essential measures for disarmament I have just outlined emanate from China's foreign policy of peace.

119. The fundamental guidelines of China's foreign policy are to unite with the third world and all other peace-loving countries, to oppose hegemonism and to maintain world peace.

120. China needs an extended period of stability and peace in the international environment in order to attain the lofty goal of its modernization programme by the end of this century.

121. China is a developing country. We are devoting all our efforts to our economic development and construction to raise gradually the material and cultural well-being of our people. We have neither the resources nor the need to take part in any arms race; to do so would run counter to the wishes and interests of our people. Only in peace can our economic development go forward and our people's needs be satisfied.

122. China's social system and fundamental interests require that we pursue a policy of peace. We do not need war and we firmly oppose a new world war. China's armaments, including its nuclear capabilities, are entirely for the purpose of self-defence against foreign aggression.

123. China does not have a single soldier outside its own borders and never seeks any bases on foreign soil. Neither does it have any territorial ambitions. Our record shows that we were forced to act in self-defence only when a war of aggression was imposed on us. We will not countenance aggression or threats against ourselves, and we never pose any threat to others. We have been consistent in pursuing a policy of peace, so we are not afraid of mud-slinging and rumour-mongering against us. The lies about so-called Chinese "threats" cannot stand scrutiny.

124. Disarmament is, in the final analysis, a question of how to prevent war and maintain peace, so it is bound to attract the attention and arouse the concern of all peoples throughout the world. So long as the people of all countries unite in a persistent and relentless struggle against wars of aggression, it will be possible to maintain world peace. The people's struggle is a powerful impetus to disarmament and maintenance of world peace. Our task is to make concerted efforts for the achievement of genuine disarmament in conformity with the wishes of the people of the

world. We sincerely hope that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will achieve results and make contributions in this respect. The Chinese delegation is ready to work actively for the attainment of this goal together with the representatives of other countries.

125. The PRESIDENT: Under a decision taken by the Assembly at its second plenary meeting, I now call on the Secretary of State of the Holy See, His Eminence Cardinal Agostino Casaroli, to deliver a message which His Holiness Pope John Paul II has addressed to the General Assembly.

126. Cardinal CASAROLI (Holy See) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, Mr. President, may I express my gratitude to you for the profound kindness you have extended to me. I am sure that your experience and your wisdom will enable you to guide the work of this special session of the General Assembly to a most favourable outcome for the cause of disarmament.

127. I should also like to thank the General Assembly for having given me the honour and privilege of reading the message that His Holiness Pope John Paul II has sent to the Assembly:

"Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen representatives of Member States:

"In June 1978, when the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament met, my predecessor, Pope Paul VI, sent a personal message in which he expressed his hopes that such an effort of goodwill and political wisdom by the international community would bring the results that humanity had the right to expect.

"Four years later you are gathered here again to ask yourselves if those expectations have been at least partially realized.

"The answer to that question seems neither very reassuring nor very encouraging. If we compare the situation in the area of disarmament four years ago with that of today, there seems to be very little improvement. Some in fact think that there has been a deterioration, at least in the sense that hopes born of that period could now be described as mere illusions. Such a statement could easily lead to discouragement and impel those who are responsible for the fate of the world to look elsewhere for the solution to the problems of all kinds, general or particular, which continue to disturb the life of the peoples.

"That is how many see the current situation. Figures from various sources point to a serious increase in military expenditures, represented by a greater production of various types of weapons, along with which, according to specialized institutes, there is a new increase in the arms trade. Recently, the news media have given a great deal of attention to the research in and large-scale use of chemical weapons. Moreover, new types of nuclear weapons have also come into existence.

"Before an Assembly as competent as this one, there is no need to repeat the figures which this very Organization has published on this matter. It is sufficient as an indication to refer to the study according to which the sum total of military expenditures on this planet corresponds to an average of

\$110 dollars per person per year—a figure which for many people on this earth represents the income on which they live for that same length of time.

“Faced with that state of affairs, I must express my satisfaction that the United Nations has proposed to tackle the problem of disarmament once again, and I am grateful for the possibility so courteously extended to me to address some words to you on this occasion. I speak with the voice of one who has no political interest or power, much less military power, a voice which is again heard in this Hall as a result of your courtesy. Here, where the voices of almost all the nations of the world, great or small, come together, my words carry within them the echo of the moral conscience of mankind in the pure sense, if I may be permitted that expression. They are not affected by other concerns or interests which could mar their ability to bear witness or make them less credible.

“It is a conscience which is undoubtedly illumined and guided by Christian faith, but which is none the less profoundly human. It is therefore a conscience which is common to all men of sincerity and goodwill.

“My voice echoes the anguish and aspirations, the hope and fears of millions of men and women who, from every part of the earth, are looking to the Assembly and wondering whether, as they hope, some reassuring light will come forth from it or if there will be a new and more disturbing disappointment. Without claiming a mandate from all those people, I believe I can be the faithful interpreter to you of their feelings.

“My point of departure is based on a statement unanimously agreed upon not only by your peoples but also by the Governments you lead and represent: the world wants peace, the world needs peace.

“In our day, to reject peace means not only to provoke the suffering and the losses that—today more than ever—war, even a limited war, causes. It could also lead to the total destruction of entire regions, with the possible and probable threat of catastrophes of even greater, possibly universal, proportions.

“Those who are responsible for the lives of the peoples seem to be engaged above all in a frantic search for the political means and technical solutions which would make it possible to ‘contain’ the effects of conflicts. While forced to recognize the limits of their efforts in this direction, they persist in this course, believing that in the long run war is inevitable and above all that the spectre of a possible military confrontation between the major camps which divides the world today will continue to haunt the future of mankind.

“Certainly no Power and no statesman would admit to planning war or to wanting to take the initiative. But mutual distrust makes us believe or fear that others might harbour such plans or desires, so each seems to envisage no other possible solution than the preparation of defences sufficient to respond to an eventual attack.

“Many even think that such preparations constitute a way—even the only way—to safeguard peace

or at least most effectively to impede as far as possible the outbreak of conflicts, especially major conflicts which might lead to the ultimate holocaust of humanity and the destruction of the civilization that man has built so laboriously over the centuries.

“In this approach one can see the philosophy of peace proclaimed in the ancient Roman principle ‘*Si vis pacem, para bellum*’—‘if you want peace, prepare for war’. Put in modern terms, this ‘philosophy’ is labelled a ‘deterrent’, and one can find it in various guises in the search for a ‘balance of forces’, which has sometimes been called, not without reason, a ‘balance of terror’. As my predecessor Pope Paul VI put it, in the 3rd meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Tenth Special Session, ‘The logic underlying the quest for the balance of power impels each of the adversaries to seek to ensure a certain margin of superiority, for fear of being left at a disadvantage.’

“Thus in practice the temptation is easy, and the danger always present, to have the search for balance being converted into a search for superiority of a type that sets off the arms race in an even more dangerous way.

“In reality this is the trend which seems to continue to prevail today, perhaps in an even more accentuated form than before. You have made it your specific purpose in the Assembly to seek possible ways of reversing this trend.

“This purpose might seem in a sense to be minimal, but it is of basic importance. For only such a turn-about can raise the hope that humanity will commit itself to the path leading to the goal so desired by all, even if many still consider it Utopian: total, mutual, disarmament provided with such guarantees of effective control as to instil in everyone the necessary confidence and security. Thus this special session reflects another truth: as well as peace, the world wants and needs disarmament.

“All the work done in the Committee on Disarmament, in the various commissions and sub-commissions and within Governments, and the concern of the public attest to the importance being placed today on the difficult question of disarmament.

“The very convening of this session indicates a judgement: the nations of the world are already over-armed and over-committed to policies that strengthen this trend. Implicit in this judgement is the conviction that this trend is wrong and that the nations of the world committed to this path need to rethink their positions.

“But the situation is a complex one in which a number of values—some of the highest order—come into play. Divergent views may be expressed on it. We must therefore confront these problems realistically and honestly.

“That is why, above all else, I pray to God that He might grant you the strength of spirit and the goodwill that will be needed for you to complete your task and promote as far as you can the cause of peace, the ultimate goal of all your efforts throughout this special session. That is why my word is a word of encouragement and hope: of encourage-

ment that you will not let your energies sag before the complexities of the questions or the failures of the past and, unfortunately, of the present; of hope because we know that only people of hope can progress patiently and tenaciously towards goals worthy of the best efforts and towards the common good of all.

“Perhaps nowadays no other question touches so many aspects of the human condition as that of armaments and disarmament. It has scientific, technical, social and economic aspects. It also includes serious political problems which affect relations among States and among peoples. Our worldwide arms systems, furthermore, to a large extent influence cultural developments, but at the heart of them all there are spiritual questions which concern the very identity of man and his choices for the future and for the generations to come.

“Since the end of the Second World War and the beginning of the atomic age, the Holy See and the Catholic Church have had a very clear attitude. The Church has continually sought to contribute to peace and to build a world that would not have to resort to war to settle disputes. It has encouraged the maintenance of an international climate of mutual trust and co-operation. It has supported those structures likely to ensure peace, such as your Organization. It has called attention to the disastrous effects of war. As lethal means of destruction have increased, it has pointed to the dangers involved and, going beyond the immediate perils, it has indicated what values should be nurtured in order to foster co-operation, mutual trust, brotherhood and peace.

“As early as 1946, my predecessor Pope Pius XII referred, in his message to the College of Cardinals on 24 December, to ‘the might of new instruments of destruction’ which ‘returned the problem of disarmament to the centre of international discussion, with completely new aspects’.

“Successive Popes and the Second Vatican Council continued that consideration, adapting it in the context of new armaments and arms control. If men would bend to this task with goodwill ... if they had the goal of peace in their hearts and their plans, then adequate measures could be found and appropriate structures could be worked out to ensure the legitimate security of each people in mutual respect and peace. The arsenals of fear and the threat of death would then become superfluous.

“The teaching of the Catholic Church is clear and consistent in this area. It deplores the arms race; it calls for at least the mutual, progressive and verifiable reduction of armaments as well as for greater safeguards against possible errors in the use of nuclear weapons. At the same time the Church calls for independence, freedom and legitimate security for each nation.

“I should like to assure you that the constant concern and efforts of the Catholic Church will not cease until armaments are completely mastered and the security of all nations is guaranteed, and until the hearts of all are won over to the ethical choices that will guarantee lasting peace.

“I turn now to your current debate. We must recognize that no element in international affairs can be considered in isolation and separately from the multifarious interests of nations. However, it is one thing to recognize the interdependence of questions; it is another to exploit them in order to gain advantage on another level. Armaments, nuclear weapons and disarmament are too important in themselves and for the world to be made just part of a strategy which would exploit their intrinsic importance in favour of a policy or other interests.

“Therefore, it is important and right that every serious proposal that can contribute to real disarmament and that would create a better climate be given the prudent and objective consideration it deserves. Even small steps have a value which goes beyond their material or technical aspects. Whatever the area under consideration, today we need new perspectives and a capacity to listen respectfully and carefully to the honest suggestions of every responsible party in such a controversial area.

“In this context there is what I would call the phenomenon of rhetoric. In an area so tense and fraught with unavoidable dangers, there is no place for any type of exaggerated speech or provocative posture. Indulgence in rhetoric, in inflamed and impassioned vocabulary, in veiled threat and counter-threat or dishonest manoeuvres can only exacerbate a problem that requires sober and attentive examination.

“On the other hand, Governments and their leaders cannot conduct the affairs of State independently of the wishes of their peoples. The history of civilizations gives us frightening examples of what happens when that is tried. The fear and preoccupation of many groups in various parts of the world show that people are more and more frightened at the thought of what would happen if irresponsible parties were to unleash a nuclear war.

“Just about everywhere peace movements have been developing. In several countries, these movements have become very popular and are being supported by a growing sector of the public from various social levels, people of all age groups and backgrounds, especially the young. Their plans, proposals and policies vary greatly and can often lend themselves to partisan exploitation, but behind all these differences of form and shape is a profound and sincere desire for peace.

“May I also associate myself with your draft appeal to public opinion for the birth of a truly universal awareness of the terrible risks of war, an awareness that in its turn could lead to a general spirit of peace.

“In current conditions, deterrence based on balance—certainly not as an end in itself but as a stage on the way to progressive disarmament—may still be deemed to be morally acceptable. None the less, in order to ensure peace, one must not be satisfied with a minimum always susceptible to a real danger of exploding. What can be done? In the absence of a supranational authority of the type sought by Pope John XXIII in his encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, an authority which one would have hoped to find in the United Nations, the only

realistic solution to the threat of war remains negotiation.

“Here I should like to remind you of a beautiful expression of Saint Augustine, which I have already cited in another context: ‘Destroy war by words of negotiations, but do not destroy men by the sword’.

“Today before you I once again reaffirm my confidence in the power of straightforward negotiations to arrive at just and equitable solutions. Such negotiations require patience and diligence and must lead in particular to a reduction of armaments that is balanced, simultaneous and internationally controlled.

“To be more precise, the present development seems to lead to the increasing interdependence of types of weapons. In these conditions, how can one envisage a balanced reduction if negotiations do not cover the whole range of weapons? To that end, the continuation of the study of the comprehensive programme of disarmament which your Organization has already undertaken could facilitate the necessary co-ordination of various forums and give their results greater truth, equity and efficacy.

“In fact, nuclear weapons are not the only means of war and destruction. The production and sale of conventional weapons throughout the world is a truly alarming and evidently growing phenomenon. No negotiations on armaments would be complete were they to ignore the fact that 80 per cent of arms expenditures are devoted to conventional arms. Moreover, the traffic in these weapons seems to be developing at an increasing rate and to be directed most of all towards the developing countries. Every step, every initiative taken to limit this production and traffic and to submit them to ever more effective control would be an important contribution to the cause of peace. Recent events have confirmed the destructive power of conventional weapons and the sad plight of nations tempted to use them to resolve disputes.

“However, to focus on the quantitative aspects of armaments, both nuclear and conventional, is not enough. Very special attention must be paid to the refinement of these arms in the light of new and more advanced technologies, for this is one of the basic elements of the arms race. To overlook it would be to delude ourselves and to deal dishonestly with those who desire peace.

“Research and technology must always be placed at the service of man. In our day there is too frequent use and misuse of science and technology for other purposes. In my address to a UNESCO assembly on 2 June 1980, I spoke extensively to men of culture and science on this subject. Today may I be allowed at least to suggest that a significant percentage of the funds currently being expended on weapons technology and science be directed toward mechanisms and arrangements guaranteeing the life and the welfare of mankind.

“In his address to the United Nations during the twentieth session of the General Assembly, on 4 October 1965, Pope Paul VI stated a profound truth when he said: ‘Peace, as you know, is built

not only by means of politics and the balance of forces and interests. It is built with the spirit, with ideas, with works of peace.’ [1347th meeting, para. 36.]

“The products of the mind, ideas, the products of culture and the creative forces of peoples are meant to be shared. Strategies of peace which do not move beyond the scientific and technical level and which merely measure balances and verify controls will never be sufficient for real peace unless bonds that link peoples to one another are forged and strengthened. Create the links that unite people together. Build up the means that will enable peoples to share their culture and values. Put aside all petty interests that leave one nation at the mercy of another economically, socially or politically.

“In this same spirit, the work of qualified experts stressing the relationship between disarmament and development is to be commended for study and subsequent action. The prospect of diverting financial resources from the development of weapons to the development of peoples is not a new one, but it is no less relevant to the present for that, and the Holy See has long endorsed it. Any General Assembly resolution in that direction would be met with the approval and support of men and women of goodwill everywhere.

“The establishment of links between peoples means the rediscovery and reaffirmation of all values that strengthen peace and join people together in harmony. It also means the renewal of what is best in man, namely, that which seeks the good of others in fraternity and love.

“I should like to add one last point. The production and possession of weapons are the consequence of a moral crisis that is gnawing at society in all its aspects—political, social and economic. Peace, as I have repeated several times, is the result of respect for moral principles. To the extent that efforts at arms reduction and then at total disarmament are not matched by parallel moral renewal they are doomed in advance to failure.

“Efforts must be made to set our world aright and to eliminate the confusion in people’s minds sown by the pursuit of self-interest and privilege or by a defence of ideological claims. This is the task of the highest priority if we wish to progress in the struggle for disarmament. Otherwise we will remain in a make-believe world, for the root cause of our insecurity can be found in a profound crisis of humanity. It is worth while, by creating greater awareness of the absurdity of war, to create the material and spiritual conditions that will lessen glaring inequalities and restore to everyone the minimum of space that is needed for the spirit to be free.

“The coexistence of haves and have-nots is no longer tolerable in a world of rapid world-wide communications without engendering resentment that will turn to violence. Moreover, the spirit also has basic and inalienable rights. These rights are quite properly demanded in countries where people lack the space in which to live in tranquillity according to their own convictions. I call upon all

those who struggle for peace to commit themselves to this campaign to eliminate the true causes of man's insecurity of which the terrible arms race is one effect.

“Reversing the present course of the arms race therefore includes a parallel struggle on two fronts: on the one hand, an immediate and urgent struggle by Governments to reduce their armaments progressively and equitably; on the other hand, a more patient but none the less necessary struggle at the level of peoples' conscience to attack the ethical roots of the insecurity that breeds violence, namely, the material and spiritual inequalities in the world.

“Without prejudice of any kind, let us unite all our intellectual and spiritual forces—those of statesmen, of citizens, of religious leaders—to put an end to violence and hatred and to seek the paths of peace. Peace is the supreme goal of the activity of the United Nations. It must become the goal of all men of goodwill.

“Unfortunately in our days sad realities still cast their shadows across the horizon of international life and cause much suffering, destruction and worry which could cause mankind to lose all hope of mastering its own future in harmony and in the collaboration of peoples.

“Despite the suffering that besets my soul, I feel authorized, indeed obliged, solemnly to reaffirm before you and all the world what my predecessors and I myself have repeated so often in the name of conscience, in the name of morality, in the name of humanity and in the name of God:

“ ‘Peace is not a Utopia nor an unattainable ideal nor an unrealizable dream;

“ ‘War is not an inevitable calamity;

“ ‘Peace is possible, and because it is possible, peace is a duty—a very solemn duty, a supreme responsibility;

“ ‘Certainly peace is difficult, and it requires much goodwill, wisdom and tenacity, but man can and must make the force of reason prevail over the reasons of force.’

“So my last word is one of encouragement and of exhortation. And since peace entrusted to the responsibility of men remains even then a gift of God, it must also express itself in prayer to Him who holds the destinies of all peoples in His hands.

“I thank you for the activities you are undertaking to further the cause of disarmament, disarmament of the instruments of death and disarmament of minds.

“May God bless your efforts and may this Assembly remain in the history of the United Nations a sign of comfort and hope.”

128. The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary of State for the Holy See and should like to request His Eminence to convey to His Holiness Pope John Paul II the deep appreciation of all of us for the important and inspiring statement and message just read out to us by His Eminence Cardinal Casaroli.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43.

² A/CN.10/38. See also A/CN.10/51.

³ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.4.