



*President:* Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**General debate (continued)**

1. Mr. ORTIZ SANZ (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Please accept, Sir, the congratulations of the delegation of Bolivia on your unanimous election as President of this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Your personal and professional qualities have once again been demonstrated, and we all owe you our thanks for the efficient and fair manner in which you have been performing the tasks of the presidency.

2. At the end of the Second World War the States declared their determination to preserve peace and recognized their duty to do so in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. Ever since that time, representatives of Governments, many eminent persons, international experts and spokesmen for humanitarian and cultural institutions have, in this forum and elsewhere, affirmed the moral duty to renounce war and eliminate the threat of annihilation hanging over mankind. They have shown us that on the one hand the nuclear arsenals are a million times more powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima, and on the other that if only 1 per cent of world expenditures on armaments were applied to development, \$6 billion would be released to provide a better life in peace for the three quarters of mankind living in poverty, social frustration and political violence.

3. For 37 years the nations of the world have said in every imaginable way that mankind aspires to peace and repudiates war and that the way to this goal is through disarmament. But if we consider the armaments statistics for that same period we note that nuclear experiments and research, the development and production of atomic, chemical, radiological and other types of weapons and the open trade in conventional weapons have increased disproportionately and become more sophisticated. Hence we are faced with a quite inexplicable historical contradiction: while mankind speaks out in favour of peace and disarmament, some are perfecting armaments, producing them in incredible quantities and selling and distributing them in various regions according to the demands of strategy or ideology.

4. At its tenth special session, in 1978, the General Assembly completed the Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*], which was adopted by consensus and which set forth a Programme of Action [*ibid.*, *sect. III*], paragraph 109 of which speaks of "general and complete disarmament under effective international con-

rol, which remains the ultimate goal of all efforts exerted in the field of disarmament". Had the Programme of Action been carried out, it would have been more than enough to lay the foundation for significant and specific progress. Unfortunately, in the four years that have since elapsed, not only has the 1978 document been neglected and become a dead letter, but the increase in tensions between the major Powers has undermined its purposes. It can almost be said that multilateral efforts to achieve disarmament, the basic forum for which is the Assembly, will have to be considered a failure if the rhetoric of declarations is not replaced by concrete negotiations aimed at making commitment to disarmament mandatory.

5. The key question is: who must negotiate? Of the 157 States Members of the United Nations, two control 95 per cent of the nuclear arsenal. They and 10 other countries are the major producers and suppliers of conventional weapons. Some 20 industrial nations produce their own weapons and sell their surpluses. But there remain 120 other States, Members of this Organization, that do not produce weapons and that, in order to satisfy their defence needs in a world in which others are busy arming themselves, must invest in weapons a percentage of the precious resources needed for their economic and social development. Is it we, the developing countries, the unarmed countries without war industries, who must negotiate disarmament? Do we in any way bear responsibility for stopping the arms race and dismantling the truly monstrous nuclear and conventional weapons arsenals that have been accumulated? The answer is "No".

6. This being a time for broadening opposition throughout the world to the arms race, it is important to identify the nature of international responsibility for peace. Although all of us, great and small, are committed to disarmament as an antidote for war, the original responsibility, the true historical responsibility, is concerned with the arms race, and it falls squarely on the shoulders of about a dozen States. Do we want to disarm the peoples of the world? Let us begin by not arming them. International experience shows that mankind's morality has not kept pace with technological advances and that now it is not that wars demand weapons but that weapons demand war. Weapons are accumulating, creating a potential for making war, and as scientific and technical progress daily produces new and more deadly weapons, those weapons create pressure to wage war before they become obsolete. We would add that the chronic perpetuation of unjust international situations which negotiations have been unable to remedy promotes a diminution of confidence both in the process of the peaceful settlement of disputes and in the effectiveness of the bodies entrusted with the preservation of peace. Thus, some countries, suffocated by chronic

unjust situations, feel compelled to seek military solutions which could have been avoided by timely implementation of just settlements.

7. To meet the requirements of disarmament we must first and foremost tackle the problem of arms buildup and the restoration of international confidence in the peaceful and just settlement of disputes, for nothing in history will be lasting—least of all peace—as long as conflict situations based on colonialism or military plunder persist.

8. The weapons industry is a secret empire, but the traffic in arms is a visible daily reality. Just as minor “death merchants” become wealthy by selling smuggled machine-guns, there are States—some of them very great and prestigious—a good deal of whose annual income comes from weapons sales, sales that are made to both sides in a war, and sometimes on the same day. This traffic in arms, besides being good for economic activity which helps the major Powers to improve their balance of payments, deal with domestic unemployment and artificially stimulate production, is also the surest way of establishing hegemonic spheres of political influence and economic plunder. Those spheres of influence are secured by placing weapons—seemingly free of charge—into the hands of the developing countries on the pretext of helping them to defend themselves, but in fact to force them into inescapable strategic dependency through the special training of their armies, through supplying ammunition and through organizing either regional alliances or subversive movements, depending on the particular case, all sharing standard military features. When that has been done, the bill for the weapons is presented in the form of political commitments or contracts allowing transnational corporations to plunder the natural resources of the countries in question.

9. We shall not enter into a repetitive analysis of the traffic in arms. We shall just note that it is curious that the five permanent members of the Security Council, the organ entrusted with “the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security”, are, together with the Federal Republic of Germany and a dozen other European States, precisely those countries which claim to be the most concerned with the defence of human rights—the largest producers and sellers of weapons in the world. The United States, the Soviet Union, China, France and the United Kingdom have a grave reckoning with history in this matter. By manipulating balances of power which have to do only with their own power and their own interests, by moving the possible scenarios of war to other continents through the fiction of strategic borders so that the bombs will explode elsewhere, and by invoking their own security requirement which does not hesitate to sacrifice the security of others, the great Powers do not act in accordance with the moral responsibility that is theirs; they use their leadership not to serve mankind but so that mankind will serve them.

10. Peace and war, nuclear explosions which could destroy the whole human race, the dangerous and unequal hegemonistic supply of conventional weapons, chemical warfare, the saturation of the oceans and of outer space with nuclear weapons—these are all activities and plans that are in the hands of a half dozen States, whose planners seem to have accepted Spen-

gler’s conclusion that man is a beast of prey and that the future of mankind will be decided not by understanding but by the triumph of weapons.

11. It is those Governments—especially those of the United States and the Soviet Union—that have been appointed by history to discuss, achieve and guarantee general and complete disarmament. They must promote the establishment of zones of peace; promote disarmament commitments in regions where agreement is most feasible; strengthen the peace-making capability of the United Nations, firmly supporting the activities of the Secretary-General and stressing the responsibilities of the Security Council, among which I must note that set out in Article 26 of the Charter; provide the world Organization with effective military and financial means making possible rapid pacifying action in areas and times of conflict. They must regulate and limit the supply of conventional weapons to States, in accordance with a criterion of regional balance and commensurate only with the true security needs of each country; promote—at a cost which would be less than the cost of weapons—the economic and social development of depressed areas in order to stave off subversion and war. They should assume broad world responsibility for education and cultural dissemination aimed against war; co-operate with the emerging nations in their development plans and double the resources that they will have saved on military expenditures; and establish a standing committee, parallel to the Committee on Disarmament, to study and implement ways and means of increasing confidence. They should finalize the Geneva Protocol<sup>1</sup> on chemical weapons and conclude a far-reaching treaty on that subject and should keep outer space free of weapons, installations and systems of war, and they should do likewise in respect of the seas and sea-bed.

12. In addition, and above all, the responsible States should put a stop to nuclear testing, as a supplement to the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty. They should agree on a moratorium on the testing and production of nuclear weapons; promote nuclear disarmament on the basis of improving the SALT II Treaty; study an agreement to control the flow of nuclear materials at all levels in support of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and should promote the denuclearization of large regional areas following the example of the Treaty of Tlatelolco for Latin America. The major Powers should, without prejudice to the continuing of all efforts to achieve partial disarmament, endeavour to reach general anti-nuclear agreement. They should strengthen, clarify and expand verification procedures.

13. These are some of the duties that the Governments which have created weapons and are solely responsible for the nuclear threat should assume with the full force of their diplomatic resolve and all the wisdom of their specialized diplomats and negotiators. In enumerating these duties, all we have really done is to recapitulate modestly the debates that have taken place in the First Committee over the past 20 years.

14. The world community, including the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States, must provide guidance for their leaders. They must co-operate in the educational and informational aspects of this effort to achieve salvation and they must place their

trust in God. At this crossroads of history, it is for our generation to decide here and now, for tomorrow it may be too late, whether we wish to seek agreement in a civilized manner or whether we wish to leave mankind the virtually immediate legacy of a nuclear holocaust.

15. We wonder if men's desire for peace can be converted into a design for annihilation. Is it feasible to think, in the presence of an irresistible force, that, for political or other reasons, some people propose to embroil us in war? We venture to say yes, that there are certain vested interests, both political and financial, which thrive on the traffic in weapons and on hegemony, and that there are Governments in the East and the West which have a mandate for peace but serve the purposes of war. The naive and ancient theory that one must arm to preserve the peace—the Romans said *Si vis pacem, para bellum*—is unacceptable, for it involves a moral tautology. It is a way of saying that the sole guarantee that mankind has to protect itself from war is to have another war in readiness which could break out at any moment.

16. The historical crossroads of which I have spoken is so serious that we would be almost defenceless in the face of the arms race were it not for a new factor that has emerged in recent days: the peoples themselves, independently of established official positions, go out into the streets and demonstrate for peace. Everywhere in the world, in many major cities, including here in New York a few days ago, hundreds of thousands of people assemble and raise a cry for peace, expressing the conviction that the arms race, in addition to being a crime, is stupid because it solves nothing. If we do not heed that voice, then we, the representatives of the peoples, are not truly representing anyone and, if the Governments of the world do not heed their voice, then they will soon cease to be Governments.

17. In this connexion, it is apposite to recall the thought put forward by the Secretary-General at the opening meeting of this session on 7 June, when he said:

“This Assembly is no doubt a meeting place of Governments. Yet let us not forget that the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations begins with the words: ‘We the peoples’. While it is Governments that must take part in negotiations, their activities here are undertaken on behalf of the peoples—all peoples. The heavy responsibilities that representatives bear are, therefore, not solely to Governments but also to humanity itself. Enormous public concern and attention is now focused on the United Nations and on you, the representatives who have gathered here to consider these issues.”  
[1st meeting, para. 59.]

18. We are in complete agreement with this opinion. We are quite convinced that, even given the wayward actions of Governments, even given the hegemonistic designs, and the corrupt pressures and money of armaments consortia, there is a powerful force which can win the battle for peace: the peoples themselves.

19. As we represent Governments which abide by legal norms, we cannot agree with the concept of “civil disobedience”, but we venture to say that,

if any act of “disobedience” is acceptable in civilized life, it is anti-war disobedience. If we claim to represent here the opinions of peoples and not simply those of Governments, we must—without prejudice to contributing to the debate and drawing up resolutions and other documents required by the cause of disarmament—at least in the course of our deliberations express support for world-wide popular action that goes beyond the borders of countries and brings pressure to bear on Governments, calling on them to work for peace and put an end to the arms race. That is what the delegation of Bolivia is doing.

20. In connexion with what I have just said I must mention the least conspicuous but perhaps the most important part of the Programme of Action of 1978, to be found in paragraphs 99 to 108 inclusive of the Final Document. It includes various measures “In order to mobilize world public opinion on behalf of disarmament” and to disseminate information about “the danger represented by the armaments race”. It suggests “increased participation by non-governmental organizations” and calls for the avoidance of the “dissemination of false and tendentious information concerning armaments”. It also suggests the development of “programmes of education for disarmament and peace studies at all levels” and welcomes the plan of UNESCO to hold “a world congress on disarmament education”, pointing out that UNESCO has a duty “to step-up its programme aimed at the development of disarmament education as a distinct field of study through the preparation, *inter alia*, of teachers’ guides, textbooks, readers and audio-visual materials”. It also says that “Member States should take all possible measures to encourage the incorporation of such materials in the curricula of their educational institutes”.

21. If we give a moment's thought to cultural questions, we must agree that true disarmament, above material disarmament, is disarmament of men's minds, that is, the ultimate and positive conviction that all the problems of history can be resolved in a reasonable, just and peaceful manner. Although history has seen the bloodshed of innumerable wars, ultimately it teaches—by the short duration of solutions resulting from war by mankind's persistent search for peace—that man's destiny does not depend on military fanfares or on the defeat of one's enemies; it depends on the preservation of justice through understanding.

22. In addition to the legitimate pressure that peoples must bring to bear on Governments to impose their views about disarmament, it is essential that the nations of the world come together and instil in children and young people an unswerving commitment to peace. We must call on all those Governments that are responsible for the arms race to provide a logical answer to the problem of disarmament. I am referring to the two countries that account for 95 per cent of nuclear weapons and the other 10 that, while they speak of the defence of “human rights”, are the only ones to manufacture and sell weapons in order to benefit from the profits of that unacceptable traffic. The others, those that do not produce weapons and do not trade in them, must protest against war and try to organize our societies in such a way as to promote a desire for peace, trusting in justice and

refusing to submit to the immoral methods of the arms race.

23. I wish to repeat in this disarmament forum that the people of Bolivia, today more than ever, support the Argentine people, who have been victims of colonialist aggression. The Malvinas Islands are and will remain Argentine, because capitulations or treaties signed as a result of military victories have no legal validity, and history will repudiate and rectify them.

24. Mr. SRITHIRATH (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): It is generally acknowledged that there is a dialectical relationship between disarmament, international security and development. In present international circumstances, marked by the breakdown of the process of détente, the revival of the cold war and the acceleration of the arms race, disarmament has become, as almost all previous speakers have stressed, one of the most imperative tasks of the international community. The fact that the General Assembly has devoted two special sessions to the subject in the space of four years is undeniable proof of that.

25. Paragraph 13 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly [*resolution S-10/2*], which session was convened on the initiative of the non-aligned countries, states: "Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority". That Document also says, in paragraph 1, "the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, today constitutes much more a threat than a protection for the future of mankind. The time has therefore come to put an end to this situation . . . and to seek security in disarmament."

26. To that end, the Final Document advocated a number of measures designed to halt and reverse the arms race, measures that would ultimately lead to general and complete disarmament, under effective international control.

27. However, when we examine the realities of the past four years we cannot but note that there has been no concrete result and that the objectives defined in the Final Document appear more and more remote. In fact, the arms race, particularly the race involving nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, stimulated by certain war-minded and militaristic circles in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*], far from slowing down, is achieving a more frantic pace and is outstripping the efforts of peace-loving forces and countries to halt it. That was illustrated by, among other things, the refusal of the United States to ratify the SALT II Treaty, which was the fruit of long and arduous negotiations; the decision of the American Administration to make the neutron bomb; the programme of deployment of cruise missiles and medium-range or intermediate-range missiles in certain Western European countries; and attempts to acquire a "nuclear first-strike capability".

28. Along with this arms race, other factors of tension, such as the policy of confrontation, aggression and interference pursued by the forces of imperialism and international reaction against the socialist

and progressive developing countries, the decision to create rapid deployment forces to intervene in certain parts of the world in the defence of alleged vital interests and, above all, the proclamation of the doctrine of so-called limited use of nuclear weapons, thereby preparing the ground for nuclear war, have all helped to make international peace and security still more precarious and pose an ever-growing threat of such a war to mankind.

29. Although in certain cases the possession of arms can legitimately assist States in defending their independence or ensuring their security, for the imperialism and the other régimes under its sway, it is a means of aggression against other countries and peoples, in a word, a means of sowing death, suffering and desolation. The history of recent decades is replete with examples of this.

30. In the course of its war of aggression against the three peoples of Indochina, American imperialism used Indochina as a testing ground for its most destructive and sophisticated weapons, including napalm bombs and chemical weapons. Three million tons of bombs were dropped on my country, killing thousands of people, particularly civilians; towns and villages were wiped off the map and thousands of acres of rice paddy and forest were destroyed. My country still suffers from the grievous unhealed wound of this deluge of fire and blood.

31. In the Middle East, the barbaric Israeli aggression, with the weapons and support of Washington, against the Arab countries, particularly against Lebanon and the Palestinian people, has already caused great human and material losses. At this very moment when the Assembly is debating disarmament, the invasion of Lebanon is continuing and hundreds of innocent people are falling under the bullets and bombs of the Zionist invader, which flagrantly tramples under foot the relevant Security Council resolution calling for a cease-fire in that region.

32. In southern Africa, the racist Pretoria régime, confident of imperialist support, insolently persists in defying the international community by continually perpetrating acts of aggression and destruction against Angola, Mozambique and other countries. In order to perpetuate its illegal occupation of Namibia and its policy of *apartheid*, it is seeking, with the co-operation of Israel and certain Western Powers, to acquire nuclear weapons which, once in their hands, will thenceforth be a constant threat to the peace and security, as well as to the self-determination, of the peoples of the region.

33. Similarly, the war of aggression against Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands in order to maintain an anachronistic colonial status in that territory has caused useless loss of life and material damage and increased tension in that part of the world.

34. All that has been done with impunity thanks to the abuse of the veto by certain permanent members of the Security Council. We wonder, therefore, whether the results of this special session will be applicable in practice, or whether they will, in fact, come up against the same veto when it comes to protecting imperialist interests.

35. In that case, the credibility, integrity and effectiveness of the Organization—in which the confidence and hope of the peoples of the world are reposed as an effective instrument for the preservation of international peace and security—will surely be called into question.

36. With this mad and continuing arms race and the hotbeds of tension that are being ignited or fanned into flame in various parts of the world, international peace and security have never been so threatened as at this moment. Nevertheless, at the same time as this session of the Assembly was beginning, the sixth summit conference of the member countries of NATO, meeting at Bonn last week, adopted measures to strengthen the military potential of that alliance and to facilitate possible military deployment beyond its zone of operation, while in the United States, the Senate adopted for fiscal year 1983 a military budget of \$177.9 billion, \$54 million of which is earmarked for the manufacture of chemical weapons. This has given the Pentagon the green light to embark, *inter alia*, on the construction of two nuclear-powered aircraft carriers and a new generation of missiles which cannot be detected by radar.

37. The chemical arms race is something the Pentagon has been wanting and working towards for many years now, but it has encountered an obstacle, namely, American public opinion. People still remember the use of chemical weapons in Indochina by the United States Army during its war of aggression, and they still recall the terrible effects such weapons had on the environment. Thousands of American soldiers who were contaminated still suffer painful after-effects. In order to justify itself in the eyes of American public opinion and to divert the attention of world public opinion, the American Government has not shrunk from concocting fables about the alleged chemical war in Kampuchea and Laos. Furthermore, the American Government has never succeeded in furnishing any conclusive proof in support of its claims. The Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons rejected the conclusions of the American Government experts. To dispel doubt with regard to such gratuitous accusations, my delegation would like to give the Assembly the following facts.

38. During more than 30 years of struggle against colonialism and imperialism for the national liberation and independence of its land, the Lao People's Army of Liberation, made up of the valiant sons of our multinational people, always faithfully served the higher interests of that people. In that struggle, our army won the support of the entire Laotian people. This was strikingly proved by the overthrow of the former régime and by the creation, on 2 December 1975, of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, without a single drop of blood having been shed.

39. In the concluding moments of the war, our soldiers avoided as far as possible firing on the troops of the former régime, which numbered more than 40,000 and were armed by the United States and assisted by the "Vangpao special forces" in the pay of the American Central Intelligence Agency, because those soldiers were all their compatriots, their brothers. Our soldiers were fewer in number and less well equipped than they, but none the less they were

victorious. Since then, seven years have passed and our armed forces have been qualitatively and quantitatively strengthened. Hence, in fighting the meagre remnants of those special forces, which were managing to eke out an existence only in the uninhabited high mountain regions and thanks to acts of banditry, we had no reason to use chemical weapons. We preferred to leave those individuals to the hostility of the populace, which is the most effective sanction. Our Government has clean hands, unlike those of a certain so-called civilized Government which, while posing as a champion of human rights, still has on its conscience the burden of the memory of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the systematic destruction of the three countries of Indochina.

40. The General Assembly at its tenth special session recognized that the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war is the most urgent and pressing task confronting mankind today, because man finds himself in this cruel dilemma: either put an end to the arms race and make progress towards disarmament, or perish.

41. To put an end to the arms race and make progress towards disarmament we should, in the view of my delegation, proceed gradually to strengthen the process of détente, that is, to strengthen mutual confidence in relations between States on the basis of scrupulous respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which in turn would help to eliminate sources of tension and restore true peace.

42. It is therefore important to reduce arms to the lowest possible level, bearing in mind the principle of equality and equal security. With this in mind, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, on several occasions and in particular at the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and subsequently, have formulated some very constructive and realistic proposals which deserve to be considered attentively by the Assembly. For its part, the Lao People's Democratic Republic firmly supports those proposals.

43. The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, adopted by consensus by the General Assembly in 1978, contains principles and objectives of the disarmament strategy which are still valid. At this special session the Assembly should therefore strive to convince the nuclear Powers and the militarily powerful States to implement fully all the recommendations and decisions in that document so that a sincere and constructive dialogue aimed at limiting weapons, in particular nuclear weapons, can be started.

44. Within this context, my delegation believes that in order to prevent the spread of those weapons, all imperialist military bases such as those in the Philippines, Okinawa, South Korea, Diego Garcia, Guantanamo and elsewhere should immediately be dismantled and reinstalled in their respective countries, and the troops stationed in them should be withdrawn.

45. The Lao People's Democratic Republic is a small country which wishes only to live on good terms and in conditions of good co-operation with all countries, without distinction as to political or social system, in a world of peace and justice, so that it can devote itself freely to its economic and social development. However, this aspiration is always being thwarted by the

evil designs of those who hold power in Peking to annex the countries of Indochina and thereby give full rein to their great-Power expansionist and hegemonistic policy throughout South-East Asia. It was ironical to hear the statement made by their representative at the 8th meeting that "China does not have a single soldier outside its own borders and never seeks any bases on foreign soil". In this regard, there are some who still remember the Chinese aggression against Viet Nam in 1979. Nor should we forget that China is still occupying the Hoang Sa islands, over which Viet Nam has sovereignty, and that China is still training Lao exiles in its territory, massing several divisions of its troops along the Chinese-Laotian border and trying to destabilize the neighbouring countries.

46. In its hypocrisy the Chinese statement is reminiscent of that of a United States leader who said in the Assembly that the United States was never the aggressor, that it struggled to defend freedom and democracy and that America's military power had been a force for peace, not conquest. But the actions of the United States against the three peoples of Indochina and against Cuba and Nicaragua, and its support for Israel in massacring the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples and for the racist Pretoria régime in repressing the Namibian and South African peoples and committing aggression against the neighbouring countries, as well as its continued maintenance and strengthening of its military bases in various parts of the world, are proof of the opposite.

47. The countries which have been their victims are only too well aware of the meaning of "Chinese friendship" and the "pax Americana". This similarity of outlook and action between the Chinese and American leaders serves only to confirm one of our proverbs: "Birds of a feather flock together".

48. Only recently, Peking and Washington encouraged the members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN] to attempt to regroup the three reactionary Khmer exile factions into a so-called coalition government, with the sole aim of consolidating the already shaky position of so-called Democratic Kampuchea in the United Nations and thereby saving the face of its odious representatives. All that is only making the question of Kampuchea even more intractable.

49. For its part, my delegation believes that the most appropriate solution to that question is not to be found in references to some kind of resolution to which the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the authentic representative of the Kampuchean people, was not a party, but in sincere and constructive dialogue between the countries of Indochina and the ASEAN countries.

50. Since peace is the imperative of the hour and a source of life and hope for mankind, my delegation will associate itself with any initiatives or constructive and realistic proposal aimed at halting the arms race, promoting disarmament and strengthening international peace and security. It will also support all measures designed to diminish tension and increase confidence in relations between States. In this regard, my delegation warmly welcomes the solemn unilateral commitment of the Soviet Union, in a message from

President Brezhnev to the Assembly, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons [12th meeting, para. 73]. The American Government has maintained total silence on that subject. Such a commitment is a further living expression of the Leninist policy of peace pursued in its entirety by the Soviet Union, which is the first socialist country in the world, born at the very time when Lenin himself proclaimed the Decree on Peace. Socialism is therefore the very negation of war and the synonym of peace.

51. The Lao People's Democratic Republic is in favour of the creation of zones of peace in various parts of the world. In this context, it firmly supports the proposal of the Mongolian People's Republic for the conclusion between the States of Asia and the Pacific of a treaty of non-aggression and the non-use of force [14th meeting, para. 126].

52. Similarly, it reaffirms its support for the proposals of Madagascar and for the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [resolution 2832 (XXVI), annex] and hopes that the international conference which should agree on the application of that Declaration will be able to meet as soon as possible.

53. Although international relations at present are dominated by a climate of tension and threat of confrontation, it is nevertheless encouraging to note that there exist throughout the world forces for peace which are fighting to avoid a nuclear war. Peace demonstrations in various European capitals against the installation of Pershing II and cruise missiles, the anti-nuclear march in Western Europe and, just a few days ago, the demonstrations for peace and against the arms race in New York itself, which brought together many millions of people, are expressions of the feelings of people of good sense, responsible people anxious to ensure a peaceful future for themselves and their children. My delegation has profound respect for these peace fighters, because they have the courage to say publicly what the majority of people in the world are thinking privately.

54. Therefore, within the framework of the World Disarmament Campaign, the international community should encourage this peace movement, which is constantly growing. This would be one sure guarantee of the prevention of nuclear war.

55. In the same context, my delegation welcomes the forthcoming resumption at Geneva of official negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear weapons and hopes that they will yield tangible results which will help remove the spectre of nuclear war hanging over mankind.

56. Mr. STREET (Australia): A great deal has changed in the world since the General Assembly met in its first special session on disarmament four years ago. It could not be said, however, that the changes that have occurred have made the world a safer place. The expansion of nuclear and conventional arsenals remains unchecked. There is a growing impatience that the limited achievement of arms control and disarmament diplomacy has not been enough.

57. Where open societies protect the rights of the individual and freedom of speech, there are widespread

popular demands from people in all walks of life for progress towards disarmament. Australia understands and sympathizes with these hopes and fears and shares fully the concerns for early and identifiable progress towards effective measures of disarmament.

58. We suspect that a majority of countries in which the rights of the individual and freedom of expression are suppressed may also support the goals and objectives of disarmament. Unfortunately, even while we have been meeting in New York there have been disquieting reports of actions by at least one Government against those of its citizens who have sought to express views on disarmament through peaceful demonstrations.

59. One of the most important challenges facing the disarmament movement in free countries is to find a way of joining its voice with similar expressions of opinion which are struggling to make themselves heard from within closed societies.

60. There is a risk that by their popular appeal, mass peace movements may divert attention from real arms control and disarmament measures. Leaders and the rank and file of disarmament movements must focus on real issues and practical solutions acceptable to the countries they claim to represent.

61. It would be the ultimate irony if the main beneficiaries of such movements in open societies were the Governments of countries in which such values and ideals are completely suppressed. It should be our objective at this special session to see that the hopes and aspirations of the millions of men and women seeking genuine measures of arms control and disarmament are fulfilled.

62. A moment ago I referred to the goals and objectives of disarmament. It is perhaps because these goals and objectives seem to us to be so obvious that there is a tendency to over-simplify them. We now hear, for example, calls for unilateral measures which on the surface are appealing; yet the practical effects of such measures are often quite contrary to expectations. Freeze proposals which merely confirm existing nuclear and conventional superiority undermine the confidence needed for real arms control. The world is already over-armed. Freeze proposals will only perpetuate this state unless they are accompanied by verifiable reductions in both conventional and nuclear weapons. We do not believe, either, that the "take it or leave it" approach provides any solution. Effective arms control can result only from genuine negotiations, not from empty gestures.

63. A clear relationship exists between disarmament and arms control and national security. No State will ever enter into arms control or disarmament agreements if it believes that by doing so its security is threatened. Arms control and disarmament depend on international confidence and mutual trust. Events in Afghanistan, Poland, the South Atlantic and the Middle East make this very difficult to achieve.

64. There can be no progress in the disarmament field unless there is confidence that commitments entered into will be respected and discharged and can be verified. Above all, proposals need to be realistic and to contribute to building confidence.

65. Australia has sought to play a constructive role in the area of arms control and disarmament. The task before us is to further the objective of disarmament. We are not asked to negotiate treaties—that is a task for other bodies, such as the Committee on Disarmament—but we do have a responsibility to identify problems, define priorities, set goals and find ways of achieving them.

66. I shall refer now to the nuclear-arms race on the one hand and the peaceful development and use of nuclear energy on the other. Forty years ago it was recognized that the power of the atom could serve the cause of peace as well as the purposes of war. Efforts were made, notably by the United States, to separate and to keep separate the peaceful from the warlike. However, both involved the same form of energy and essentially the same technology. The energy of the atom can provide civilizations with power for warmth and light. It can also destroy civilizations. These two aspects of the atom—its peaceful and non-peaceful uses—are essential to the non-proliferation régime negotiated during the 1960s, to which the great majority of States now subscribe. The purpose of that régime is to guard against the proliferation of nuclear weapons and at the same time to establish satisfactory international conditions for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

67. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] is the main, though not the only, international instrument regulating nuclear activities. It recognizes that while a few States already have nuclear weapons the great majority do not. It requires that the latter should renounce the intention of acquiring them. The Treaty gives responsibilities to each group. It specifically acknowledges that voluntarily accepted restraints by non-nuclear-weapon States would not prevent access to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Well over 100 non-nuclear-weapon States have now acceded to the Treaty. They have thus entered into an international legal commitment not to acquire nuclear weapons or any other nuclear explosive device in any manner whatsoever. By attracting additional adherents each year the Treaty continues to demonstrate its vitality and relevance. Australia welcomes recent accessions to the Treaty and looks forward to its universal acceptance.

68. There remains a small minority of States with nuclear programmes which do not accept the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Their unwillingness to accept a legally binding commitment to non-proliferation, which the overwhelming majority of States have accepted, is for them to explain. The lack of confidence about their nuclear ambitions and the implications this has in regional and global terms is of concern to all nations.

69. Yet, despite the actions of a minority, acceptance of the non-proliferation régime by a large and growing number of States means that the régime is developing into a part of customary international law. Indeed, its key provisions are observed even by States which have not so far acceded to the Treaty itself. Some of those States have freely chosen to accept full-scope safeguards on their nuclear activities. They have agreed to apply the principle of verification and to enter into legal commitments not to carry

nuclear programmes beyond the strictly peaceful. That is cause for hope. But there are strong pressures which challenge the non-proliferation objective. One such pressure is the temptation to develop civilian nuclear facilities towards, but stopping just short of, the capacity to produce nuclear weapons. Another is the possible undermining of non-proliferation principles by the failure of some suppliers and customers to apply full-scope safeguards to all nuclear transactions. Those and other pressures sometimes come from inside the régime and sometimes from outside it.

70. The nuclear non-proliferation régime can and should be strengthened. That is the responsibility of each member of the international community. Regrettably, several States have not made the contribution they could make to international confidence, and thus to international peace and security, by accepting the obligations of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

71. Australia respects the right of States to protect their legitimate security interests. However, we believe that the spread of nuclear weapons leads to situations of insecurity and dangerous instability. Australia considers that we must all continue to strive for universal adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

72. We must also continue to strengthen and extend the IAEA safeguards system. That is vital to the practical operation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and provides a working international system of verification. It is essential for the creation of the climate of confidence on which the non-proliferation undertaking depends. The second special session devoted to disarmament must identify and devise measures to maintain the integrity and vitality of the régime.

73. Australia is already playing a constructive part in these efforts by applying strict full-scope safeguards set out in published agreements to all its nuclear transactions with other countries. Our policy is consciously designed to strengthen non-proliferation efforts to further the goal of universal adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

74. I referred earlier to the fact that the Non-Proliferation Treaty imposes responsibilities on both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States. A common obligation on all parties is that they negotiate an early end to the arms race and achieve nuclear disarmament. Nuclear disarmament has to begin with nuclear-weapon States themselves, and in particular with the two super-Powers. Thus those States bear a special responsibility.

75. The Australian Government welcomes the agreement of the United States and the Soviet Union to undertake negotiations on reduction of their intermediate-range and strategic nuclear weapons. The Government of Australia in particular welcomes the initiative of the President of the United States which led to a joint commitment by both Governments to work towards substantial reductions in these forces. These developments hold out the prospect of becoming important steps towards real disarmament. Australia hopes for a steady broadening of dialogue between those two States on nuclear matters, and I urge all Governments to give their full support to the steps now being taken.

76. In acknowledging the primary role and the obligations of the nuclear-weapon States for nuclear disarmament, Australia is at the same time well aware that multilateral disarmament measures are also essential. The issues at stake bear directly on the safety and security of every member of the international community.

77. Australia remains convinced that an item of highest priority on the disarmament agenda is the need to conclude a comprehensive and fully verifiable nuclear-test-ban treaty. Such a treaty would reinforce non-proliferation efforts by checking the development and acquisition of nuclear weapons by States which do not now possess them, and it would curb the continuing expansion of existing nuclear arsenals. We accept that important aspects of a test-ban treaty relate to strategic nuclear matters under negotiation by the nuclear-weapon States. We hope that these too will be soon agreed.

78. In the meantime, Australia considers that the wider international community, through its representatives here at the United Nations in New York and in the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva, also has a part to play in this process. In this context, we are encouraged by the decision of the Committee on Disarmament to establish an *ad hoc* working group to deal with verification aspects of a nuclear-test ban [A/S-12/2, para. 38].

79. Australia's representatives in the Committee on Disarmament will continue to play an active role in that work. On the question of verification of a comprehensive test ban, I would draw attention to the valuable technical work which is being done by the *Ad Hoc* Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, which has been reporting to the Committee on Disarmament. Australia will also maintain its active participation in the work of that group. We shall therefore consider favourably any proposal that Australia provide the site of one of the data centres which will need to be established to monitor a comprehensive test-ban treaty by seismic means.

80. Nuclear testing continues to be conducted in the South Pacific, although there has been no testing in the atmosphere since 1974. Australia has joined the other Governments of the South Pacific Forum in "strong condemnation of testing of nuclear weapons or dumping or storage of nuclear wastes in the Pacific by any Government as having deleterious effects on the people and environment of the region". Australia will maintain its strong backing for a comprehensive test-ban treaty which would outlaw nuclear testing by all States in all environments. That would go a long way towards satisfying the concerns of the countries of the region.

81. Another subject requiring urgent action is that of a comprehensive convention to ban chemical weapons. The very notion of such weapons is abhorrent. There is a constant temptation to use them against less well-equipped adversaries, and thus the unsuspecting and the unprotected are the most vulnerable. Reports that chemical weapons have been used in Afghanistan and Indochina persist. That is very disturbing. A ban on chemical weapons would overcome the deficiencies



in the Geneva Protocol of 1925<sup>1</sup> and the biological weapons Convention of 1972 [*resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex*].<sup>2</sup> Such a ban would, of course, have to be fully verifiable.

82. The recent declaration by the Soviet Union indicating that it now accepts the principle of on-site chemical weapons inspection should be acknowledged as an encouraging step.

83. The Committee on Disarmament already provides a forum for negotiating a ban on chemical weapons, and it resumes work on the subject on 20 July. This special session of the General Assembly can, nevertheless, itself contribute to progress by reaffirming the resolute opposition of the international community to these abominable weapons.

84. Within the Committee on Disarmament, Australia will continue to be active in the discussions of a chemical weapons convention, particularly the issues involved in verification. For example, Australia participates through a terminal located near Sydney in the "recover" project for the remote-control verification of nuclear installations. That IAEA experience could have relevance in the chemical weapons area.

85. A further goal for this special session is a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Important preliminary work has been carried out at Geneva. That has identified for us the main issues on which we need to secure agreement. Work has already begun at this special session, but there remains a wide diversity of views within the United Nations which need to be reconciled. The Australian delegation will continue to work actively towards that end.

86. Australia also believes there is an urgent need for progress in reducing the conventional arms race. Far too high a proportion of the world's scarce resources is devoted to unnecessary purchases of conventional arms. The special session must tackle this problem because of its impact on security and because of the waste involved in countries acquiring arms beyond their legitimate defence requirements. Studies by the United Nations have shown that excessive expenditures on arms are a serious drain on resources which would otherwise be available for social and economic development. Countries in the developed world have the grave responsibility of curbing this appalling waste.

87. There is also a substantial black-market trade in arms. This clandestine traffic has undoubtedly played a part in the growth of international terrorism. Australia imposes rigorous controls on the export of arms to other countries and calls on other nations to do likewise.

88. One step taken since the last special session on disarmament was the conclusion in 1980 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.<sup>3</sup> This is encouraging, and Australia has signed that Convention.

89. Useful work has also been done by the Disarmament Commission in preparing guidelines for a study on conventional disarmament [*A/S-12/3, annex III*], to be undertaken by the Secretary-General with the assistance of a group of qualified experts. Those guidelines

deserve close study. They note that States with the largest military arsenals, as well as other militarily significant States, have important responsibilities. They point out that reductions must be balanced and equitable so as to ensure the right of every State to security and to guarantee that no single State or group of States gains unilateral advantage. The guidelines also focus on verification and note that confidence-building steps between States contribute to progress in conventional disarmament.

90. References in the guidelines to regional factors are also of interest. Tensions often develop and feed on each other in specific regions. Sometimes the tension can be eased by international action, for example, in the Security Council. Long-term solutions, however, may frequently best be achieved at the regional level. The regional settlement of disputes should be more actively pursued and promoted.

91. In this context, confidence-building measures can cost little. At the same time, they can make a valuable contribution in political, security and economic terms. Such measures need to be better appreciated and more energetically pursued.

92. Australia supports the concept put forward by ASEAN of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia. Australia also subscribes to the objective of establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and will continue to contribute actively to the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean, set up for that purpose.

93. I have suggested that confidence and trust among nations is essential to any success in arms control and disarmament negotiations. Accordingly, the overall international political climate shapes the prospects for disarmament.

94. Arms control and disarmament agreements which are not transparent—that is, which do not contain proper measures of verification and compliance—are inadequate and defective. Also, agreements which restrict information about military expenditures and the size and scope of military arsenals ultimately run the risk of failure.

95. Arms control and disarmament proposals must always be realistic and must take full account of the need for States to be confident that such agreements do not impair basic national security.

96. Unrealistic proposals discredit the cause of arms control, for in the end we will be judged on what we actually achieve, not simply on declarations and resolutions, however high their motives. The fact is that disarmament proposals must be developed against the background of the Soviet Union's massive and sustained buildup over many years.

97. The international arms control and disarmament agenda cannot ignore such facts. For it is only when States are able to feel secure and have confidence about the intentions of other States that reliance on arms, and their use, will be reduced.

98. These realities may not be palatable to some. But existing international tensions cannot be wished away or papered over. Effective disarmament negotiations will necessarily be protracted and difficult if agreement is to be reached on practical, concrete and carefully negotiated proposals.

99. In summary, Australia considers that this special session should give priority to the following: first, a halt to the nuclear-arms race; secondly, revitalizing and strengthening nuclear non-proliferation efforts; thirdly, a comprehensive and fully verifiable ban on nuclear tests; fourthly, an effective and verifiable ban on the production, use and storage of chemical weapons; fifthly, drawing up a comprehensive programme of disarmament; sixthly, measures to encourage a reduction in the conventional arms race; and seventhly, the development of a framework for building confidence and trust.

100. If we are to achieve those objectives, we shall have to marshal the political will of the peoples represented in the Assembly. Australia is committed to working with others for this high purpose.

101. Mr. AL-QASIMI (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): On behalf of the United Arab Emirates, I should like to express to you, Sir, my congratulations on your election as President of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Your election as President of this important session, which deals with the destiny of all mankind and its survival or destruction, demonstrates the confidence that the international community places in your ability, wisdom and wise leadership.

102. Four years ago, the General Assembly held its first special session devoted to disarmament. The result of that session was the adoption of a Declaration and of a Programme of Action [*resolution S-10/2, sects. II and III*] for general and complete disarmament. At this twelfth special session we have a duty to evaluate the implementation of the results of that session within the framework of existing international relations and in the prevailing international climate.

103. Unfortunately what we note primarily since that session until now is a continuous escalation in military expenditures. Expenditures for 1981 amounted to more than \$600 billion. That is an increase of \$200 billion over the figure for 1978. Today, the nuclear warheads in the United States and the Soviet Union, taken together, total 16,000, which is an increase of 2,000 over the number possessed by the two super-Powers in 1978. These warheads alone can destroy any city in the world eight times over.

104. The treaty banning nuclear weapon tests which aims to ban all nuclear explosions in all parts of the world has not yet been finalized. No progress has been made in the current negotiations between the NATO States and the Warsaw Pact States on the reduction of military forces. To all of that should be added the freeze in the implementation of the agreement on the limitation of strategic weapons, a subject already covered in the Treaty already concluded between the two super-Powers.

105. In a word, the last four years, marked by these negative events, have been characterized by a deterioration in international affairs and political destabilization, as shown by the large number of violations of the Charter of the United Nations, invasions, military occupations, interference in the internal affairs of other countries and violations of human rights.

106. The reduction of armaments and disarmament can take place only in a climate of political stability and mutual confidence, in other words only with international peace and security. Experience has shown that peace cannot be achieved while military confrontations exist.

107. The destructive capacity of conventional and nuclear weapons, both qualitatively and quantitatively, has completely changed all our concepts about war and defence. In the event of a world-wide nuclear war, all nations would feel its destructive effects, and it would be difficult to say who were the winners or the losers, if indeed there were any winners, for everyone would lose.

108. It would be vain to speak about disarmament, mutual trust and security without taking into account those who promote instability and resort to aggression in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

109. Israel heads the list. It is the trouble-maker in our part of the world which has committed and continues to commit aggression against the Palestinian people and Arab States, thereby violating the purposes and principles of the Charter and the norms and rules of international law. It is not surprising that the most recent Israeli aggression against Lebanon is taking place during this session, whose purpose is to establish a sound basis for international peace and security, for Israel understands only the language of force. It believes solely in the use of weapons and has recourse only to treachery and aggression.

110. I shall not review Israel's history, which is replete with acts of aggression and violation of the Charter since its creation. I shall only recall what has happened during the past 12 months. This will be sufficient proof of the aggressive nature of Israel, its contempt for all ideals, all principles of law, morality and human rights.

111. In June 1981 Israel committed a flagrant act of aggression against Iraq, destroying its nuclear facilities which were being used for peaceful purposes. In July of the same year Israel intensified its barbaric incursions against the civilian populations in southern Lebanon and Beirut, which resulted in thousands of dead and wounded. In December 1981 it annexed the Syrian Golan Heights, thereby violating the Charter and the fourth Geneva Convention and flouting international opinion, which condemned that aggression.

*Mr. Amega (Togo), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

112. At the beginning of this year Israel dismissed the mayors of certain towns on the occupied West Bank, disbanded the town councils and subjected the Palestinian citizens to intimidation and persecution, leaving dozens of dead and wounded as a result. Last but not least, Israel has launched large-scale savage attacks against Lebanon, occupying one quarter of Lebanese territory and killing and maiming thousands of Lebanese and Palestinians. Hundreds of thousands have been left without shelter. Several Lebanese cities and villages and Palestinian camps have been totally destroyed.

113. This aggression is continuing even today, for the Lebanese and Palestinians are being subjected day in and day out to barbaric bombing from the land, sea

and air. In Lebanon what is happening is a systematic massacre, in which all mankind will be implicated if it closes its eyes to Israel's crimes. Israel could not, of course, have committed all these acts of aggression had it not been for the immense arsenal provided by the United States and the political, diplomatic, economic and financial support of the American Government.

114. Israel has imposed conditions for its withdrawal from Lebanese territory. But does any State have the right to impose by force, intimidation and occupation any conditions that suit it?

115. What about the principles of law and justice, which are the real *raison d'être* of the Organization and specify that anything based on the use of force, pressure or intimidation is invalid and that the aggressor must not be rewarded for his aggression? And what is the American Administration's position today? What change has occurred in its position since the Security Council meeting of only 20 days ago, when its representative, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, said "We must not allow force to triumph"?

116. Here we must ask the American Government if it considers Israel's barbaric acts of aggression against Lebanon, the killing of thousands of innocent people, the destruction of cities and occupation are or are not acts of aggression. If they are, in the view of the United States, then that country as a major Power must pressure Tel Aviv to withdraw immediately and unconditionally, so that its deeds are in keeping with its words.

117. But if the United States does not feel that these acts of aggression are a crime, if the United States accepts Menachem Begin's theories regarding self-defence, then the situation becomes confusing, for it would be difficult to determine who the aggressors are: the United States or Tel Aviv, especially since the weapons of death used by Israel are gifts from the United States.

118. The purpose of this session devoted to disarmament is not just to reduce the numbers of weapons; it is also to prevent the use of those weapons. Do we not therefore have the right to ask whether the United States has respected the purposes of this session? That question must be asked in the light of Israel's continuing acts of aggression.

119. Do we not also have the right to ask why the United States cannot apply its own laws in the case of Israel? United States law says that American weapons must be used only in self-defence. Do we not have the right to ask too in what conditions the United States might cease to supply Israel with these sophisticated weapons, which are being used to exterminate the Palestinians and to humiliate the Arab States?

120. At this session we are discussing arms reductions. Should the United States not reduce its supply of arms to Israel? Or does the United States hold that Israel is an exception, that it is above United States law?

121. What is true in the Middle East is also true in Africa. In Africa too there is a racist State which is acquiring nuclear weapons to intimidate the African continent and to deprive the peoples of Namibia and

South Africa of their right of self-determination. We believe that the peace and security of Africa demand the disarmament, both nuclear and conventional, of the racist régime, so that that continent and those peoples may enjoy real peace and real security.

122. I should like in conclusion to say that mankind has suffered greatly in the past from circumstances and challenges similar to those of today. It has been said that identification of a problem is half its solution. We shall continue to consider here how to identify problems so that we may live in peace. Now that the problems are known, has the time not come to remedy and eliminate them, so that coming generations will not be the victims of our errors and our indifference?

123. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): Four years ago we convened here in the first special session devoted to disarmament. We met then with high hopes and aspirations, sharing a common perception of the dangers of war and a determination to act in concert to banish war as an option in inter-State relations. Our deliberations in 1978 culminated in the adoption of a Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] which embraced a set of principles, a Programme of Action [*ibid.*, *sect. III*] and institutional measures to attain the laudable and far-reaching goals we had set ourselves.

124. Today, as we meet in this second special session devoted to disarmament, the optimism and hopes of 1978 have given way to a sense of profound disappointment and generalized worry. As we survey the international scene, we must sadly remark a growing tendency to resort to policies of confrontation and force and to argue the efficacy of the military option in the settlement of inter-State disputes and controversies, in selfish drives for the fulfilment of territorial ambitions and in efforts by some major Powers to impose ideological conformity on smaller countries. Force of arms is persistently advocated as a solution to philosophical differences and for the advancement of geo-strategic interests. The use of force, in a word, is perceived by a growing number of States as the transcending determinant for the achievement of national interests.

125. These manifestations of heightened instability and tension have developed in clear contradiction with the goals of the tenth special session as enshrined in the Final Document. Even as the United Nations struggled to make these goals a reality, weapons accumulated faster, and their sophistication and over-kill capacity increased many times over. And we now live under the clear and ever-present danger of extinction through nuclear holocaust. In fact, this twelfth special session has been convened against the background of war in more than one region of the world—and all this nearly four decades after the signing of the Charter of the United Nations, the first purpose of which was to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

126. But it is not only in the fact of war that the nations of the world have failed to live up to the promises and commitments of 1978. Regrettably, in every area of disarmament activity the picture is one of disillusioning failure. In fact, we have retrogressed.

127. World military expenditure continues inexorably to grow: whereas in 1978 some \$400 billion was expended on armaments world-wide, by 1981, and at current prices, that figure had risen to between \$600 billion and \$650 billion. We can expect even further growth in the years ahead now that so much emphasis is being placed on renewing strength. At a time of deep-rooted difficulties in the world economy, trade in arms continues to be an area of dynamic growth. The 1982 Yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute noted that while world trade in general grew by only 70 per cent over the past decade, the volume of sales of major weapons to third world countries increased by over 300 per cent. The major Powers, with the notable exception of China, have been devoting increasing amounts of their economic and other resources to the development and deployment of armaments, both nuclear and conventional. Newer and ever more deadly nuclear-weapons systems are being developed by the main nuclear Powers, as if they did not already possess a panoply of strategic arms that could destroy the planet several times over.

128. While the irrational rush to armament continues apace, there has been a deplorable hiatus in the negotiating process, at both the bilateral and the multilateral level, to control and eventually to reduce arms.

129. The manifest failure of the disarmament process so far cannot be divorced from the current international situation. At one level, that of super-Power relations, we have seen since the start of the 1980s the collapse of the limited détente, one highlight of which was SALT I, inaugurated in the early 1970s. The language of reasoned discourse has given way to the rhetoric of confrontation. In the tense atmosphere of super-Power relations, the facile expedient has been to increase military spending and to deploy more sophisticated weapons systems, which in turn has led to a deepening of the crisis in the relations between the super-Powers.

130. This climate of crisis in the relations between the super-Powers is even manifested in renewed efforts to hark back to an anachronistic and unacceptable system of hierarchical relations founded on ideological conformity, spheres of influence and bloc politics, domination and subordination. In pursuance of strategic objectives, the military option has been elevated as a primary element of foreign policy. In the charged ideological environment of the time, repeated efforts are being made to manipulate local situations of conflict to suit narrow ideological purposes and to cast struggles for justice and a better life to the mould of an East-West confrontation.

131. These are only some of the factors that have frustrated the commitment of the international community to disarmament. In general, the unsettled nature of the international situation has led to the intensification of national insecurities and to the resulting, though self-defeating, urge to seek security through armaments.

132. If there is one lesson in all this, it is that progress towards disarmament cannot be achieved in circumstances of conflict and mistrust. It is a truth that the non-aligned countries have consistently maintained,

that disarmament can be constructed only on a foundation of co-operation, confidence and mutual trust and in a climate of strengthened international security. A special responsibility therefore devolves on all States, in particular the major Powers, to abide in their international relations by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and by the various decisions of the General Assembly concerning peaceful, friendly relations among States, as articulated in such documents as the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV), annex*] and the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States [*resolution 36/103, annex*].

133. States must positively seek the development of friendly relations with other States, and the threat or use of force in their international relations must be ruled out as an option. The peaceful settlement of disputes must not be merely a guiding principle; it must be made an essential and overriding aspect of State behaviour.

134. These principles of State behaviour are being flagrantly violated in a number of local situations in various parts of the world. The international community needs to take effective action to alter the attitudes which lie behind these violations in order to ensure that these situations, by their continuation, do not serve as a source of encouragement for other violations in the same or in other parts of the world, to the detriment of peace and security.

135. In this context, the international community must intensify pressure on the Pretoria régime for the dismantling of the odious system of *apartheid*, which ruthlessly oppresses the black majority populations of South Africa and Namibia, and for respect by that régime for the political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbours.

136. We must also reaffirm our support for the Palestinian people and for their enjoyment of their inalienable rights, including their right to their own independent State. We must reaffirm that the Palestinian question continues to be the core of the Middle East question. The international community must vigorously condemn Israel's arrogant violation of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. We must condemn Israel's wallowing in the blood of Lebanese and Palestinians. Who made Israel an arbiter of the destiny of independent Lebanon? Israel must withdraw forthwith and unconditionally from Lebanon.

137. On the question of Cyprus, we must insist on an early settlement which ensures the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-aligned character of that territory.

138. States must curb expansionist ambitions; they must respect the sanctity of legally established international borders, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States. They must respect the sanctity of international agreements freely entered into and seek to settle their disputes by peaceful means.

139. The integral relationship between disarmament and a stable system of international security is self-

evident. An important aspect of our efforts to strengthen international security must therefore be the creation of a functioning system of collective security on which States, in particular small States, can depend. In this regard, my delegation has noted with special interest the proposals made by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, in section 4 of Chapter 6 of its report,<sup>4</sup> in relation to the strengthening of the United Nations system. In general, my delegation would like to urge that all States, in particular the major Powers, reduce reliance on force of arms and seek instead to make maximum use of the collective security provisions of the Charter and of the negotiating machinery provided for within the United Nations system. My delegation believes that this twelfth special session provides a unique opportunity for the initiation of a search for new ways in which the preventive security aspects of the Charter can be fully explored.

140. But at the very heart of the problems we are discussing lie the competition between two social systems and the non-acceptance, in this decade, of the idea of ideological pluralism, which, no one doubts, was one of the major achievements of the 1970s. This competition assumes a fearsome character because of the number and the sophistication of the weapons in the arsenals of the two super-Powers. It is precisely in the area of nuclear arms that mankind faces its gravest threat and its most daunting challenge. Each of the super-Powers alone possesses more than enough megatonnage to bring to an end all life on the planet. Yet, with an incomprehensible and perverse logic, each side continues to refine and to increase its nuclear stockpiles in what it sees as the search for a margin of superiority. And the nuclear spiral continues as if impelled by some irresistible technological determinism.

141. The simple fact of the matter is that in no conceivable scenario could there be a winnable nuclear war. As put in section 1 of chapter 6 of the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues: "There will be no winner in a nuclear war. The use of nuclear weapons would result in devastation and suffering of a magnitude which would render meaningless any notion of victory." Yet we witness on both sides a marked reluctance to free themselves from the dangers to which they and we are all exposed and to free mankind from the prison of fear to which they have committed us. Instead, we see a proliferation of esoteric doctrines on nuclear strategy, some of which by their very acronyms—MAD and NUT—sum up the irrationality of nuclear warfare. There is the contradiction of an avowed search for security and survival through the pursuit of policies of suicide.

142. We have therefore come face to face with what are effectively the limits of nuclear power as between the two super-Powers. Since neither can score a nuclear victory over the other, the only alternative is to find ways of peaceful coexistence and constructive co-operation. There is no alternative but to embrace the idea of ideological pluralism and to seek actively to contain suspicion and mistrust.

143. The control of nuclear weapons, reinforcing the barriers against their proliferation and refinement, thus becomes all the more a prime imperative of the inter-

national community. It must remain a priority item on the disarmament agenda. In this respect, the Non-Proliferation Treaty naturally comes to mind. My delegation regrets the imbalance inherent in some of the provisions of this instrument, but we sincerely hope that the nuclear-weapon Powers will, as a matter of the greatest urgency, make their actions in this regard consistent with the overall objective of that Treaty, which is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

144. My delegation welcomes the announcement by the two super-Powers of their intention to start talks later this month on the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear arms. In this context, my delegation is also gratified by the recent resumption at Geneva of negotiations for the regulation of medium-range missiles. We sincerely hope that these positive steps will be pursued steadfastly and in good faith by both sides.

145. My delegation also welcomes the proposals submitted by the Soviet Union for consideration during this special session 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*].

146. Guyana has consistently taken the position that as a step towards the complete elimination of nuclear weapons there must be agreement among all the nuclear-weapon Powers on complete prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances whatsoever. In this regard, my delegation considers that important first steps have been taken by China, followed by the Soviet Union, in their declarations on non-first-use of nuclear weapons. We hope that these will be followed by similar declarations by other nuclear-weapon States. Of course, an essential counterpart to an agreement on the elimination of nuclear weapons would be the effective prohibition of the testing of such weapons by all States. The question of a comprehensive test-ban treaty has been on our agenda for many years now, and my delegation urges that, pending the conclusion of such a comprehensive treaty, all nuclear Powers agree to an immediate halt of nuclear testing.

147. At the regional level throughout the world there are a number of ideas being considered or implemented which are generally supportive of the overall efforts of the United Nations aimed at disarmament. In my own region—Latin America and the Caribbean—the Treaty of Tlatelolco,<sup>5</sup> which seeks to make Latin America a nuclear-weapon-free zone, has been in force for some time now. Guyana has repeatedly expressed, and wishes to reiterate, its unqualified support for the principles and objectives of the Treaty, though we are denied accession to it by an exclusion clause which discriminates against us. But for that aspect, the Treaty of Tlatelolco could serve as a model to other regions seeking to ban the development and emplacement of destructive nuclear weaponry.

148. At the same time, the States of the Caribbean subregion are at present exploring the idea of making the Caribbean a zone of peace. My delegation solemnly urges that States eschew policies which frustrate the development of this concept and refrain from introducing into the politics of the region the acquisition of new and sophisticated weapons. There is no need for an arms race in Latin America or the Caribbean.

149. The concept of security, about which so much has been said in the course of this debate, transcends military concerns and must include the problems of poverty, hunger and the inadequate distribution of resources. Security needs can be fully met only by addressing all aspects of the question, especially the release of resources, both human and material, now being utilised for destructive purposes, in order to meet the goal of enhanced development. The close link between disarmament and development needs no elaboration.

150. While in the countries of the third world tens of thousands of children die each year from hunger and disease, while poverty stalks tens of millions of people from the developing world, while illiteracy and inadequate housing are the lot of untold millions, increasing billions are spent on armaments, as if to mock human existence. A particularly ironic aspect of such expenditure is that some of those very third world countries, with the price of their own exports falling in some cases, are themselves mortgaging the future of their needy populations for the acquisition of sophisticated military hardware.

151. My delegation would not presume to determine what are the legitimate security interests of any State, whether big or small. However, preparations for defence are sometimes clearly disproportionate to the needs of defence. In such cases arms expenditure and acquisition contribute directly to the creation and intensification of suspicions and tensions.

152. We need to examine seriously the conclusions and recommendations in the study entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*, which is annexed to the report of the Secretary-General,<sup>6</sup> in particular the proposals for promoting the reallocation of financial resources from armaments to development. My delegation believes that this necessarily has to be part of any long-term strategy for disarmament.

153. If the present review regarding disarmament is essentially one of dashed hopes and limited achievement, there is one development that my delegation firmly believes represents an encouraging sign for the future. I refer to the growing sensitizing of peoples of the world to the danger of nuclear weapons. I refer to the movements on behalf of peace and nuclear disarmament that have arisen, primarily in Europe and North America.

154. The participants in this movement represent the conscience of the world. In simple, yet effective, fashion they argue for the peaceful resolution of international differences and for the utilization of resources not to build destructive weapons of war, but to resolve the widespread social and economic problems confronting societies. They are for the ethos of human assertion and survival. They seek to protect the natural environment from the ravages of nuclear war. They constitute a dynamic force that cannot be ignored.

155. Guyana is convinced that this expanding movement of common peoples expresses the high hopes and lofty aspirations that we ourselves, as Government representatives, have endorsed. We must not disappoint them. Let us by the seriousness of our deliberations and the action-oriented commitments that we recall here vindicate the trust that our peoples

have placed in us as the protectors of their high hopes and aspirations.

156. Debate we must, but at the end of the day, at the conclusion of this second special session on disarmament, we must ensure that there is no going back on the commitments in the Final Document of 1978. We must ensure that the decisions that we take at this session lead to the fulfilment of those commitments. The choice is between peace and war.

157. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): I should like to join all the previous speakers in congratulating President Kittani and our esteemed Secretary-General.

158. Four years ago the Assembly reached the consensus that enduring international peace and security cannot be built by the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances or sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority. Genuine and lasting peace can be created only through effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and by the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces through international agreement and mutual example, leading ultimately to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. At the same time the causes of the arms race and the threats to peace must be reduced, and to this end effective action should be taken to eliminate tensions and to settle disputes by peaceful means.

159. In adopting this consensus, which is part of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the States Members of the United Nations solemnly reaffirmed their determination to work for general and complete disarmament and to make further collective efforts to strengthen peace and international security; eliminate the threat of war, particularly nuclear war; implement practical measures to halt and reverse the arms race; strengthen the procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes; reduce military expenditures and utilize the resources thus released in a manner which will help to promote the well-being of all peoples and to improve the economic conditions of the developing countries.

160. In view of that, the tenth special session and the Final Document it adopted aroused legitimate expectations among the people of the world that early and significant progress would be made towards achieving the objectives agreed upon.

161. Now, four years later, we have to admit with profound regret that developments since the tenth special session have moved in a direction opposite to those hopes and aspirations of all the peoples of our planet. Almost without exception, none of the objectives, priorities and principles invoked in the Final Document has been either faithfully respected or observed.

162. In this context, I should like to refer to the area in which my country is situated, the Indian Ocean. There is growing fear that the Indian Ocean is becoming the focus of a new cold-war rivalry between the two super-Powers. Around the Indian Ocean there exist conflicts and tensions in South-East Asia, in and around Afghanistan, on the Iraq-Iran border, in West Asia and the whole of North Africa, as well

as in southern Africa. The United States base on our own sovereign territory of Diego Garcia—I repeat, our own sovereign territory—is to be further strengthened. The Indian Ocean, which is the smallest of the three major oceans of the world, has 36 littoral nations and 11 hinterland nations, with a population of approximately 1,270 million, constituting 30 per cent of the world's population. With very few exceptions, these nations are non-aligned and still in the process of development.

163. The Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 9 through 13 February 1981, expressed grave concern at the buildup of great-Power military presence in the Indian Ocean area and noted that, despite the expressed wishes of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, the military activity of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean, in all forms and manifestations, had intensified and that there has been a marked deterioration in the climate of peace and security of that area. The Foreign Ministers further noted that the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace was being systematically nullified by the preparations of the great Powers. They were also seriously concerned at the dangerous tension in the area caused by the expansion of existing foreign bases, military installations, logistical supply facilities and the disposition of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, as well as by the search for new base facilities. Furthermore, they warned of the dangers of any actions that would provide pretexts for the intervention of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean region. The situation in terms of harsh facts is far more disturbing, as is illustrated by an Indian scholar, Mr. Supramanyan, in a research paper soon to be published by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research [UNIDIR].

164. That is just one of the many factors that make my country highly interested in disarmament and in the success of this special session. Disarmament is not an aim in itself. Disarmament is a means, and one can say the most important one, of safeguarding international peace and security. As one of the security-building factors—along with political, economic, technical, scientific, juridical and others—disarmament injects more force into all those factors, which in turn condition and support it.

165. Without exception, all the speakers in the general debate at this special session have shown a preoccupation with the situation now prevailing in the field of nuclear disarmament. My country fully shares those preoccupations, and it is particularly worried about the interruption of a meaningful dialogue on nuclear disarmament. I should like to stress that in our view the very existence of nuclear weapons directly and fundamentally jeopardizes the security interests of all States, in particular non-nuclear States, and that negotiations on the limitations and reductions of such weapons should therefore not be hostage to the state of relations between the major nuclear-weapon States and their allies. Non-nuclear-weapon States have a right to participate in multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. However, the Committee on Disarmament, the single multilateral body for negotiations on disarmament, has been prevented from effectively discharging its responsibilities in the

field of nuclear disarmament. The proposals of the non-aligned and neutral countries in the Committee for the setting up of an *ad hoc* working group to deal specifically with the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament have been opposed by some nuclear-weapon States.

166. Nuclear disarmament is without doubt the number one issue in the world today because of the consequences that it might have for the very survival of mankind on this planet. Sane thinking calls for the destruction of the whole body of the present global military order. War has been the permanent feature of the period since the Second World War. It is no secret that almost 130 conflicts have erupted in the world since 1945, 50 of which have occurred during the past ten years. While quoting such figures, we should certainly never forget that however devastating some of the wars in that period have been, their scope and amount of violence are limited—and even insignificant—if compared with what a nuclear war might entail.

167. While not suspecting that any of the present nuclear-weapon States intend to launch a nuclear war by design, I would bring to the attention of members of the Assembly the analysis of the risks of an unintentional nuclear war contained in a very recent UNIDIR publication on this subject.<sup>7</sup> It is my delegation's earnest hope that some of the proposals contained in that study will be included in the active agenda of the Committee on Disarmament and other disarmament bodies for negotiation.

168. Among the many issues with which this session has to deal, my delegation would particularly like to stress the following.

169. First, the situation prevailing now in the Indian Ocean emphasizes the need for the early convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean. Regrettably the Conference, originally scheduled for 1981, could not be held because of the negative attitude adopted by certain States and has now been rescheduled for 1983. It is recommended that a firm decision be taken at this session on convening the Conference in the first half of 1983 and that the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean be enabled to complete its preparatory work before that date.

170. Secondly, vigorous action should be started to bring about the freezing and reduction of military expenditure. It is to be recalled that the General Assembly, at its tenth special session, stated that gradual reduction of military budgets on a mutually agreed basis—for example, in absolute figures or in terms of percentages or points—particularly by nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States, would be a measure that could contribute to curbing the arms race and increase the possibilities for the reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries.

171. In spite of that consensus, since 1978 the world total military expenditures have shown a steady increase and have now reached an estimated figure about \$600 billion per annum, representing an extraordinarily heavy burden for the economies of all nations and having extremely harmful effects on international peace and security. If, for the attain-

ment of an agreement on the reduction of military expenditures, it is felt necessary to accelerate work on the common reporting instrument developed within the United Nations framework and designed to enhance comparability of military budgets, I would propose that such activity, which should be in the nature of a study, should be carried out further by a research organization, namely, UNIDIR, which could also sponsor the conference proposed by President Ronald Reagan of the United States a few days ago here in the General Assembly [16th meeting].

172. Thirdly, the growing importance of scientific information and of the studies in the context of disarmament efforts should lead to a decision that would give UNIDIR a definitive status. It should also be given the means necessary for fulfilling its task, particularly as an institution for independent research, especially in so far as long-term problems are concerned. In general the United Nations role in this area should be substantially increased and the means for carrying out its functions should be strengthened.

173. In concluding, I should like to read paragraph 18 of the Final Document, which seems to me not only extremely important but also more relevant today than at any time in the past:

“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.”

Because we are rational human beings, we should state unequivocally that today we have no choice, and we should start that long overdue process of real and meaningful disarmament. This should be the main preoccupation of all of us who meet here as representatives of our people at this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

174. I have concluded my statement on the issue before us. However, since I am here at the rostrum, I should be grateful to you, Mr. President, and the members of the Assembly if you would all be kind enough to bear with me for a little while so that I may read out a brief statement by the Mr. Jean Claude de Lestrac, the Minister of External Affairs in the newly elected Government of Mauritius, which sets out the broad foreign policy of my country, especially as parts of it cover the issue of disarmament. The following policy statement was made on 18 June 1982 to representatives of foreign countries and international organizations accredited to Mauritius:

“Mauritius as a member of the international community will abide scrupulously by the principles of the United Nations Organization so as to enable the Organization to fulfil its purposes, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security; the development of friendly relations among nations; and the encouragement of international co-operation in solving international economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems and in promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedom.

“Our support of the Organization will be wholehearted, since the Government is determined to work for the establishment of a world order distinguished by equality, freedom and justice.

“In furtherance of these goals the Government will work assiduously for the development of friendly relations with all the members of the international community, irrespective of their social and political systems. However, the Government will zealously practise a policy of non-alignment with regard to the two super-Powers and to other foreign Powers. This dedication to the tenets of non-alignment springs from our conviction that every nation should be allowed to determine its own social, economic and political system, free from outside interference. The Government will dedicate itself to the reinforcement of the non-aligned movement.

“In working for the establishment of a world of freedom and justice, the Government will develop a closer relationship with the nations of the third world still a prey to injustices endemic in the present system of relationships between nations and peoples with a view to creating a new international order in which a life of dignity and well-being becomes the inalienable right of all. A more just and peaceful world can only be established if the existing injustices are rectified.

“The Government will reinforce its solidarity with the third world, especially in the context of global negotiations for the establishment of a new international order. The friendly and privileged relations which Mauritius already enjoys with the individual members of the developed world will be concurrently maintained and strengthened. The bonds of friendship based on historical and cultural association with France and the United Kingdom will be further strengthened. No less important to the new Government will be the development of closer relations with the traditional friends of Mauritius, such as the members of the European Community, the United States, Canada and Australia. As a member of the Group of African, Caribbean and Pacific States, Mauritius attaches great importance to the co-operation between the Group and the Community under the second Lomé Convention and particularly to the Sugar Protocol.

“Greater emphasis will be given to strengthening economic and commercial relations with African sovereign States, and an early ratification of the treaty establishing a preferential trade area for eastern and southern African States will be considered. The Government is determined to play an active role at the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and support that Organization's efforts to achieve the complete decolonisation of the continent and the eradication of racism and neo-colonialism. More particularly the Government will work for the accession of Namibia to independence, the acceptance of majority rule in South Africa and the recognition as a sovereign State of the Sahraoui Arab Democratic Republic. The liberation movements concerned—namely, the African National Congress and the South West Africa People's Organization—will be recognized by Mauritius as the legitimate representatives of the South African and Namibian peoples respectively. Abhorring *apartheid* and supportive of the oppressed people of South Africa, and in conformity with the resolutions of the OAU, the United Nations and other inter-



national organisations, the Government will work towards the gradual reduction of our economic links with the citadel of racism in the African continent.

“The Government would wish to affirm its determination to widen the field of co-operation with the whole of the Arab world, which should be allowed to use its economic and strategic importance for the social and economic development of its peoples and contribute to the promotion of international peace and security. The Government is convinced that the recognition by the international community of the Palestine Liberation Organisation as the sole representative of the Palestinian people and of the inherent right of the Palestinian nation to statehood is one of the essential preconditions for the restoration of peace to the region.

“Regional co-operation will be given a boost under the present Government. The Government will afford priority to developing a close working relationship with India in the economic, commercial and industrial fields. Relations with the neighbouring countries of the Indian Ocean will be reinforced and consideration will be given to forging, along with the Governments concerned, mutually profitable commercial and economic ties. The support of these countries and the countries bordering the Indian Ocean and the other peace-loving countries of the world will be actively sought by Mauritius in its determination to work for the complete demilitarization of the Indian Ocean. We shall spare no efforts in seeking the dismantling of all foreign military bases in the regions.

“True to its commitment to preserve jealously the integrity and sovereignty of its territory, the Government will spare no efforts to secure the return to Mauritius of the Chagos Archipelago and Tromelin Island.”

175. Mrs. JONES (Liberia): The world has entered a new age of technological discovery and mastery and has become fearful of what the future will bring. Indeed, the people of the earth have become scared to death by the super-Powers, as to what this new scientific age holds and can unleash. After 37 years of experiment in universal brotherhood it is time for the United Nations, and the world, to pause and reflect upon a future course of action and direction for the peaceful and sustained blossoming of this new age. There are those who believe we can continue our existence on a course of disequilibrium and the unequal distribution and use of nuclear power, in the form of military hegemony, while others believe that we should preserve our existence by disarming.

176. No one can turn back the clock of history. The history of mankind on the planet earth is one of movement. Man will not stand still. He must, however, pause now and then to reflect on what rational or irrational, responsible or irresponsible, course of action he should follow and on the options left for him to portray and maintain a civilized *homo sapiens* behaviour.

177. The world has been through this dilemma, with scientific advancement and progress concerning the fate of the earth and human society, before. We recall here that the uncertainties of the Industrial Revolution nearly 250 years ago were no less traumatic

than the present time. The fate of humanity then lay in the hands of the rich and powerful, as it still does today. Let us not repeat this trauma in the 20th century in our rendezvous with our common destiny. Let there be an equilibrium between nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and nuclear energy for security and self-preservation.

178. The super-Powers have promised to achieve mastery over the full potential of nuclear technology, exercising self-control and self-discipline. It would appear difficult to believe them; yet it is unthinkable that they will wipe themselves out of existence in their attempt to master this new age of nuclear technology. Indeed it is unthinkable that the Caucasian race will deliberately wipe itself out of existence simply because it has the power and ability to do so. We do not truly know at this moment the full danger that a possible nuclear war would pose for the other races of the earth and all other living things. But if there is the likelihood that all living things could be exterminated, as has been made clear to us during these past weeks in this Hall, then we may as well ask Mr. Noah to build us another ark, before the deluge—a deluge of fire that will consume us all.

179. These special sessions on disarmament have put mankind back on a collision course in the eternal debate between science and morality. Science is ahead and, as always, is never concerned about moral values in society. The super-Powers must restore the balance between science and morality and provide for the world confidence-building measures and assurances that science will be used to bring about paradise on earth and not to create a living inferno. So far, what they have told us gives us little comfort, and the world does not have a good night's sleep because they in their laboratories and think tanks are planning and designing how to out-distance one another in the arms race.

180. There, in those nuclear towers caressing death, they have produced deadly equations to destabilize the planet Earth, as if Earth had been given to them by Adam and Eve and to no one else as their sole inheritance. The world community is asking the super-Powers to return to their nuclear palaces and nuclear ivory towers and to produce new equations to stabilize and renew the Earth. Indeed, what they have told us in the Assembly is that they are married to those nuclear bombs and it would be painful to divorce them. They could think about some terms of separation, but not yet. Meanwhile, they will rule the Earth in a manner they perceive to be right in their own eyes, and the rest of us must take it or leave it. They need time and the rest of us need time and, if there is any lesson to be learned from the recent Falkland-Malvinas crisis, it is that they will take us to the edge of the precipice, restrain themselves and refrain from walking into the jaws of death. This means, we hope, for the sake of mankind, that they will agonize over the right course of action and reason will prevail ultimately. There is hope indeed for mankind. They will gain mastery over nuclear technology for peaceful purposes to relieve hunger and misery all over the Earth. They have the resources to launch a global Marshall Plan to save humanity from suffering.

181. In the race between peace and war, peace must take the offensive, no longer the defensive. The super-

Powers will make this come to pass as they have always done in the final analysis. We have walked this road with some of them before, when they agonized over the slave trade and gave way to public pressure, when they agonized over colonialism and gave way to public pressure, when they agonized over the huge profits of the Industrial Revolution and gave some back to create welfare States under public pressure.

182. They will hold on to their creatures as long as it is possible but will abandon them when reason prevails and there are other and better options. Man is good; he will not want to be immortalized by evil deeds.

183. The super-Powers have told us they need time to make good their promises. Yet, in the event that they are slow in doing so, the public good and public pressure will become catalysts. The ghosts of Robin Hood, William Tell, Paul Revere, Karl Marx, Mahatma Gandhi, Kwame Nkrumah, Marcus Garvey, Martin Luther King and others could stride the Earth again. The super-Powers must have remembered the Boston Tea Party while they witnessed the recent New York tea party and other tea parties. All such healthy public pressure for the common good of humanity is necessary to prevent them from having a good night's sleep in the same way as they prevent the rest of the world from having a good night's sleep. Imagine sleepyheads exhausted from strife finally falling into a long, deep, peaceful slumber, waking up refreshed, strengthened and renewed.

184. The United Nations was conceived for disarmament and, as an optional forum to war theatres around the globe, for the peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiation, dialogue and resolution. Today, accordingly, while the Earth is being held hostage by the super-Powers, we here in the Assembly must negotiate for its release. We call on the friends of the Earth, Earth ombudsmen, to save it from possible assassination. The Earth is the only home we have, and man must cease behaving like a hurricane, a tornado or volcano upon it. The dilemma of world insecurity should be addressed by peaceful means rather than by making war.

185. Throughout the ages fire-power has never conquered the spirit of man. We therefore appeal to the highest instinct of the super-Powers, that which ennobles, refines and adorns man and gives him dominion over the Earth as a partner with God, to develop the Earth as husbandmen and not as destroyers, for where else could we go?

186. A few nations have always taken it upon themselves to control the destiny of mankind on Earth. Again, we walked this road before when the hegemony of the Iberian Peninsula over the whole world was challenged 500 years ago. The super-Powers have indeed succeeded the States of the Iberian Peninsula in creating a modern-day hegemony over the Earth.

187. Their arms hegemony is having a negative growth effect throughout the world today, and negotiations on a new economic order are still an ideal to strive for. My delegation fears that the 1,000 rural bridges so badly needed in Liberia, which we believe are the key to open the doors to comprehensive rural development throughout the length and breadth of our country, may never be built. The \$1 million

that is needed for that purpose could easily be got from savings from military expenditures.

188. We see our world today not in a perfected state but still evolving. From the dawn of creation until barely 100 years ago the world had been scientifically and technologically standing still. A certain time-lag is therefore being conceived as the key to motivation for man to use science and technology to make up for this lag and the absence of material progress for the millenia of years of his existence on earth. Here lies the dilemma. He must catch up in great haste, but the danger is that in such a haste to catch up he could overdo it. War for him has always been a keen indicator of how progressive he is—a measurement of progress he finds self-assuring and worthy of emulating, preserving and transmitting to his progeny. The greatness of a nation, he has conditioned and programmed himself to believe, lies in the quality and quantity of its military arsenals. We watch the super-Powers daily on a collision course, and the Earth could crash under the weight of their rivalry. If the moral force of the masses of humanity does not give a helping hand to our efforts at the United Nations, soon it will be said that here lies the late great planet Earth.

189. Man has long been known to quarrel with the planet Earth and to have an incurable itch now and then to give it a new face-lift. He has done it before, with the achievements of the Industrial Revolution, and he would like to give it a new face-lift again, this time with the achievements of the nuclear revolution. In so doing, the people of the Earth have always wanted to know what their fate would be in the process of face-lifting. When answers are not forthcoming, or are wrong or unconvincing, we see the people speaking to themselves and providing the answers, as has been the case recently.

190. What we have been engaged in here in the Assembly and will continue to be engaged in for a long time is an attempt to prevent the super-Powers from sowing bad seeds for the twenty-first century. We have already reaped the fruits of bad seeds in this century. Science is good; science is evil. It cannot, however, at the same time perfect the Earth and destroy it. Rivalry is healthy, but the present style of super-Power rivalry is misdirected and misguided, and the dilemma before us is the danger of dragging that rivalry into the next century. Super-Power rivalry is wasteful and selfish, and no one is impressed by the waste and carnage.

191. We must therefore continue to raise our voices, even when our voices are tired, so as to prevent a nuclear scourge upon the Earth. Accordingly, my Government recommends the following steps. The surveillance powers of the Secretary-General should be extended to policing the nuclear performance of the super-Powers. There must be more special sessions devoted to disarmament, and the interval between sessions should be shorter. Daily monitoring of nuclear activities by satellite and other sensing and policing devices should be intensified. We have the scientific capability to police the arms race and to single out the culprits for condemnation for disturbing the peace of the Earth. Steps must be taken to prevent the accidental use of nuclear bombs in the third world and to preserve the third world as a whole as a

nuclear-free zone and a safety valve for the world. A step-by-step reduction of armaments to a harmless, verifiable and secured level must be worked out before the end of the twentieth century. We are mindful of the fact that such a reduction exercise could entail sizable expenditures for freezing, verification or reduction of nuclear weapons. Conferences on confidence-building measures and on the reduction of military expenditures would be necessary every year. Continual pressure should be brought to bear upon the super-Powers to maintain a balance in the arms race for the sake of the peace and security of all nations and peoples of the Earth. The United Nations should be fully empowered to disarm the super-Powers by material and non-material means. Its disarmament machinery should be kept in constant motion so that by the twenty-first century there may be zero growth of armaments.

192. There is a leak in the dyke on the planet Earth and, like the little Dutch boy of long ago, all of us in the world must place our hands on this leak day and night so as to keep the sea from rushing in. Let us have reverence for life. Let us for ever engage in the struggle for disarmament.

193. Mr. ZUMBADO (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Costa Rica has come to the Assembly as a people without weapons, without soldiers, without an army. That institution was abolished in 1948, more than three decades ago. During those three decades Costa Rica has lived in peace with itself and with its neighbours.

194. It is our conviction that only a profoundly democratic people committed to a permanent struggle against injustice and poverty can hope to do without weapons in the maintenance of power.

195. The decision to disarm unilaterally also requires deep respect for and an almost boundless confidence in the rule of law and in the international machinery established to preserve peace and security. For that very reason, Costa Rica, which is among the 51 original signatory States of the Charter of the United Nations, is committed to strengthening this Organization and is determined to see it play an increasingly useful and active role in responding to the numerous challenges we face today.

196. Costa Rica, a nation without weapons, lives in a region which has today become a major focus of conflict and which would seem to have institutionalized resort to arms as a means of acquiring or maintaining power. This is aggravated by the fact that the region's geopolitical importance has made internal struggles spill over national borders, with the world's great Powers involved in those struggles in one way or another. This has set off an arms race which has obvious adverse effects upon the peace and security of our region. Costa Rica maintains that arms are in themselves a cause of internal and external tension. Accordingly, if we are to give peace and tranquillity a chance to prevail in our own lands, it is imperative that we initiate a process of demilitarization in Central America.

197. It is ironic that we should be meeting here at a time when the world is passing through a period of great belligerence, with serious conflicts in the Middle East and the South Atlantic, where our

Argentine brothers in particular have been seriously affected, and with grave tensions apparent in other parts of the developing world, where the precarious prevailing conditions could lead to war.

198. Unfortunately, the history of mankind shows us that arms races follow such conflicts in a chain reaction, affecting not only the countries that were parties to the confrontation but also countries which had no direct part in it. The harm that such arms races do to our countries' development opportunities is sometimes as devastating as the conflicts themselves.

199. So-called conventional wars are proliferating today so readily that the conscience of the world appears to have been numbed by them. This tendency goes so far as to present such situations as victories as long as they remain within the confines of the developing world and do not unleash a nuclear war.

200. Perhaps the well-documented horrors of the possible consequences of nuclear war have made the international community insensitive to the effects of so-called conventional wars. We see with great indignation how frequently the mass media nowadays focus greater attention on the performance of this or that machine of destruction or the efficiency of an army in bringing about the suffering and death, deprivation and humiliation of the vanquished.

201. The last few weeks have even shown how the conflicts themselves can be used as advertising campaigns by the military establishments in the market. Even as we debate here about how to achieve disarmament, thousands of scientists the world over are drawing object-lessons from the latest conflicts with a view to improving and refining their capacity for destruction, backed by the mounting billions of dollars in appropriations set aside for this purpose.

202. One can foresee that, unless we can marshal the necessary political will to turn the tide, technological developments and investments in the war industry will rule out any chance of overcoming the problems of underdevelopment and poverty. It will, moreover, become increasingly difficult, given the growing strength of certain interest groups, to create the minimum political conditions for the achievement of significant agreements on disarmament and development in the future.

203. It is time that we ask ourselves when the developed world will begin to give the same treatment to countries beset by economic difficulties that it gives to its clients when they are at war. As the representative of Ecuador indicated in his recent statement [*17th meeting*], we are living at a time when the leading industrialized Powers, paradoxically, are reducing their contributions to programmes designed to promote the transfer of resources through multi-lateral channels, while at the same time increasing their military budgets. At the same time, little headway is being made in the North-South dialogue towards the achievement of a more just and equitable order, an elementary condition for laying the foundations of lasting peace.

204. Costa Rica unreservedly supports the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the relationship between disarmament and development.<sup>6</sup> We feel that the debate on disar-

mament must be broadened to include considerations relating to the need for structural changes necessary to put an end to violence in all its forms. It is obvious that the sluggishness of our economies, the exhaustion of physical resources available to sustain world growth, as well as the tensions generated by the skewed distribution of income and wealth nationally and internationally, are factors adversely affecting world security.

205. This is also pointed out in the report of the Brandt Commission,<sup>8</sup> which states that world security is linked to the enormous gap separating rich and poor countries, with grave injustices and the neglect of the most elementary needs in poor countries acting as a further cause of insecurity. If military expenditure could by some means be kept within bounds and part of the savings channelled towards development, world security would be strengthened. To that end, we feel that serious consideration should be given to the proposal for the creation of an international fund to be replenished by resources emanating from the efforts which countries made towards disarmament.

206. In addition to these recommendations, we further suggest that consideration be given to the following proposals. First, arms-producing countries should limit their production of conventional weapons. Let there be an end to the cynical excuse that "if we do not sell, others will". We should likewise do away with the immoral perception of the war industry as merely one industry among others, of trade in weapons as legitimate as trade in tractors. We must bear in mind that the right to life is the first and most essential of all human rights. War as the negation of that right is, therefore, the antithesis of all human rights. The war industry has a cause-and-effect relationship with violence, and it must be perceived accordingly.

207. Secondly, since it has been pointed out that each instance of strife contributes to accelerating the arms race, it would seem highly desirable that after every armed confrontation there be some kind of conference in the United Nations, including all the parties involved in the conflict, together with those who supplied the arms, in order to forestall the expected arms race.

208. Finally, Costa Rica has for many years argued that, in the allocation of resources through international co-operation programmes, special attention be given not only to the comparative poverty of countries but also to the efforts their peoples make towards disarmament.

209. Our nation, with barely more than 2 million inhabitants, has a deep sense of mankind's concern for survival. We are not given to rhetoric, but we have lived according to the words of a great Latin American, Benito Juárez, which are inscribed at the entrance to this Hall and which sum up the spirit of the Organization: "Respect for the rights of others is peace". We hope that that spirit shall some day guide the conduct of all the world's Governments.

210. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the United Kingdom has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

211. Sir Anthony PARSONS (United Kingdom): With reference to the statement made this afternoon by the representative of Mauritius, I warmly reciprocate the desire of the Government of Mauritius further to strengthen the bonds of friendship between Mauritius and my country. But I must take issue with Mr. Ramphul on the question of sovereignty over the island of Diego Garcia. The United Kingdom, not Mauritius, has sovereignty over that island. Our position on all these questions of sovereignty over certain small islands in the Indian Ocean is well known and has been explained at previous sessions of the General Assembly. It remains unchanged.

*The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138, p. 65).

<sup>2</sup> Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

<sup>3</sup> A/CONF.95/15 and Corr.2, annex I. For the printed text of the Convention and its Protocols, see *United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*, vol. 5: 1980 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.81.IX.4), appendix VII.

<sup>4</sup> "Common Security: a programme for disarmament" (A/CN.10/38. See also A/CN.10/51).

<sup>5</sup> Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326).

<sup>6</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1.

<sup>7</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.0.1.

<sup>8</sup> *North-South: A Programme for Survival*: report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues under the chairmanship of Willy Brandt (Cambridge, Massachusetts: the MIT Press, 1980).