



President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar is pleased to see you presiding once again over the General Assembly. We should like once more to express to you our fraternal esteem. We are sure that we shall be able to count on your exceptional qualities, devotion and commitment to help us overcome the difficulties before us in the weeks ahead.

2. To the extent that they denote a serious deterioration in international morality, if not the disintegration of the political and juridical order envisaged by the Charter, the armed conflicts which, unfortunately, form the background to this session make the problems of disarmament much more acute and urgent than is usually the case.

3. It is our impression that the debate is taking place in an atmosphere of unreality, at a time when in the Middle East Israel is proclaiming its indifference to our concerns about international peace and security. The systematic destruction of the Lebanese nation and the acts of barbarism which have been inflicted upon its civilian population in order to intimidate and terrorize it have been condemned by the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, who, in a message dated 8 June 1982 addressed to the Secretary-General,¹ called for the adoption of concrete measures against Israel and its accomplices in order to put an end to the unacceptable policy of genocide against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples.

4. In southern Africa, benefiting from general apathy and the assurance of total impunity, the South African army has resorted to the most modern means to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia, to crush the South West Africa People's Organization in savage acts of repression and to carry out large-scale military operations in Angola, Mozambique and other front-line States in order to destabilize their Governments.

5. In the South Atlantic, again on behalf of interests difficult for us to understand, a war has broken out, even though recognition by the United Nations and by the movement of non-aligned countries of the rights of sovereignty claimed by Argentina over the Falklands (Malvinas) Islands could have served as a basis for the settlement of the dispute without it having been necessary to resort to force or other means of coercion not provided for by the Charter.

6. A symbol of the failure of diplomacy and of our vision of a world of justice and peace, these conflicts in themselves constitute grounds for concern—a concern that has just been exacerbated by the failure of the Security Council resolutely to condemn the aggressors, to order or enforce a cessation of hostilities and to take the appropriate measures to prevent their escalation or extension. Furthermore, we cannot but point to the cynical and brutal way in which the natural aggressiveness of Israel has laid bare in Lebanon the limitations inherent in the mandates of the peace-keeping forces, which can only undermine the confidence of Member States in the capacity of the United Nations to maintain a credible system of collective security.

7. This session could certainly help to dispel doubt and dissipate the fears in various quarters by advancing the cause of disarmament, which must go hand in hand with the efforts made elsewhere to restore peace on a more just basis and vindicate the principles of the non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes, in a word, to strengthen international security as a whole, including political and economic security. Indeed, we could not find a better opportunity to demonstrate that, in spite of the appearances created by the ineffectiveness of our institutions, the international community as a whole is not ready to reward aggression or to allow arms rather than reason to determine the course of international relations.

8. We should be pleased that the idea of disarmament has once again succeeded in bringing together in this Hall eminent statesmen from all corners of the world, including many heads of State and Government. This seems to indicate that the Governments represented here remain devoted to the international strategy for disarmament, adopted by a historic consensus in 1978, and that they accept the central idea underlying our efforts, that is, the renunciation of the military option in the conduct of international relations.

9. If this were indeed the case, it would not be difficult for us to proceed from principles to action and to satisfy the aspirations of the masses who have had their consciences aroused and who are making their voices heard in a way that leaves no room for ambiguity.

10. Unfortunately, the results are there to justify those who loudly voice their apprehensions, to remind us that we are not all firm and resolute in what we say and to show that the logic of disarmament has not yet penetrated the policy of States, in particular States possessing the most important military means. In this regard it is ironic to note that in their statements previous speakers referred to the irreplaceable value of the Final Document and the Programme of Action

of 1978 [*resolution S-10/2*], which nevertheless have remained dead letters.

11. Are we to understand, then, that, in order to assuage international opinion for a time, it suffices to engage in a rhetorical exercise, in the full knowledge that the situation hardly lends itself to the achievement of what we are advocating and that our devotion to the principles of the Charter cannot stand up to the demands of policies that are always based on confrontation and the search for advantages which cannot be renounced in the name of an illusory security?

12. The only concrete result which has been achieved since the last special session on disarmament is the adoption on 10 October 1980 of a Convention, with three Protocols, on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.²

13. Were it not for this single achievement, we would be able to speak only of failures and trends which, within the context of our deliberations, can only be considered as negative.

14. Among other examples, we could mention the persisting ambiguity surrounding the SALT II agreements; the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean, initially scheduled to be held at Colombo in 1981; the strengthening of foreign military bases; the multiplication of agreements conceding such bases; the headlong increase in military expenditures; the development of new types of weapons, in particular the neutron bomb; the 200 nuclear-weapon tests recorded since 1978 and the still flourishing traffic in those arms which are called conventional but whose deadly power has been demonstrated in recent conflicts.

15. It is not only that agreements on various aspects of nuclear disarmament seem always to elude us; we see the development of new doctrines which imply that a limited nuclear war is now something that can be envisaged and even won. Such acceptance of the legitimacy and effectiveness of nuclear weapons is likely to increase the probability that such weapons will be used, and it quite rightly troubles all who continue to believe in the validity of the "Martens" clause and who voted in favour of resolution 35/152 D, whereby the use of nuclear weapons constitutes both a violation of the Charter and a crime against humanity.

16. Other information indicates that the force and validity of previously concluded treaties have been undermined by recent events and developments.

17. This applies to outer space, where it has already been agreed not to station nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction. Today, the problem of the use of outer space for military purposes still remains, particularly concerning anti-satellite weapons, in regard to which negotiations were begun and then suspended.

18. Similarly, in the field of chemical weapons, the scope of the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare,³ and of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of

Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxic Weapons and on Their Destruction, approved by the General Assembly in 1971 [*resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex*] would be singularly limited if there were not a prompt reaction to information that the world is approaching a threshold which, if crossed, could make impossible any further strengthening of measures of control over chemical weapons.

19. On the regional level now and since the 1978 session, the situation in Africa has taken a disturbing turn. The idea of making that continent a nuclear-weapon-free zone has been undermined since the acquisition of nuclear weapons by South Africa, thanks to the complicity of State and private entities determined to disregard the embargo enacted against the racist régime, became a certainty. Moreover, the temptation to find security in alignment has brought some of us into the wake of the great Powers, and we see that solutions to crises such as that of the Western Sahara, which could have been settled in the framework of agreed-upon principles, are now subject to the introduction of weapons into the continent by means of strategies which invest the conflict with an international dimension.

20. The above-mentioned facts and trends are indicative of the difficulties hampering negotiations on disarmament.

21. The forced race to non-quantifiable fundamental security complicates the facts of the problem more every day. Each new situation requires a re-examination of the overall balance; each new type of weapon demands specific negotiations, and the possibility of attaining the objective of general and complete disarmament is further delayed.

22. For our part, we concede the right of each State to security and the right of all States to equal security. Along with the whole of the non-aligned movement, we maintain that it is not necessary to await the creation of ideal conditions before beginning disarmament, and we continue to believe that the deterioration of the international situation requires an intensification rather than a relaxation of suspension of disarmament efforts.

23. As the theatre of some 130 armed conflicts since 1945, the countries of the third world are aware of the permanent insecurity in which they live and are probably as worried as anyone else, if not more worried, about present developments in international relations. They consider it highly unlikely that a miracle will suddenly normalize these relations in the way advocated by the Charter and restore mutual confidence, considered by some to be the *sine qua non* to disarmament. That improbability inclines us in the present circumstances to take up willingly the challenge of disarmament, which could well be, after all, the source of this confidence that is so ardently desired.

24. For without the will to take up that challenge, without the will to seek security in another way than through weapons, and hence to renounce, as we have already said, the military option in the conduct of international relations, the undertaking of disarmament would become a soulless and purposeless process, confined to a futile exercise reserved for experts in deterrence, balance, parity, undiminished security and verification.

25. We do believe, however, that a step in the right direction has just been taken through the joint communiqué issued by the Soviet Union and the United States that those two countries are embarking, at Geneva on 29 June 1982, on negotiations on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons. We can only express satisfaction at that decision, more particularly as, going beyond the notion of arms control, the parties have this time decided to include in their programme the more advanced concept of the reduction of nuclear arms. Obviously, it would have been desirable for these talks to cover all nuclear weapons systems as well.

26. But the importance attached by public opinion to these negotiations is such that the announcement that they are to begin is already rousing hopes which in themselves may relax international relations and inject a new sense of dynamism into other forums of negotiation. That is true also for the negotiations under way between the members of the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic Treaty [NATO], for the tripartite negotiations on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests, and for the Committee on Disarmament.

27. We venture to hope that the same influence will permit us during this session to go beyond the mere reaffirmation of the Final Document of 1978 and to mobilize the necessary political will for the adoption of the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

28. That programme, which is designed to ensure the consistency of the measures to be taken, should in our view have binding force and should lay down an appropriate timetable which would ensure respect for and implementation of the programme. Its adoption should therefore receive the highest priority so as to permit the Committee on Disarmament to resume the necessary negotiations as soon as possible.

29. In spite of the divergencies in many areas, the agreement not to call into question the priorities worked out in the Final Document should be stressed.

30. Without wishing to go into the whole programme, my delegation would venture at this stage to give its views on the proposals which seem to it to warrant the attention of the international community.

31. At this session the General Assembly should focus its attention on the growing risks of a nuclear war and try to adopt measures to avoid such a war. To that end we could, first, give thought to the total prohibition, by means of a convention, of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and also the unilateral or joint commitment by nuclear States not to be the first to use these weapons. At the very least these States should be bound to respect and abide by commitments they have entered into under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*].

32. Secondly, in the light of the considerable stockpiles already accumulated, the manufacture of new nuclear weapons should be prohibited. Such a freeze could be the first step towards the total elimination of these types of weapon.

33. Thirdly, the complete cessation of nuclear-weapons testing should be delayed only until the three Powers have overcome their hesitations, and a commitment on the part of all States from now on to respect

a moratorium would be very useful pending the conclusion of a properly worked out agreement.

34. Fourthly, a joint or unilateral declaration by the nuclear Powers to the effect that they would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-aligned countries, neutral countries and other non-nuclear States which have no affiliations with the two major alliances would contribute considerably to increasing the degree of security of the latter. Such a non-discriminatory guarantee could strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty régime.

35. We cannot, of course, consider disarmament without mentioning the Indian Ocean, a zone of peace—an initiative of the greatest possible interest to my country. We deplore that the conference, initially scheduled for 1981 at Colombo, had to be postponed. Resolution 36/90 provides that it should be held before the end of the first half of 1983, and we urge the Assembly to adopt at this session specific measures to help the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean to fulfil its mandate and to apply resolution 36/90.

36. The ever-growing military presence of the great Powers continues to be of considerable concern to the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean. This tendency, contrary to the objective of resolution 2832 (XXVI) in declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, would make nonsense of the concept of equal security for all, if this Assembly were to permit the Powers concerned to endanger the lives of the peoples of the area in the name of a strategic confrontation of no interest to those peoples.

37. For his part, in 1980 the President of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar proposed the convening at Antananarivo of a summit conference on the Indian Ocean that would bring together all the countries concerned about the peace and security of that region. At the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly [*11th meeting*] we explained in detail the scope of this proposal, which reflects a concern to define the nature of commitments that should govern the mutual relations of participating States on the basis of the principles affirmed at the level of the United Nations and within the framework of a regional security agreement guaranteed by the major Powers.

38. Disarmament concerns the whole world. It concerns first and foremost our peoples, and my delegation, like those that have spoken previously, is pleased that the first decision at this session was to launch the World Disarmament Campaign. If appropriate financing can be guaranteed, such a campaign can only give greater scope to the popular movements that support our efforts and transform them into true partners of the United Nations.

39. Access to objective information on the dangers of over-armament and the obstacles to disarmament would undoubtedly be of interest to the peoples of the whole world. At the same time we hope that the Campaign will help our peoples, those of the third world in particular, to make their voices heard on a subject that is dealt with in the major information media as a matter of interest to the militarily important countries only.

40. Thus, to give an example, the relationship between disarmament, the responsibility of the big

Powers, and development, the aspiration of the poor, remains one of the aspects given very little space by the large-circulation press which in our view should receive much greater coverage within the framework of the Campaign, because this is a theme that has been broadly echoed in the course of this and earlier debates, because it is true that the hundreds of billions of dollars spent for military purposes each year could very well be used to alleviate the misery of the world. Surely it must be conceded that a world free from hunger, disease and ignorance would be a world less disposed to social and political turbulence and thus a more stable world from which it would be easier to banish arms and the engines of destruction.

41. The problem should no longer be that of choosing between the arms race and financing development; rather, the question should be why the choice called for in the name of the survival of humanity has not yet been made—a choice that would help us build a more just international order that would ensure genuine and lasting peace.

42. For years, decades, generations, we have dismantled and rebuilt the machinery of disarmament. We now understand the uncertainties and limitations of this exercise, and at the same time we know what measures are necessary to overcome these problems. Theoretically, general and complete disarmament cannot constitute a permanent challenge to the human spirit. But it is as if man, fascinated by the spectre of his own destruction, endeavours to invent endless excuses and pretexts for postponing the advent of a universally valid peace, without armaments.

43. Indeed, we must recognize the obstinacy and earnestness with which we have tried to define what one or another understands by limitation, reduction, negotiation, control, verification, security and confidence. But hardly is an agreement on definitions reached than a new idea, a new imperative arises calling into question everything that has been achieved and laying down ever more elaborate conditions, which in the final analysis in no way help us to attain our common objectives.

44. What security are we talking about? Is it the security of a few Powers, the security of a group of countries, the security of certain continents, or universal security—not to mention collective security, the idea of which becomes ever more remote as the principles of the Charter become ever more blurred.

45. In truth, the security of the North should not necessarily be identified with the security of the South, unless we agree that the world is doomed to a constant confrontation between East and West and that the interests of the most powerful continue to take precedence over those of the feeble in an international society which is supposed, incidentally, to be just and democratic.

46. The same goes for confidence, which is a convenient screen for sheltering those who fear that the balance may now be out of date and difficult to qualify and quantify because of technological progress. But the notion of confidence is so subjective that it would be illusory to require its application to such a complex or technical field as disarmament. Furthermore, there is nothing to say that if confidence is established between two Powers or two groups of

Powers, the rest of the world should automatically participate.

47. It is perhaps herein that the tragedy of disarmament resides. Too many things have been done, justified by private interests and considered as primary truths; too many responsibilities have fallen on a limited number of States, which are thus able to monopolize them; too little attention has been given to the concerns of the third world, which is tired of being the theatre of conflicts, rivalries and competition. It may be alleged that our approach is simplistic or at best, with a bit more indulgence, idealistic. But what is expected by those who are realistic and pragmatic, those who have the means to understand truly and fully what disarmament represents, to demonstrate by concrete and significant measures that they are ready to end their schoolyard quarrels, to lower their technical demands to a reasonable level, to recognize that their political strategies will have value only in so far as a world still exists where they can be applied.

48. This appeal has been made often and in many ways. There is nothing new about it. It may cause certain people to have a somewhat condescending or knowing attitude, to which we have become accustomed. International public opinion for its part will never become accustomed to the perpetual shirking of responsibility and quite rightly may ask us: what have you done about the Disarmament Decade? Where is the promised land of security that you have been dangling before us for so many generations now? When will there be universal peace?

49. Mr. CALLE Y CALLE (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President on behalf of my Government and the delegation of Peru which is attending this great Assembly, I have the honour and pleasure to express our warmest congratulations to you on your election to conduct our proceedings. Your well-known experience of sensitive international affairs guarantee that our proceedings will be guided wisely and that this session of the Assembly will have a fruitful outcome.

50. The present special session of the General Assembly is taking place at a time when the international situation is deteriorating drastically. Whereas at the first special session devoted to disarmament it was felt that a momentous step had been taken towards the solution of one of mankind's most distressing problems, today we must admit that any depiction of the present state of international affairs must, if it is to be realistic, be rendered in sombre tones.

51. None of the critical situations which then beset the world have been resolved; on the contrary, now there are new conflicts in various parts of the world.

52. At present we are witnessing a disproportionate and unjust act of aggression by a nuclear Power from outside the continent, a party to the Additional Protocols of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco),⁴ against a sister Latin American republic which is trying to assert its sovereign rights over the Malvinas Islands as part of the process of decolonization set forth in various resolutions of the United Nations.

53. This situation is directly related to the relentless arms race of the major Powers and significantly

retards efforts to establish a system of legal and political guarantees based on mutual trust and respect making possible the maintenance of international peace and security.

54. Given our present disorderly international structure, the communications gap between the two major economic and military blocs, on the one hand, and between those blocs and the developing world, on the other, has widened, and international society is experiencing an intolerable situation in which some States or groups of States are acting solely in accord with their own interests, disregarding the notion of mankind's common objectives and interests.

55. These days the two super-Powers are exchanging accusations and threats, and at the same time a number of other States are resorting to the use of force to impose narrow political goals on the developing world, whose interests are being subordinated to those of blocs that are competing with one another. In addition, an artificial proliferation of local and regional conflicts, subtly encouraged from the centres of world power, is threatening to disrupt the incipient unity and co-ordination built up over recent decades by the developing countries to promote their clear common interests within the international system.

56. The widespread impetus given to the arms race between not only the major Powers and their blocs, but extending also to dependent regions of the third world, deserves particular condemnation. These countries, involved as they are in crises provoked and encouraged from abroad, must devote ever greater resources to military purposes, which in turn adversely affects their plans for economic and social development.

57. Therefore it is important that the international community should become aware of the dangers inherent in the present international situation and, instead of yielding to counterproductive pessimism, heed the demand of world public opinion to the world leaders to take concrete action to limit arms and gradually to reduce the nuclear and conventional arsenals and to eliminate, immediately and once and for all, the nuclear threat.

58. The Peruvian Government wishes to reaffirm its unswerving support for the valuable initiatives taken to promote world public awareness of the dangers of the arms race, emphasizing the latent and tragic possibility of a nuclear catastrophe. We are fully convinced that the effectiveness of the World Disarmament Campaign launched by you, Mr. President, and the educational effect that various forums, seminars and other related programmes will have will depend essentially on strengthening the role of the United Nations. It is most important that the Organization be given an administrative apparatus in the area of disarmament, one with sufficient standing and material means to carry out its vital task of promoting information and guidance.

59. A great deal has been said here about the economic costs and the waste of the social and scientific efforts poured into the arms buildup, as well as into the exponential increase in the destructive capacity of the weapons which the major Powers are determined to produce. All that is true, and the peoples of the world have developed a keen awareness of the dimensions of the problem, its significance for peace and

international security and its negative consequences for the social and economic development of each country. That is why there is an enormous and justified interest on the part of the peoples of the world in all problems relating to the arms buildup and a demand for concrete and effective disarmament measures, which must be heeded lest we frustrate a universally expressed will.

60. No delegation in the Assembly can guarantee that a nuclear war will not take place. That eventuality not only exists but is being actively planned in various scenarios and in various ways. For that reason it is clear that the nuclear-weapon States must recognize that the situation has become extremely dangerous.

61. There is no need to dwell on what would happen if mankind became the victim of special irrational interests, because we are quite convinced that no people wants this war or supports policies which could lead to such a war.

62. We have said, and we wish to repeat in the Assembly, that the peoples really want to see an end to the arms race, especially the race for nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. They want to see specific steps to begin the process of general and complete disarmament under international control. It is essential to make it perfectly clear that the nuclear Powers have a fundamental and primary responsibility in this matter, which they must recognize, as logic clearly indicates that disarmament cannot be started by the least armed. Once again it must be recognized that in the so-called conventional area it is those same countries that have unlimited power. It must also be recognized that the concern, not to say the anxiety, of many countries has in recent years led to enormous expenditure, which has been a heavy burden on their economies. It is clear that bilateral, subregional and regional efforts must be made to promote confidence and bring about the limitation of weapons and, finally, disarmament. Peru and the rest of Latin America have shown that in this field also they can make a contribution. In the present circumstances, every possibility must be explored of making progress along those lines.

63. The overwhelming majority of countries do not possess nuclear weapons, having renounced them under the Non-Proliferation Treaty, on the understanding that those possessing such weapons would negotiate effectively on their elimination. Unfortunately, as shown by the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, that has not been done. Therefore, we have the right to point out to the nuclear Powers, both those which are and those which are not parties to the Treaty, that the situation is alarming and that their lack of political will to initiate the disarmament process will prompt many countries to ask why what is indispensable for some cannot also be expedient for others.

64. Because of the danger of a world holocaust and the diversion of resources that could be better used to feed the millions of human beings who suffer from hunger, disarmament is imperative. But if disarmament is to be a reality it must be balanced and verifiable. Only when there is a political will to change the sort of action that has led to the present situation will it be

possible, in various parts of the world and at various levels, to reach agreements that will bring us closer to general and complete disarmament.

65. In connexion with the nuclear-arms buildup and mankind's common goals, such as non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament, as part of the general process of general and complete disarmament, Peru emphasizes the urgent need to consolidate, with the assistance of the United Nations, regional initiatives which, together with the overall treatment of the question by the international community, can play a primary role in alleviating tension, providing a reasonable margin of security and establishing a climate of relative confidence in sensitive areas which have been chronically unstable. For this reason, we give our firm support to the establishment, by common agreement, of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones wherever their application is urgently necessary. This, for example, is one of the areas in which Latin America made a pioneering effort by concluding the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

66. This special session of the General Assembly is an excellent opportunity to shed further light on the role of the Committee on Disarmament, for it is experiencing a clear crisis of identity. I am not referring to the secondary issue of membership, but to the very nature of the Committee as an international body.

67. The General Assembly has recognized that that Committee is the sole multilateral negotiating body in this field. Yet in practice that status has not been fully accorded to it, and the Committee has been debating a great deal and negotiating little and badly.

68. Some countries have reluctantly agreed to negotiate in the secondary and non-priority areas. The primary disarmament negotiations are taking place outside the Committee, within a narrow framework, and negotiations on the few secondary issues which have been taken up have been deadlocked by the increasingly obvious reluctance of the nuclear Powers to allow the Committee to reach significant agreements. That attitude must be corrected because, if it is not, what is now an identity crisis will surely become an existential crisis, which brings further questions about the usefulness of that body, to which Peru continues to attach great importance.

69. In our opinion the agreements that were reached in the 1978 session must be put into effect, and for that reason Peru believes it is most important that a comprehensive programme of disarmament be approved at the present special session. We appeal in particular to those countries which possess the largest nuclear arsenals to show a genuine spirit of political accommodation and reconciliation by realizing that the present paralysis in the disarmament process and the critical international situation require that the desire for peace, professed by all, be translated into specific and organic commitments that can be verified gradually in time and in space.

70. At the start of this special session, Mr. President, you reminded us that:

“Not a single weapon has been destroyed over the past four years as a result of a disarmament agreement. Nothing of significance has been done to reduce the imminent threat of self-extinction that

makes the present so dangerous and the future so uncertain.” [1st meeting, para. 15.]

71. In addition, the Secretary-General of this world Organization challenged Governments to combine efforts and give a reply to the peoples of the world—the creative reply expected of this special session.

72. Those are the requirements for survival that our peoples have put into our hands. It is their hope that this special session devoted to disarmament will be a historic occasion and a collective act of faith in mankind.

73. Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): Mr. President, may I say how pleased the New Zealand Government is to have you guiding our deliberations at this critical time. We are indeed in good hands.

74. At the opening of this special session you spoke eloquently and sadly of the failure of disarmament negotiations since the tenth special session was held four years ago. The Final Document of that session provided a new framework for disarmament efforts and set standards against which progress in disarmament could be measured. The expectations generated by that session have certainly not been fulfilled. We are still discussing disarmament in terms of agreements hoped for, rather than agreements reached. Expenditure on arms and armed forces has continued to increase. There has been no reduction in the resources allocated to the development of deadlier and more accurate weapons of war. Political tensions remain dangerously high. And armed conflict has continued to bring misery and destruction to people in many parts of the world.

75. One of the things that history demonstrates is that the desire of ordinary people to be freed from the burden and danger of armaments is not strongly or consistently reflected in the policies of Governments. More often than not, Governments are drawn by circumstances to the conclusion that the security of their countries can be preserved only by the acquisition of more arms.

76. History also shows that disputes among nations can seldom be settled peacefully except in an atmosphere of international confidence. The aggressiveness of some States and their pursuit of expansionist policies are destructive of that confidence. Their actions provoke others to seek improved security through increases in their military strength and improvements in their weaponry. In turn, each advance in weapons technology causes others to match that development with advances of their own. These become a cause of further instability. Every step in the arms race in this way damages confidence and heightens distrust and insecurity. That is what has been happening without pause in recent times and on a scale without parallel in the past. It symbolizes the failure of all efforts to control the growth of armaments and, at the same time, represents a formidable threat to peace and an appalling waste of resources.

77. The extent of that waste is revealed in the recent study entitled *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development*,⁵ in the annex to the Secretary-General's report: 40 million people employed by the armed forces of the world in activities that with few exceptions are of no civilian economic utility; over

100 billion dollars spent each year for machines of destruction on which are lavished the best that advanced technology can offer but which rapidly become obsolete; a disproportionate share of minerals and energy consumed in the satisfaction of military demands; a fifth of the world's scientists and engineers engaged in military research and development, on which more is spent than for any other objective of scientific inquiry or technological development. The pattern of military expenditure in our day, as never in the past, is one of persistent and sustained increase in virtually every region of the world for the maintenance of permanently mobilized forces. That is not expenditure that can rationally be regarded as an investment in security or in the future. Rather, in a reversal of the priorities of the Charter, the future is being mortgaged to the present, and resources that should be invested in education and health, and to promote economic growth, are being diverted into unproductive military activities.

78. There has never been a time when the need for restraint in the development and deployment of new weapons has been more urgent, or when the need for effective measures of arms control has been greater. It is therefore disappointing that so little progress should have been made in implementing the broad strategy outlined in the Final Document of the tenth special session. It is of particular concern to my Government and to the people of New Zealand that this should have been the case in relation to that section of the Programme of Action to which highest priority was given—namely, nuclear weapons. Over the years several agreements have been concluded aimed at reducing the risk of nuclear war. Some of them have included a measure of arms control. But they have been limited in scope and they have not removed the threat of nuclear war. If the risks of nuclear disaster are to be reduced, renewed efforts will be needed to halt and reverse the arms race. This objective can be achieved only by negotiated and verifiable agreements. As has so often been said, the primary responsibility for initiating and carrying forward negotiations to this end lies with the main nuclear-weapon States, since without agreement among them there will be no nuclear disarmament.

79. New Zealand has therefore welcomed the fact that negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe have begun, and that Strategic Arms Reduction Talks will begin shortly. We welcome too the fact that although the SALT II treaty remains unratified, its provisions continue to be accepted as a guideline for strategic arms levels in the interim. That there is less than complete agreement on the approach to these negotiations seems to us less important than the fact that they are to resume and that the two countries have demonstrated a readiness to get on with the business of making real progress in controlling and reducing their nuclear weapons. What is now needed is a long-term commitment to, and determination to achieve, the complete eradication of nuclear weapons.

80. In the meantime there are other goals to pursue. Among these none has a higher priority for my Government than the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. It has been evident for many years that the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the

Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water⁶ did not slow the arms race but simply diverted it into other channels. Since the 1963 Treaty entered into force nuclear-weapons testing has continued at a high level. It is a matter of particular concern to New Zealand that some of those tests are being conducted in the South Pacific. In a way that would not have been possible if a test ban had been in place, nuclear weapons have become not only more numerous but more advanced in their designs, with all the mounting dangers that those developments can imply. There is no surer step that the nuclear Powers could take to demonstrate their commitment to the reduction of their nuclear arsenals than a treaty, with appropriate verification provisions, for the permanent banning of all tests.

81. The report of the negotiating nuclear-weapon States to the Committee on Disarmament dated 30 July 1980⁷ showed that there had been considerable progress in the trilateral talks and that the positions of the three States were not far apart, though the unresolved issues were difficult and complicated by mistrust. It is to be hoped that the recent agreement of the Committee on Disarmament to consider some of the most vexed of those problems will contribute to their solution and lead to an early resumption of negotiations for a test-ban treaty satisfactory to all States. The longer the delay in concluding such an agreement, the greater the risks of proliferation of nuclear weapons will become. We are surely entitled to expect that the three nuclear Powers concerned will meet the obligations they entered into in the partial test-ban Treaty and the non-proliferation Treaty by taking this long-delayed but essential first step to achieving genuine nuclear disarmament. Such a step would at the same time put an end to their inconsistency in seeking to persuade others that nuclear weapons are undesirable while they themselves continue their test programmes.

82. The Non-Proliferation Treaty is not a perfect instrument, but whatever its defects it is the only comprehensive treaty of its kind and most States have agreed to be bound by it. Recent developments give cause for concern that in some parts of the world the non-proliferation régime may be in jeopardy. These fears will be removed only by universal adherence to the Treaty, by a renewal of confidence in IAEA safeguards and the full implementation of all the articles of the Treaty. Supplier and consumer nations must work together to ensure that the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy is not misused.

83. A measure of direct relevance to the objective of non-proliferation is the provision of assurances by the nuclear Powers to those who have renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons that such weapons will not be used against them. It is evident from the report of the Committee on Disarmament that there continue to be difficulties in reconciling the several unilateral declarations on the non-use or threat of use of nuclear weapons [see A/S-12/2, para. 63]. We can only hope that the various assurances can before long be reduced to a common formula that might be incorporated in an international instrument of a legally binding character and that the Committee on Disarmament will continue its negotiations to that end.

84. It is a measure of the frustration that non-nuclear Governments and their peoples feel at the lack of progress towards nuclear disarmament that they have turned to such regional measures as nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace as possibly offering substitute guarantees of freedom from the threat of nuclear destruction. It is a measure likewise of the difficulty of establishing an effective regional system of nuclear disarmament that only one such zone has been established in an inhabited area and that that zone is as yet incomplete because several important countries within its intended scope have so far failed to ratify either the regional treaty or the Non-Proliferation Treaty. New Zealand supports the principle and the objective of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We should like to see the whole world free of nuclear weapons, and nowhere more than our own part of the world, the South Pacific. There are formidable difficulties in the way of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in an area which is predominantly ocean space, not least the difficulty of verifying compliance with it. New Zealand would favour the establishment of a verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific, compatible with the relevant rules of international law and the security arrangements to which New Zealand is a party. We are, however, under no illusions about the difficulty in present circumstances of satisfying these requirements.

85. Another task of high priority is the conclusion of an agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons. The need for early progress in the negotiations on this issue in the Committee on Disarmament is reinforced by recent developments. New Zealand is in particular concerned by indications that chemical weapons are being used in conflicts, in violation of international law. The Organization has accepted responsibility for investigating recent reports of use to determine whether or not they can be verified. We believe that the persistence of reports of the use of chemical weapons reinforces the need for setting up standby machinery to investigate such allegations of use pending the establishment of permanent arrangements for this purpose.

86. It has never been more evident than it is today that confidence in the value of international arrangements relating to arms control depends on the adequacy of the verification arrangements which are put into force. The arms race appears now to be proceeding by the improvement of weapons more than by an increase in them. Each advance has made international inspection arrangements more desirable or urgent. For some years now, national technical means of inspection have fulfilled essential verification requirements, but there are indications that this may not hold true for much longer. If States are to be ready to pursue serious disarmament negotiations, they must be satisfied that the agreements they enter into will satisfy the requirement of increased security at lower force levels. If that cannot be guaranteed—if each party cannot be certain of the compliance of the others—the outlook for real measures of disarmament will be bleak indeed. Greater openness in the provision of information and flexibility in considering verification proposals, especially on the part of those States which have so far shown reluctance to cooperate in these areas, would contribute substantially

to the prospects of disarmament in future years. We consider that it would be valuable for the United Nations progressively to develop the capacities necessary to verify and control the implementation of disarmament agreements and for it to adopt proposals to that end.

87. New Zealand has given its support, through the attendance of its scientists, to the activities of the *Ad Hoc* Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. With our particular expertise in the seismic field, we regard this as a practical contribution we can make to the goal of international verification of a comprehensive test ban. We also welcome Sweden's proposal for an international system for the monitoring of airborne radioactivity. We hope to be in a position to participate in such a system. We are also ready to assess other means of enhancing the existing verification régime.

88. Nuclear disarmament rightly has the highest priority on the disarmament agenda, for nuclear weapons in their destructiveness and their after-effects differ fundamentally from all other weapons. In the words of the Final Document, they pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization.

89. Their levels of destructiveness have now reached such heights that the term "arms limitation" no longer provides reassurance. The clear message from peoples everywhere is that nuclear-weapon States must strive for genuine and substantial reductions in their nuclear armouries. As I have said, we welcome recent progress towards strategic arms reduction talks and the fact that the provisions of the earlier SALT agreements continue to find acceptance in the interim.

90. At the same time, we cannot afford to ignore the implications of the spread of conventional weapons, in particular the advanced weapons which recent wars have shown can cause appalling devastation, and the expansion of conventional forces in many parts of the world. It is to those forces and weapons that most of the world's military expenditure is allocated, and all the casualties of conflict in recent decades have resulted from their use in conventional war. In some cases conventional forces may be a factor in restraining conflict. In others they increase the potential for conflict, with all the risks of involvement by the great Powers and the threat to international security that that can entail. The need for restraint in this area has never been more evident. All of us have an obligation to work towards a world in which all nations have a better chance to live in peace. We believe that the Organization could contribute significantly to that end by enlarging the scope of its work on conventional arms control. The planned study on conventional disarmament [see A/S-12/3, annex III] is a useful first step in this direction.

91. The Government and people of New Zealand are of one mind in their concern over these issues. That concern has been reflected recently in the setting up of a Parliamentary Committee on Disarmament and Arms Control to examine and report on the whole range of issues on the agenda of this session. Everywhere, in fact, the peoples of the world have made manifest their determination that the ceaseless escalation of armaments must end. They know that there

has been no measurable progress since the tenth special session four years ago. They know that the destructive arsenals we found so intolerable then have increased still further. Now they are demanding action. If we fail to reverse the trend and to produce that action we risk the bitter condemnation of future generations—or worse, the very denial of their future. In this Assembly we have a solemn duty to respond to their demand.

92. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister of Denmark. I have great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Anker Jorgensen and inviting him to address the General Assembly.

93. Mr. JORGENSEN (Denmark): I should like first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the office of President of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

94. I should also like personally to welcome most warmly Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar to the extremely important post of Secretary-General of the United Nations.

95. The representative of Belgium, Mr. Leo Tindemans, has already spoken on behalf of the 10 Member States of the European Community [2nd meeting], and Denmark subscribes to the views he expressed on that occasion.

96. The nature of disarmament and security has changed fundamentally. Before nuclear weapons existed nations could reasonably argue that they provided for their own security. The threat of nuclear war has caught up with all of us, for if a nuclear war breaks out it will be a catastrophe for all.

97. As the Secretary-General said in his statement at the opening of the session: "In the nuclear age... [man] is faced with the very real and mounting threat of the death of the whole species" [1st meeting, para. 41]. Therefore no nation alone can guarantee peace, and no unilateral action can protect any of us from the consequences of nuclear war. Thus we are forced to work for security together. A mutual balance of terror cannot for ever remain the basis for the survival of man. Disarmament and security are two sides of a coin.

98. This leaves us with no alternative but to unite in an effort by all nations to reach a common understanding on security and disarmament.

99. What we cannot do alone we must do together. We see today all over the world a current of anxiety and restlessness about the growing tension and in particular the steady development of ever more terrible arms, especially in the nuclear field. It manifests itself in the movements in favour of peace and against nuclear war. We see it in the big demonstrations and popular meetings, for example, recently in Europe—at Bonn, Germany—and the day before yesterday here in New York. They are a clear indication of a deep anxiety. Therefore in this connexion I say that it must be the right of everybody all over the world to express anxiety about war and to call for peace.

100. I think that it is fundamentally wrong to see these currents of opinion as indications of defeatism or capitulation. Such phenomena probably play a role, but I want to warn against the belief that this is all. Feelings go far deeper. We must understand that we are facing a genuine and deeply felt popular reaction

against a trend of development which leads into absurdity. Therefore we seek security, but in reality the whole development in the field of nuclear weapons is condemned to lead to insecurity. A balance of power or of terror based on unlimited quantities of nuclear weapons seems impossible or insane to almost everybody.

101. The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, four years ago, was the broadest possible platform at the time for the United Nations effort in the field of disarmament. Our task at this session will be to widen our common understanding of the issues.

102. When reviewing the implementation of the Final Document and its Programme of Action we should avoid futile discussions on who is to blame for the lack of progress. We should instead concentrate on formulating and recommending ways to achieve real progress. We should work out a comprehensive programme of disarmament, with emphasis on concrete steps seen in a longer perspective, and we should aim at further strengthening the United Nations system.

103. Nuclear weapons remain the primary concern of the public as well as of Governments. In recent years, awareness of the danger of nuclear war has grown immensely.

104. In spite of popular backing, the process of nuclear disarmament will be neither easy nor short. What is most important is that the process get under way. This is a matter for talks between the nuclear Powers, in particular between the United States and the Soviet Union. That negotiations will be conducted beginning at the end of this month on both medium-range nuclear forces and strategic weapons systems is a great step forward.

105. The first goal should be the complete dismantling of land-based medium-range missiles capable of hitting targets in Europe and substantial reductions in the strategic arsenals of both sides. But I want to underline that the negotiating partners must not be mistaken. People are not interested at all in various technical scenarios about atomic warfare. What they feel and think is that the practical application of any weapons based on nuclear technology would be the start of the end of the world. Therefore, we want to eliminate the risk of nuclear war and thereby also do away with the debate about any use of nuclear weapons.

106. Hence, it is high time for these negotiations to begin. Too much time has already been lost. The people are impatient. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, which Denmark has always strongly supported, explicitly puts an obligation on the nuclear Powers to negotiate in order to reduce their arsenals. The Danish Government believes that it is in their and our common interest to do so. Thus we are also convinced that both sides must remain ready to negotiate in good faith.

107. Meanwhile, the Danish Government, together with the other Nordic countries, will continue to press for universal acceptance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Also, we call on all States with non-military nuclear facilities to accept international safeguards for all fissionable materials.

108. Another important factor in our efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons would be for all States

to ratify the limited test-ban treaty.⁶ The Committee on Disarmament should work for an early conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

109. I should like also to say something about nuclear-free zones. The idea of establishing nuclear-free zones is also an important contribution to the endeavours to achieve *détente*. The Danish Government believes that nuclear-weapon-free zones are important contributions to halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This applies especially where the Non-Proliferation Treaty has not been accepted by all States. The initiative, however, must come from, and be accepted by, all States in the area concerned.

110. Negotiations are more than ever the only possibility for the survival of mankind. The tremendous development in military technology may otherwise run out of the control of those who have the responsibility, and we shall end in disaster.

111. In this connexion I think that the attitude which Denmark and the other Nordic countries have taken towards the possible stationing of nuclear weapons in the Nordic area has been right. It has been a factor which contributed to a reduction of tension not just in the Nordic area. It is in this spirit that the ongoing debate on a possible formalization of this state of affairs should be seen. But we are nuclear-free, and the Danish Government does not think that any Nordic country would want to change that. The decisive element must be to make a greater part of Europe free of nuclear weapons and include both sides of the line dividing it into East and West.

112. Attention must therefore be directed towards those geographical areas where nuclear weapons actually exist more than towards areas where there are no such weapons.

113. However, the threat of nuclear war is global, and it cannot be removed by solely declaring parts of the world free of nuclear weapons. The existing nuclear-free status of the Nordic countries must therefore also be seen in a wider context.

114. In this context Denmark therefore welcomes the report of the Palme Commission entitled "Common Security—a programme for disarmament",⁸ which puts forward interesting proposals with regard to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Europe. It must always be kept in mind that the goal is to control, reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons. Attention must therefore be focused on such weapons where they exist or may be introduced. This brings me once again to underline the importance of the talks at Geneva on medium-range nuclear weapons. The success of these talks remains the primary condition for avoiding a new spiral of the nuclear arms race in Europe.

115. To the extent that nuclear disarmament talks are successful and result in a reduced role for these weapons, the nations of the world will find themselves confronted with the classical problem of how to maintain peace between sovereign States in an international system lacking adequate peace-keeping institutions. The United Nations was set up to deal with this problem. It is right that the Palme Commission should now direct attention to the need for strengthening the collective security procedures of the Organization.

116. The United Nations was established at a time when only a few people knew about nuclear weapons. But, in any case, we cannot simply return to the times before nuclear weapons existed. We must not forget the two world wars in this century.

117. Other fields of disarmament also deserve our attention. A ban on the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons needs early consideration. The invention and deployment of new weapons of mass destruction and a future arms race in space must be prevented.

118. The conventional arms race has sometimes been ignored because of the preoccupation with the nuclear threat. That is understandable, but it would be sad to save the world from nuclear war only to see it destroyed in so-called conventional wars. The Second World War was a conventional war, but it ruined large areas of the world and tens of millions of people were killed. Since the Second World War there has been a fantastic development of conventional weapons, and millions of people have died and suffered in conventional wars. Eighty per cent of the world's spending on armaments goes on conventional weapons. Therefore, attention to conventional armaments must not be loosened. There must also be a reduction in this field. We therefore welcome with great satisfaction new initiatives in the negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions.

119. For years, the Danish Government has taken an interest in and has tried to attract more attention to this issue. Results have now been achieved. In a few weeks time a United Nations expert group will start working on a study on conventional disarmament. It is our hope that this may pave the way for concrete results in this field.

120. A particularly promising achievement in relation to conventional armed conflict is the adoption of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.² I am pleased to announce that Denmark will ratify the Convention in the very near future. It is the hope of my Government that the Convention will soon be ratified by all States, in order to make it universally binding.

121. The recently published study on disarmament and development⁵ is the result of a joint Nordic proposal. It demonstrates the economic absurdity of the heavy burden on all countries of military spending. We suggest that steps be taken to pave the way for reallocating resources from military to civilian purposes. As the report points out, we have to choose between a continued arms race and balanced social and economic development on a world scale.

122. I should like to close by making a few remarks about the international climate as a basis for disarmament. It is *détente* we seek, but *détente* presumes the ability and will to defend oneself. Peace is not enough; we must also have freedom and respect for the individual. We must stand up for our opinions, but we must seek to avoid measures that increase tension, because it is our aim to recreate the conditions of *détente*.

123. I have already referred to the collective security system, which was the basic idea behind this

Organization. It was based on the big Powers operating in harmony with each other. Yet, at that time already some foresaw the risk of a breakdown of the war-time alliance.

124. In his Open Letter to the United Nations in 1950, the Danish physicist Niels Bohr underlined the need for greater mutual confidence in order to reach an agreement about nuclear arms. Good will and respect between nations, he wrote, cannot prevail without free access to information about all aspects of life in all countries. Many of the barriers previously regarded as indispensable to the protection of national interests clearly stood in the way of common security.

125. In this statement Niels Bohr not only identified some of the causes of the tensions of the cold war, but he also made an early reference to the concept of common security. His observations are relevant even today. During the four years since the first special session on disarmament we have again entered into a vicious circle. It leads to greater tension and a growing belief that there are military solutions to all problems. This is a vicious circle which has to be broken. Our common interest in survival and our common security are in fact more important than our differences. We have to change our way of thinking. We have to educate ourselves for peace.

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

127. Mr. GOMA (Zambia): This second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is taking place against the background of a severely strained international situation occasioned by continuing super-Power and bloc rivalry, several local or regional wars and the consequent phenomenal upsurge of national armaments and the consolidation of bloc military arsenals. This development has made a mockery of our collective pledge at the first special session devoted to disarmament, in 1978, to chart a new course of general and complete disarmament and to ensure international peace and security.

128. Four years after that first special session we are still where the one most profound statement in the Final Document of that session left us: "Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation." [*Resolution S-10/2, para. 18.*] Very little indeed in that Final Document has been implemented since 1978.

129. Lack of progress in curbing the arms race is all the more reprehensible since we are now in the Second Disarmament Decade. This Decade, like its predecessor, reflects contradictions of objectives and aspirations. The arms race is not diminishing but increasing. It may be wondered whether disarmament is an attainable demand or an illusion.

130. This session represents a timely attempt to resurrect and keep alive the momentum generated by the first special session devoted to disarmament, which momentum has since been lost in the maze of the arms race. It is yet another attempt in the continuing human experiment to bring about enduring world peace and security. Indeed my delegation is gratified that the first substantive step taken by the General Assembly at this twelfth special session was the launching

of the World Disarmament Campaign. We believe that the Campaign could serve as a fresh impetus to disarmament, which is necessary to engage not only all countries but also all peoples of all countries.

131. One of the latest positive developments associated with the increasing awareness of the deleterious effects of the arms race is the nuclear-freeze movement. Nuclear-freeze sentiment is the outgrowth of the moral consensus about the poverty of the arms race. It attests to the growing impatience and disillusionment wrought by the stalemate in disarmament efforts. A nuclear freeze could, therefore, be the way out of the impasse, since it promises to provide an intervening period in which cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction would be followed by halting for all time the production and deployment of any nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction. We would hope that during such a moratorium all Governments concerned would prepare themselves for the final destruction of their arsenals.

132. Although the nuclear-arms race affects the security of all States, it is clear that the two major nuclear States, the United States and the Soviet Union, will have to take the lead in the nuclear disarmament process. A special responsibility devolves upon them to achieve nuclear disarmament, so bilateral negotiations between them are of paramount importance. In this regard we lament the premature death of SALT II and urge the two super-Powers to reconcile themselves to talking to each other rationally and constructively. Accordingly we welcome the talks currently taking place and wish to emphasize the importance of the projected talks scheduled to start at the end of this month at Geneva between the United States and the Soviet Union.

133. It is disconcerting that some world leaders are today grappling with the concept of nuclear war as a legitimate means of solving international problems. Hence we are being treated to rhetoric about a winnable nuclear war, pronouncements about assured destruction, levels of damage and limited nuclear exchange. My delegation wishes to reiterate the imperative necessity for all nuclear-weapon States to subscribe to the concept of non-first-use of nuclear weapons in settling disputes in the world.

134. There can be no doubt that the greatest threat to mankind today is the existence and continuous development of devastating nuclear weapons. We must, however, recognize a fundamental difference between the security concerns of the big Powers and the blocs they represent and those of the third world. To the third world, the East-West threat perceptions, as related to each other, reflect security concerns about avoiding or fighting a nuclear war. Such a war has never actually been fought; it is a prospective war. On the other hand, the perceived threats to the third world emanate from specific security crises actually experienced or directly witnessed. Virtually all the local or regional wars fought since the Second World War have occurred in Asia, Africa and Latin America, using conventional weapons. Thus it is the existence and continuing development of conventional weapons that actually are the immediate menace to the countries of the developing world.

135. It can be said that more and more third world countries are increasingly inclined to view themselves as victims of an escalating arms race led by a handful of industrialized countries. While the heavy concentration of military power among the industrialized countries has been paralleled by the absence of open military confrontation among them since the Second World War, there have been and still are many hotbeds of crisis and actual wars in the various regions of the third world.

136. Virtually all the military conflicts in the developing countries have been fought with imported weaponry. Since only a small number of third world countries possess any significant armament production facilities or capabilities, the weapons used in the developing countries are imported from the industrialized countries. The majority of militarily endangered countries today are countries of the developing and non-bloc world. The big Powers thus cannot escape the charge that they promote tensions around the world and then sell large quantities of arms to third world countries that feel themselves threatened or are actually engaged in combat with each other.

137. It is clear from the foregoing that an ominous development of conventional weapons is taking place simultaneously with that of nuclear weapons. Admittedly the nuclear-arms race has overshadowed the race in conventional weapons, and yet the world is increasingly threatened by the use of conventional weapons in the numerous local and regional armed conflicts. While therefore devoting constant attention to the dangers of nuclear weapons and stressing the priority of nuclear disarmament, we should realize that the same nuclear Powers have been running an unparalleled race in conventional weapons. It is only logical then that the obligation to reduce conventional forces and arms should rest with the militarily strong, and especially with the nuclear-weapon States.

138. It is against this background that regional disarmament deserves serious attention, especially in the light of the knowledge that the security concerns and the social and economic burdens associated with the arms race in many regions are predominantly—for most countries, exclusively—related to the conventional component of the global arms race. The effectiveness of regional disarmament therefore lies in putting an end to regional conflicts. In turn, that would contribute positively to strengthening the fabric of world peace and security. Regional disarmament would further serve to dispel lurking distrust, a persistent burden in disarmament negotiations at regional and global levels.

139. It follows that the big Powers have a responsibility and duty to promote regional disarmament. It is incumbent upon them to desist from fomenting local conflicts and tensions around the world and from using the third world, in particular, both as a market and as a testing ground for their weapons.

140. I wish in this regard to underscore the fact that disarmament is inextricably linked to international security. The elimination of hotbeds of tension in the world, which encourage the arms race and threaten regional and international peace and security, would create the necessary climate for meaningful disarmament. To eliminate them we must identify and tackle

their root causes, in keeping with the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law. This calls also for a political will to abide by and fully implement United Nations resolutions.

141. We cannot, for example, realistically talk about disarmament in respect of the questions of Namibia, South Africa and Palestine without addressing the fundamental question of the inalienable rights of the oppressed peoples there. Disarmament will continue to be an illusion and, indeed, peace and security will remain threatened in such areas for as long as the root causes of the conflicts are not eliminated. The independence of Namibia, the elimination of *apartheid* in South Africa and the exercise by the Palestinian people of their right to self-determination and a national homeland would represent a major contribution to the cause of disarmament and peace and security in southern Africa and the Middle East.

142. Within the specific context of southern Africa, I should like also to reiterate Zambia's concern about the acquisition of nuclear capability by South Africa. The Western Powers, which have been responsible for this ominous development in Africa by supplying nuclear materials to, and through their nuclear collaboration with, South Africa, must re-examine the rectitude of their actions. We urge them to cease their collaboration with South Africa because that country's nuclear arsenals will, without doubt, be used against the rest of Africa, which opposes the Pretoria régime because of its *apartheid* policy. The independent States of Africa have demonstrated their peaceful intentions through their commitment to the denuclearization of the continent. It is for South Africa and its collaborators to co-operate fully and not to frustrate this noble aspiration.

143. Zambia also ascribes high priority to the concept of the creation of zones of peace in the world because, when such zones are aggregated, they could constitute the substance of world peace. It is for this reason that we have always supported the idea of turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. At the moment, the increased and frenzied activities of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean area run counter to the objective of proclaiming the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. Besides, increasing regional conflicts in and around the Indian Ocean make it more than imperative that the region benefit from a disarmament régime. To this end, my delegation wishes again to urge all States concerned, in particular the big Powers and other maritime users of the Indian Ocean, to co-operate fully and make possible the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean at Colombo in 1983.

144. In conclusion, I should like to note that, when we met here during the tenth special session in 1978, we were all animated by the desire to survive as much as by a fear of a horrendous death as the price of the arms race. We thus collectively pledged to part company with the creeping arms race which would lead us to self-destruction either by miscalculation, accident or malfunction. In fact, we agreed to choose to eliminate the danger of war and expressed our total readiness to negotiate real disarmament measures. The fact that the arms race still proceeds apace despite our commitments of 1978 demands that we all abandon our egoistic concerns for national security

which have prevented the emergence of the requisite political will to negotiate meaningful disarmament. It is through political will that mankind will survive the impending holocaust. In this regard we need to fight the long-standing tendency of the big Powers, especially the two super-Powers, to make their own interests and mutual relations the kingpin of mankind's efforts to bring about disarmament. We must reaffirm and strengthen the role of international negotiating mechanisms under the United Nations.

145. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister of Uganda, Mr. Otema Allimadi. On behalf of the Assembly, I have the honour of welcoming him and inviting him to address the Assembly.

146. Mr. ALLIMADI (Uganda): Mr. President, allow me to express the pleasure and satisfaction of my delegation at seeing you presiding over this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I extend to you and to the representatives gathered here the good wishes of the Government and people of Uganda for a successful conclusion of this important session.

147. I also wish to take this opportunity to convey very warm congratulations to Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar on his election as Secretary-General of the United Nations. We are very happy to see a distinguished son of Peru, a friendly and fellow non-aligned country, at the helm of the Organization.

148. Four years ago, at the initiative of the movement of non-aligned countries, of which Uganda is a devoted member, the United Nations held the first special session devoted to disarmament. On that historic occasion, we unanimously adopted a Final Document [resolution S-10/2] which embodied, *inter alia*, a Declaration [*ibid.*, sect. II] and a Programme of Action [*ibid.*, sect. III] and contained provisions for democratic machinery for the ultimate attainment of worldwide disarmament. Paragraph 18 of the Final Document summarized the issue thus:

“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.”

That was the issue four years ago; it is still the issue today.

149. What, then, has happened in the intervening years since the unanimous adoption of the Final Document in 1978? We have witnessed a general deterioration in the international situation. Détente, which characterized relations between the super-Powers during most of the decade of the 1970s, has now given way to open confrontation and unbridled rivalry among the big Powers. The cold war, that unfortunate legacy of the post-war era, is once again marking what could well be a pre-war period. The intensification of East-West rivalry is being manifested in several new hotbeds of tension around the world. Competition for spheres of influence continues unabated. The arms race, particularly its nuclear aspect, has escalated to new levels of irrationality. In addition to the enlarged capacity to wage nuclear war, there has developed a strange willingness on the part of some

nuclear-weapon States to contemplate the use of such weapons.

150. The production of new and more deadly weapons and attempts to promote the highly dangerous concept of a so-called limited nuclear war are tragic omens for the future of our world. There is increasing recourse to the use and threat of use of force, military intervention, foreign occupation and interference—all in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law.

151. The focal points of aggression and tension, particularly in southern Africa, the Middle East, South-East Asia, Central America and the Caribbean, continue to deteriorate. Even as we are deliberating here, Israel is occupying Lebanon and has unleashed a most brutal campaign of massacre and destruction on the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. In the South Atlantic a war is raging between Argentina and the United Kingdom. Meanwhile, the tragic conflict between Iraq and Iran continues to take a heavy toll on the peoples of the two non-aligned countries.

152. Times have clearly changed for the worse. These developments together represent a decade of greater turbulence, uncertainty and tension. The picture is indeed grim. The prospect of global catastrophe has now moved from the level of fantasy to the realm of frightening possibility.

153. Over the last four years, the hopes raised by the unanimous adoption of the Final Document have been eroded almost to the point of despair. No progress has been registered on the basic disarmament questions. The ever-soaring global military expenditure has now reached the staggering level of \$600 billion per annum. The nuclear-weapon States have frustrated all efforts to conclude a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. There is consequently a growing danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Meanwhile, outer space is being increasingly militarized. There has also been a conspicuous lack of progress in such areas as the prohibition of the production of the neutron bomb, the creation of additional nuclear-weapon-free zones, bans on new types of weapons of mass destruction, and the limitation of conventional arms buildup and transfers.

154. The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks between the super-Powers have been in abeyance, although we note with interest the recent announcement by the United States and the Soviet Union concerning the resumption of those negotiations. It is our hope that concrete and positive results will emerge from the negotiations.

155. The implications of the arms race for the global economy and particularly for the development of the developing countries are a source of particular concern to my delegation. As I have already stated, the global military expenditure for this year alone will certainly reach \$600 billion, which makes global spending on development seem a cruel mockery. We cannot help but notice that the phenomenal increase in the military expenditure of the big Powers in recent years has taken place during a period when their annual spending on official development assistance has declined drastically. Indeed, only 5 per cent of the resources currently spent on arms would be enough to implement the entire International Development Strategy for the

Third United Nations Development Decade [resolution 35/56, annex].

156. World peace and security do not depend on a balance of military terror. On the contrary, world peace and security depend on disarmament and the establishment of a new and just international order.

157. The source of much of the insecurity in the world today is the widening gap between rich and poor countries. No amount of weapons, nuclear or conventional, can remove this underlying cause. This basic inequality and injustice in the international system can be remedied only by restructuring international economic relations and establishing the new international economic order.

158. For us in Africa the commitment of our people to live in peace and to ensure a nuclear-free Africa is as total as our commitment to rid the continent of the last vestiges of colonialism, racism and racial discrimination. The objective of General Assembly resolution 1652 (XVI), of 24 November 1961, to establish a nuclear-free zone in Africa has not yet been achieved. This failure has enabled the racist minority régime in South Africa to acquire nuclear capability, which has put it in a position in which it can hold the rest of Africa to ransom while perpetuating the abominable policy of *apartheid*, which has been rightly recognized by the Assembly as a crime against humanity.

159. The acquisition of nuclear capability by the *apartheid* régime in South Africa, in collaboration with certain Western countries, poses a grave threat to the peace and security of Africa, as well as to international peace and security in general. We fear that a desperate régime such as the one in Pretoria could easily trigger a nuclear war once the irresistible tide of liberation threatens the foundations of its minority rule.

160. This grave danger which the racist régime poses to Africa is compounded by disturbing developments in the Indian Ocean. The growing buildup of big-Power military presence in the Indian Ocean is a matter of great concern to us in Uganda and Africa as a whole. Despite the expressed wishes of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, military activities in all forms and manifestations by the big Powers have been intensified in the Indian Ocean. Indeed, there has been a marked deterioration in the climate of peace and security in the area.

161. The concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace—as set out in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) of 16 December 1971 and as considered at the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, held in New York from 2 to 13 July 1979, as well as at subsequent meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean—is being systematically nullified by this unwarranted escalation of military preparations by the big Powers.

162. The proposal to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean is an authentic expression of the desire of the peoples of the region to safeguard their hard-won independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. It is against this background that Uganda continues to support the proposal to convene a conference on the Indian Ocean in accordance

with the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee [A/S-12/5, paras. 60 to 63]. It is for us a matter of profound regret that the conference was not held last year as scheduled because of the negative attitude adopted by certain Powers.

163. The elimination and destruction of nuclear weapons is the surest means of averting nuclear war. The conclusion of international arrangements of a legally binding nature to respect the inviolability of non-nuclear-weapon States and of nuclear-weapon-free zones are important supplements to but not substitutes for the ultimate objective of comprehensive and complete disarmament.

164. Although the prevention of nuclear war must remain the primary objective of disarmament, greater efforts must also be made to halt the production and sale of conventional weapons, which today account for 80 per cent of all arms spending. The trade in conventional weapons has in recent years increased at an alarming rate. The traditional exporters in both East and West have now been joined in the trade by some developing countries which have become significant arms producers and suppliers in their own right.

165. There is urgent need to reach agreement to restrain the sale of arms and arms-producing facilities, especially to areas where conflict and tension are rife. In this task, needless to say, the big Powers bear a very special responsibility. At the same time, the poor countries also have a responsibility to scale down their expenditure on arms with a view to directing the resources thus released to development projects.

166. We are pleased that since its creation the Committee on Disarmament has considered the question of a comprehensive programme of disarmament as a priority item and has established several working groups to study all aspects of nuclear disarmament.

167. However, we note with deep regret that owing to the lack of the political will on the part of some countries very little progress has been made on the substantive aspects of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

168. The question of disarmament and the maintenance of world peace and security cannot be the monopoly of the big Powers or a particular group of countries. All countries, powerful and weak, big and small, rich and poor, are exposed and vulnerable to the catastrophe of a nuclear war. For this reason, all countries and peoples of the world have a stake in the question of disarmament and peace.

169. In this regard, Uganda welcomes the emergence of popular peace movements throughout the world as a reflection of the moral outrage and indignation of the citizens of the world in the face of the irrational policies of some Governments, which are slowly but surely leading the whole of humanity down the path of global catastrophe.

170. Only last Saturday in this very city, we witnessed an unprecedented mammoth peace rally, the participants in which gathered from all corners of the world. That event was a most eloquent and powerful testimony against war and in favour of disarmament and peace. And again today we have seen rallies.

The peoples of the world have spoken and continue to speak forcefully and unequivocally. They want to live, and to live in peace.

171. We also commend the important work being done by various non-governmental organizations all over the world in educating and mobilizing international public opinion about the grave danger posed by the arms race and, in particular, nuclear armament.

172. In conclusion, I should like to underscore the primary role of the United Nations in disarmament negotiations.

173. At this special session the Assembly must adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament and reaffirm the determination of the international community to eliminate the danger of nuclear war. It must call for an immediate freeze on the development, production and deployment of nuclear weapons.

174. This session must also reaffirm the validity of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session and map out a strategy for its speedy and effective implementation.

175. Moreover, we must during this session solemnly resolve that any States or statesmen that resorted to the first use of nuclear weapons would be committing the gravest crime against humanity.

176. Lest we forget, the Charter of the United Nations reminds us that the Organization was founded in order "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind". We have a moral and political obligation to save humanity from the greatest scourge of all—the scourge of a nuclear holocaust.

177. I have come here to reaffirm the commitment of the Government and people of Uganda to the cause of disarmament and peace. Consistent with this commitment, I am happy to announce before this special session devoted to disarmament that the Government of Uganda has decided to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

178. The Government and people of Uganda will continue to contribute all they can to make our world a more secure and peaceful place to live in.

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

180. Mr. CHISSANO (Mozambique): Mr. President, as you come from a country which is at war, you know the horrors which war can produce and the destruction which results from it. We are certain that this session devoted to disarmament will find in you not only a skilful and perspicacious diplomat, but also a man profoundly concerned to conduct it in such a way that it can help to prevent each of the nations here represented from continuing to live under the spectre of war. From the outset, we should like to assure you that the delegation of the People's Republic of Mozambique will spare no effort to co-operate with you for the success of the task that we have entrusted to you.

Mr. Renzaho (Rwanda), Vice-President, took the Chair.

181. I take this occasion to congratulate Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar on his election to the high post of Secretary-General of the Organization. He assumes

his mandate at a time of strong international tensions, a time in which the use of force in international relations has a tendency to prevail over the climate of détente. Consequently, the great responsibility to reverse this trend in order that the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations may be observed rests upon him. We should like to assure him of our co-operation in the discharge of this heavy responsibility.

182. The process of détente initiated in the decade of the 1970s in response to the peoples' concerns for and just aspirations to freedom, peace and progress has been interrupted. The dialogue which has been established was suppressed in its incipient phase and replaced by the language of force, the language of the cold war. Force overruled reason, leading to the intensification of the East-West dichotomy and the worsening of the danger of threats to international peace and security to the detriment of the climate of understanding and comprehension.

183. As imperialism developed its military might, the tone of its threats was raised and its acts of aggression against the peoples engaged in the struggle for true political and economic independence increased in number.

184. The arms race led to the deterioration of relations among States, creating grave changes in international relations which brought with them the increasing nuclearization of the world and the enlargement of military pacts, thus increasing the possibility of a direct confrontation among nuclear-weapon Powers from which nothing could result but the extermination of mankind. It is unthinkable that mankind could survive if such a war broke out among such Powers.

185. The question of nuclear arms is not only a matter for nuclear-weapon Powers, or the so-called super-Powers. We should not accustom ourselves to the doctrine that it would be possible to wage a limited nuclear war. A nuclear war, wherever it breaks out, will inevitably assume universal dimensions owing to its own dynamics and the high technological level of modern weapons in the present context of international relations. For this reason, the People's Republic of Mozambique attaches paramount importance to the problem of disarmament. In speaking on disarmament we are aware that this is not in itself the objective of our discussions. Our objectives are peace, freedom and the welfare and progress of peoples.

186. But the arms race and war have their causes—causes of which we cannot lose sight in appealing to the good sense of the countries responsible for these phenomena.

187. Southern Africa continues to be the area where progressive and peace-loving forces are confronted with the bellicose and retrogressive forces whose aim is to perpetuate the exploitation and domination of peoples, which results in the accumulation of arms. The arrogance and irresponsibility of the racist régime of Pretoria constitute one of the most dreadful demonstrations of the aggressiveness of imperialism.

188. The South African régime is irresponsible and criminal. Taking into account the facility with which nuclear technology designed for peaceful purposes can be used for military ends and also taking into con-

sideration the nature of that régime, the possession of nuclear technology by South Africa becomes a threat to international peace and security. It is like fire in the possession of a lunatic.

189. In launching armed attacks against the front-line States, the *apartheid* régime aims to prevent the consolidation of the political and economic independence of our countries, thus forcing us to withdraw our total and unconditional support for the liberation struggle waged by the peoples of Namibia and South Africa. As a consequence of these attacks, the countries of the region are more and more compelled to arm themselves in order to defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity, which are constantly being threatened by the South African racist régime.

190. Our weapons are intended to ensure that our children will no longer be barbarously massacred, as is happening to thousands of South African children who are being systematically decimated by the racist régime.

191. Our weapons aim at defending liberty, human dignity and peace. They are like the weapons grasped by the heroic Saharan people who are facing Moroccan aggression. The Rabat régime, which is incapable of sustaining the great successive political and diplomatic victories of the Sahraoui Arab Democratic Republic, which has just been admitted as a member of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], is trying to invalidate those victories. To that end it has established alliances which are contrary to the efforts undertaken by the international community for the maintenance of world peace. In this context Morocco has established military links with imperialism by providing military bases which will be used as springboards for aggression against countries that have chosen a system of development that will benefit the vital interests of their peoples.

192. Disarmament in Africa necessarily implies the eradication of colonialism, neo-colonialism, *apartheid* and imperialism. Material, diplomatic and political support for the liberation movements is an essential component of the struggle for peace and disarmament. The war for national liberation is a just war because it seeks to gain freedom and peace. As long as there are oppressed people there will be no peace in the world.

193. The principles and purposes incorporated in the Charter of the United Nations constitute a whole. Therefore capitalization of some of them to the detriment of the others cannot be acceptable. The prohibition of the use of force cannot be translated in any manner as an acceptance of oppression and exploitation. A people's right to independence and self-determination is a sacred right which should never be questioned. To exercise and defend that right, peoples are entitled to use all available means, including force. However, the imperialist Powers, with the deliberate intention of confusing world opinion, constantly question those States which provide political, material and diplomatic support to the liberation movements. Western Powers allege that such countries, in contributing to the emergence of new States and in supporting the consolidation of their independence, are breaking the existing balance of forces. Under the

pretext of the need to re-establish such a balance, imperialism blocks negotiations for disarmament and unconditionally supports the dictatorial, fascist and racist régimes. The massive accumulation of armaments, the acquisition of related technology and the possession of nuclear weapons by the colonialist, racist and dictatorial régimes constitute a danger to international security and hinder the process of disarmament.

194. It is in that context that heavily armed Israel has been able recently to annex the Golan Heights and to attack Lebanon, causing destruction and death in a sovereign country Member of this Organization. The Israeli régime is just as irresponsible as the *apartheid* régime. Moreover, the collusion between those two régimes in the military and the nuclear domain and their aggressive practices leave no doubt as to the similarities which exist between them. In order to achieve peace in the Middle East the total elimination of zionism and the re-establishment of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are conditions which ought to be met.

195. In Latin America, where several countries, such as Cuba, Nicaragua and Grenada, live under the threat of aggression, peace and the cessation of the arms race imply respect for the sovereign will of the peoples of the region and non-interference in the internal affairs of their respective countries.

196. In this zone peace also means the elimination of the fascist and dictatorial régimes, the eradication of oppression and humiliation so that once and for all the peoples of Chile and of El Salvador, among others, can lay aside their weapons. It implies respect for the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the countries of the region, such as Guyana, Argentina—whose territory includes the Malvinas Islands—and Belize, which is an independent and sovereign country. Those countries can neither be divided nor annexed totally or partially. Any attempt to do so will create conditions for a further accumulation of armaments in the zone and for the outbreak of war, with unforeseen consequences.

197. We should like to take this opportunity to welcome the initiatives of Mr. José López Portillo aimed at creating a climate of peace and security in this zone.

198. In Asia disarmament and peace mean the end of the occupation of East Timor by the Djakarta régime and respect for the right to self-determination and independence of the people of East Timor. It also means the unconditional withdrawal of foreign occupation troops from South Korea and the peaceful reunification of Korea.

199. In the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament we adopted an international strategy that could lead us, gradually but firmly, towards a world of peace, free from the threat of nuclear war. However, the just aspirations of the international community were frustrated by the flagrant lack of political will on the part of imperialism, particularly the United States of America, which decided among other things to increase its military budgets astronomically and to produce a new generation of nuclear weapons, including the neutron bomb.

200. Imperialism—busy with preserving its political, military and economic control over various regions of the world, instead of engaging during the last four years in serious negotiations conducive to denuclearization, to the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and to the reduction of conventional weapons—has sought to strengthen its military position by increasing its nuclear weaponry. It was within that context that the programme of production of the neutron bomb was approved and production of the MX missiles, whose destructive power threatens to bring the world to a holocaust, was projected.

201. In the field of negotiations on nuclear weapons no progress was achieved—multilaterally, regionally or bilaterally. Thus the Programme of Action adopted during the tenth special session was completely torpedoed, driving further away the possibility of rapidly establishing the necessary climate of peace, which could guarantee the realization of a strategy for the speedy development and progress of nations.

202. Thirty-seven years ago the world witnessed the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Japanese and all other peoples that love freedom and peace still have sad memories of those horrors, which they will never forget. However, new nuclear arsenals, with even greater destructive power, are still being built up. The use of these arms in a war will leave no signs in man for the simple reason that there will be no human beings left to remember. Such is the destructive power of modern armaments. That is the sad reality which those who dream about so-called limited nuclear war pretend to ignore when they try to make us believe that in such a war there will be victors and that from it prosperity will result for certain nations.

203. Nevertheless, the people will not let themselves be misled. Hence, in the whole world, particularly in the United States, the peoples have determinedly mobilized themselves against the arms race. The rally in favour of disarmament which took place last Saturday here in New York signified the culmination of a series of activities by the peoples in the struggle for peace.

204. There has been no progress either in negotiations on disarmament in the field of weapons of mass destruction and chemical weapons. In this field, the imperialists have deliberately adopted delaying manoeuvres to gain time to implement their plans to deploy such weapons.

205. The imperialist Powers are not concerned about the disastrous consequences of the use of those arms. In Viet Nam, Angola and Mozambique defenceless populations were the victims of chemical warfare during the period of the colonial war of aggression. To this day, women, children and the youth of our countries bear the wounds caused by chemical weapons and the trauma of the horrors experienced at the time of their deflagration.

206. Warmongers are busy improving the instruments of death, seeking more and more ways to obstruct the production of means of detecting them. It is within this context that they have developed the technology of binary chemical weapons, with their high level of toxicity.

207. With regard to conventional weapons, a Convention and three Protocols² have been concluded concerning the use of three categories of such weapons: non-detectable fragments; mines, booby traps and other such devices; and incendiary weapons. These results are poor, however, compared to the magnitude of this problem. We hope that everybody will consider this only a first step in the field of conventional disarmament.

208. In this respect we welcome the unilateral initiative of the Soviet Union concerning the reduction of its troops, tanks and other military equipment in Europe.

209. The sea-bed and outer space have become strategic areas and consequently subject to the arms race. Exploration of space has brought great benefits to humankind, including advances in the fields of communications, remote sensing of the earth, meteorology and navigation. Nevertheless, we are witnessing with concern a multiplication of space missions for military purposes, thus endangering peace and international security. This situation, far from creating a climate of stability, gives rise to mistrust and undermines the whole process of negotiations aimed at general and complete disarmament. The peoples of the world, in particular those from developing countries, demand that effective measures be undertaken to put an end to the militarization of outer space and the sea-bed.

210. Outer space and the sea-bed constitute the common heritage of mankind and should be used for the benefit of the scientific and technical development of nations, to ensure for everyone the availability of food, education and health—in other words, to guarantee the availability of better material conditions and social welfare for all.

211. The struggle for the establishment of the new international economic order is an integral part of the struggle of peoples for political, economic and cultural liberation. It is a struggle to exercise full sovereignty over their own natural resources.

212. Education, culture, health and the opportunity to work are among the essential human rights, irrespective of race, social status and ideology.

213. The harmonious development of the world is intimately related to the disarmament process. There is no other solution for the tensions and conflicts confronting the world today, which will continue as long as there are people living in hunger, barefoot and without access to schools and hospitals.

214. According to figures of which we are all aware, there is an alarming contradiction between the astronomical amount of money being wasted on the manufacture of weapons of all kinds and the amount destined for development programmes. The war industries of the big Powers are increasing. However, the industrialization of the developing countries which lack the means to satisfy the needs of their peoples is moving backwards or is doomed to stagnation.

215. Disarmament can lead to the integral development of peoples and to the reduction of inequalities among nations. In this struggle, the establishment of the new international economic order would constitute the fullest expression of the people's deter-

mination to build a world of peace and progress. In this context we underline the importance and significance of the proposals presented by the socialist countries with a view to reducing military budgets, specifically those of the permanent members of the Security Council and of the great military Powers. The reduction of these military budgets would permit the release of human and material resources which could be used for economic development, especially within the framework of the establishment of just and equitable co-operation among nations.

216. Let us put an end to the arms race, and we shall see that education, culture and health can be within the reach of everybody.

217. Let us put an end to new nuclear projects, and we shall eradicate the hunger and disease from which the great majority of mankind suffer.

218. Let us reduce military budgets, and we shall have the funds that will enable us to increase agricultural and industrial production and improve and expand transportation and communication systems, which Africa, Latin America and Asia badly need.

219. Let us eliminate the inequities among nations, and we shall eliminate war and promote confidence among nations.

220. The cessation of the arms race, general and complete disarmament and the effective diversion of resources to socially and economically productive purposes are the *sine qua non* of the success of the Third United Nations Development Decade.

221. The principles and priorities agreed upon at the tenth special session remain valid. Denuclearization is the highest of these priorities. The conclusion of a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests is of great importance to mankind. The adoption of such a treaty would put an end to the production and proliferation of nuclear weapons. At the same time, the security of the non-nuclear countries should be assured so that they do not become victims of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

222. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones constitutes a very important step towards denuclearization. We consider, therefore, that every effort conducive to the attainment of this objective should be pursued.

223. We hope that the African continent and the Indian Ocean will be effectively transformed into nuclear-weapon-free zones. Certain NATO countries which are members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean systematically hinder every effort intended to secure a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

224. Resolution 34/80 B was rejected by those countries, thus preventing the holding of the international conference on the Indian Ocean. But at this session we should overcome the lack of political will manifested by certain States and ensure the implementation of resolution 36/90, which stipulates that that conference should take place in the first half of 1983.

225. Disarmament in the Indian Ocean implies the dismantling of all military bases in the region, the total withdrawal of foreign troops from the area and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of

the States of the region, so that the Indian Ocean may soon become a denuclearized zone of peace.

226. In the disarmament movement particular responsibility rests with the United Nations. The United Nations is the most nearly universal organization of the international community. It is in the United Nations that the aspirations of the peoples struggling for liberty and peace are voiced. In this capacity, the United Nations constitutes the primary forum for global negotiations on the issues related to disarmament.

227. We consider that the negotiating and deliberating bodies created by the first special session devoted to disarmament remain valid. Therefore, in our view, bilateral, regional and multilateral negotiations should be carried out, taking into consideration the concerns of the peoples as embodied in the principles and objectives of the Charter.

228. The Charter clearly states that the maintenance of peace and international security in the world is the primary responsibility of the Organization. Therefore, to remove the discussion of this complicated issue of disarmament from the context of the United Nations would be to go against the precepts of the Charter that guides us.

229. In conclusion, we hope that this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will be able to make use of the Final Document adopted at the tenth special session in order to obtain better results. It is not a matter of revising and reformulating the Final Document; rather, it is a question of reinforcing it and making it more dynamic and more effective. This session must be taken as another opportunity for reflection on new avenues the pursuit of which could accelerate the disarmament process. It must be an occasion for us to engage in serious and meaningful debate on the crucial questions with which we have been involved for some time now.

230. Too much energy has already been wasted in the production of armaments. Too much blood has been shed in the small and big wars taking place all over the world. The possibility of ending the massacres and genocide resulting from those wars lies in the hands of man. The establishment of peace and progress depends on man. With each one of us present at this session rests the responsibility of responding positively to the anxieties and clamour of the hundreds of millions of human beings who, from outside, cry "No" to the arms race, "No" to nuclear weapons, "No" to the neutron bomb, "No" to war.

231. The struggle continues.

232. Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The high qualities and wide knowledge which the President evinced in presiding over the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly confirms the wise decision taken by the Assembly to elect him President of the current special session. In my own name and on behalf of my delegation, allow me to express my warmest congratulations to the President. I am fully confident that he will devote himself untiringly to this session with a view to the achievement of a satisfactory conclusion, in the interest of the welfare of humanity and the safeguarding of its security and stability.

233. Four years have elapsed since the convening of the first special session devoted to disarmament, in 1978, but unfortunately no real progress has been achieved so far in this respect. The conventional and the nuclear arms races are still in full swing, qualitatively and quantitatively. There is no doubt that the main problem we are facing is the development and sophistication of armaments *per se*. There is no other field of human activity in which research and innovation equal that in the arms industry. As the world is now seeking ways to foster international peace and security, disarmament measures can promote confidence among States and improve the prospects of peaceful co-operation. Hence, it is necessary to find an alternative to the current arms race with all its ramifications. This would lead to the creation of the political will to begin the process of disarmament.

234. The need for disarmament is strengthened by the fact that at present mankind is facing a unique problem. The nuclear age has altered the military and strategic concept. The destructive potential of armaments has never been so immediate and so comprehensive as it is now. Never before has mankind faced the menace of self-annihilation, the threat of an estimated 40,000 to 50,000 nuclear warheads, the explosive power of which equals that of more than 1 million Hiroshima-type bombs. The balance of deterrence is considered by some to be stable, but there are substantive arguments against the reliability of that balance. These theories could become more complex with the increase in the sophistication and diversification of the means available to apply them, because these are hypothetical security scenarios, based on the existing nuclear-weapon systems and the hope that the balance of deterrence will remain stable.

235. Within the framework of these data the United Nations should continue its endeavours to secure more effective participation by its Members in the negotiation and discussion of specific proposals on disarmament. In this respect it is gratifying to note the endeavours of the Organization to establish more effective instruments and mechanisms, in addition to those that already exist, with a view to providing adequate information and knowledge regarding discussions and negotiations on disarmament, and to help non-governmental organizations in their efforts to create an informed public opinion in this regard.

236. In the light of the failure of international attempts to achieve comprehensive disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, and the inability to achieve much success in the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones is becoming more important—not as an alternative to comprehensive disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, but to complement such an endeavour. In certain regions with suitable conditions, some States are striving to give effect to the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones in order to guarantee the non-involvement of those regions in nuclear war or to prevent them from entering a destructive arms race, especially in nuclear arms. This concept is all the more important when States in a certain region do possess or have the capability of possessing nuclear weapons relatively soon, since that will lead other States of the region to seek to acquire the same capability. This will result in competition for the pos-

session of nuclear weapons and hence may bring about nuclear war.

237. In the light of those facts, my delegation wishes to make an appraisal of the situation in the Middle East, which has negatively affected international efforts in the field of disarmament. Although we do not want to be too pessimistic, we must draw the attention of the international community to the grave situation in the Middle East that has resulted from the Zionist entity's possession of a military arsenal which threatens regional and international relations and hampers the achievement of disarmament in that vital area.

238. The Zionist entity in the Middle East now enjoys formidable supremacy in quick-deployment equipment. As *The New York Times* put it on 7 November 1977, the armament programme, the cost of which was estimated to be millions of dollars, has resulted in the supremacy of the Zionist entity over the Arab Powers as a whole in armaments and trained manpower. That means that international pressures now can have but a marginal effect upon that entity in the event of any new confrontation in the area.

239. In its issue of 26 October 1977, *The Washington Post* said that this immense advantage of the Zionist entity was the result of an intentional and wilful effort to redress the military weak points uncovered by the October 1973 war and to ensure that no foreign Power—especially the United States of America—would be able to dictate cease-fires in the future by threatening to stop vital military supplies. This has been achieved thanks to the vast influence of the Zionist pressure group in the United States, which automatically secures aid from Congress to meet any Israeli request for arms.

240. The sophisticated weapons and electronic devices the Zionist entity gets and its success in developing a substantial military industry have enabled and will continue to enable it to carry out its quick aggressive strikes. The most recent dramatic action by the Zionist entity in this respect has been its invasion of southern Lebanon and the destruction of cities and villages there for a second time.

241. Despite the enormous arms flow to the Middle East since the October 1973 war, many important transformations have occurred in regard to the transport of arms within the region, especially in favour of the Zionist entity. For example, the American Co-ordination and Distribution Agency has stated that before the October war the Zionist entity received less than 30 per cent of all the weapons transferred to the region of conflict and that since 1973 it has been receiving more than 53 per cent of these quantities.

242. What is perhaps more important than the increase in the quantity of weapons flowing in is the enormous increase of sophisticated weapons transferred to the Middle East. A real change has taken place in the distribution of sophisticated weapons imported for the advantage of the Zionist entity. This is especially true of sophisticated electronic countermeasures, radar-jamming devices and means of communication, "Stand off" enemy target-detecting devices and other sophisticated weapons. The Zionist entity has had the highest priority in acquiring necessary technical expertise. In accordance with the

memorandum of understanding between the Zionist entity and the United States, in 1971 the Zionist entity received enormous assistance from the United States for the development of its national arms programme, and it now produces 50 per cent of its fighting equipment in local industries. This is the case with its Kfir and Arafat aircraft, and it is now working on the production of its Ariye fighter, according to *Davar* of 10 August 1976, in addition to the Shafir air-to-air missile and the Caprir anti-ship missile. That is information from the spring 1977 publication of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

243. The military budget of the Zionist entity is one of the biggest in the world when one views its military expenditure in relation to its gross national income. That information is from statistics published by *Le Monde Diplomatique* of 25 February 1977.

244. Just as the Zionist entity is trying to achieve supremacy in conventional weapons, it is endeavouring also to possess and monopolize the nuclear options in the Middle East. It has managed to have a reserve stock of nuclear weapons. The nuclear-bomb project came into being with the beginning of the Zionist entity, when the Israelis produced phosphate low-grade uranium and developed useful technology for the production of heavy water. In order to be permitted to use this Israeli method, the French allowed the Zionist entity in 1953 to study the French atomic programme and to participate in nuclear tests in the Sahara Desert. That information is from the Hebrew Section Archives of *Ma'ariv* of 5 April 1976. At the beginning of 1953 an agreement was signed between the French and Israeli atomic commissions which paved the way for joint training and for the exchange of expertise and information between the two countries in this field.

245. On 20 November 1954 work began on the reactor Richon le Zion, designed by AMF Atomics, the American firm. On 17 September 1957 the reactor Nahal-Soreq was established with the co-operation of United States scientists. On 5 November 1960 the Dimona reactor was established in co-operation with the French Atomic Energy Commission; the Zionist entity admitted its official existence on 21 December 1960, although it had denied its existence at first and pretended that it was a weaving mill. That reactor had operated at an output of 24 megawatts and in 1964 it produced sufficient plutonium to manufacture one nuclear bomb a year. The Zionist entity stole uranium from the United States from the 1960s on, from the Apollo laboratory in the state of Pennsylvania, as was stated in the Central Intelligence Agency [CIA] special memorandum on Israeli nuclear armaments, according to *The New York Times* of 19 October 1977 and *Newsweek* magazine of 22 January 1977. From early in its existence the Zionist entity possessed a number of fast breeder reactors and other apparatus.

246. The ability of the Zionist entity to secure the nuclear option was mentioned by the American scientist known as the father of the hydrogen bomb, Dr. Edward Teller, on 12 December 1965 during a visit to the Zionist entity. He said, "There is nothing to prevent Israel from manufacturing the atomic bomb since everything necessary is available, including experts, equipment and plutonium". Carol Dakett,

Assistant Secretary of the Science and Technology Department of the CIA, mentioned the Zionist entity's possession of between 10 and 20 nuclear bombs, according to the *Herald Tribune* of 28 January 1978. *The New York Times*, on 12 April 1976, reported that the Zionist entity possessed 13 nuclear bombs. These were actually distributed to air force units during the October war of 1973, but the Zionist entity refrained from using them because the war turned in its favour. *Ma'ariv*, on 5 April 1976, said that those bombs had a potential equal to that of the two bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

247. At the beginning of 1976 Moshe Dayan said, "We are now able to produce the nuclear bomb", according to *The Sunday Times* of 14 April 1976. Patrick Moynihan, the former head of the United States delegation to the United Nations, said that it was preferable that the world know that the number of nuclear weapons in the possession of the Zionist entity ranged from 10 to 20 nuclear bombs.

248. Paragraph 25 of the *Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament*⁹ annexed to the Secretary-General's report stated that the Zionist entity had been involved in nuclear research and development as early as 1949. Paragraph 27 referred to the ability of the Zionist entity to manufacture the atomic bomb.

249. It is worth noting that the Zionist entity adopted a negative attitude to the Non-Proliferation Treaty as well as to United Nations resolutions concerning the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. In 1974, 84 States reaffirmed their ratification of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and 22 new States became signatories. Moreover, the Zionist entity was among the seven States that did not sign the Treaty.

250. The efforts of the Zionist entity to ensure its supremacy in conventional weapons and its monopoly of the nuclear option in the Middle East are dictated by the ideological factor. The notorious Zionist terrorist Menachem Begin expressed this factor in the early days of the Zionist entity in his book *The Revolt*, published in 1950. He said that there could be no peace for the land of Israel or the people of Israel or even for the Arabs, since "we have not liberated our fatherland, even if we have signed a peace treaty". The terrorist Begin was not the only one to claim that the "historic borders" would be achieved by building up military arsenals and launching aggressive *blitzkriegs* against the unity, integrity and sovereignty of Arab territories. The politicians and militarists of the Zionist entity shared his policy.

251. The endeavour of the Zionist entity to ensure supremacy in conventional weapons and a monopoly of the nuclear option led it to undertake the air raid against the peaceful Iraqi nuclear reactor at Tamuz on 7 June 1981. This aroused international indignation, which was increased by the fact that Iraq was among the signatory States of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the activities of its nuclear reactor were subject to IAEA safeguards, which is not so in the case of the Zionist entity.

252. The Zionist entity stormed into Lebanese territory under the pretext of safeguarding Israeli security. Despite the convening of this session, which has the support of millions of people throughout the world who expect and hope that we shall reach a consensus

on the adoption of resolutions aiming at genuine disarmament or the reduction of armaments, preventing the use of such weapons against the weaker peoples and States and preventing the aggressive and expansionist régimes from using them against others, we have seen the racist, expansionist Tel Aviv régime launch a new act of aggression against the sovereignty, territory and people of Lebanon in order to massacre more and more Palestinians, who are struggling to recover their rights, which are recognized by our General Assembly.

253. The fascist military invasion carried out by the Zionist army against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples is clear evidence of the truth of what we have repeatedly said in the wake of ferocious acts of aggression by the racist Tel Aviv régime against the Arab peoples in general: namely, that if this Organization does not shoulder its responsibility to stop the Zionist mania the region will be exposed to dangers that could jeopardize peace and security all over the world.

254. We must mention here the strategic co-operation between a great Power, the United States of America, and the Zionist entity. The United States has provided Israel with political, diplomatic and military support. It has encouraged Israel to continue its aggression and carry out its criminal plans against the Arab people. The bloody developments now taking place on Lebanese territory while this session meets show yet again the Zionist entity's disregard of world public opinion, the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law.

255. For the aforementioned reasons, the delegation of my country would like to reaffirm its position on the necessity of establishing a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. That region requires, as we see it, the following.

256. First, each party concerned must be convinced that the denuclearization of the region will bolster the security of its country as well as of other countries in the region.

257. Secondly, if the regions are subjected to conditions of political tension as a result of differences and contradictions among the States of the region, the denuclearization of the region will be difficult. Hence, the establishment of nuclear-free zones should be preceded by the relaxation of international tensions as well as by the renouncing by all States of the region of any aggressive or expansionist tendencies. The international arms reduction agreements concluded to date came as a result of the easing of international tension.

258. Thirdly, nuclear-weapon States have a special and important responsibility in the establishment of nuclear-free zones. Without the co-operation of those States it would be difficult to denuclearize any region. That responsibility has two sides. The first is a negative side—namely, the commitment of nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against any State in the nuclear-free zone. They should cease exporting to any State or facilitating the possession by any State in the nuclear-free zone of nuclear armaments or of the capability of using nuclear energy, unless it is for peaceful purposes. The second side is a positive one; it is the readiness of the nuclear Powers to protect the States of the region against any nuclear

attack from outside the region and to take effective steps to reduce the arms race among them.

259. Fourthly, the establishment of nuclear-free zones by the States concerned in the region must take place on a voluntary basis, and the participation of all the parties concerned is a necessity.

260. Fifthly, effective international machinery for supervision must be set up and there must be the right of inspection with respect to the establishment of nuclear-free zones. Additional safeguards should also be established to enable the States of the region to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

261. Sixthly, it is axiomatic that the agreements establishing nuclear-free zones should not be limited as to time; they should be absolute.

262. Seventhly, the States of nuclear-free zones should not become involved in military alliances including nuclear parties and should not allow the establishment of military bases of nuclear States on their territory, since that would represent a violation of the principle of the establishment of a nuclear-free zone. If there were such alliances or bases, nuclear weapons could be introduced via the territory of States members of the nuclear-free zone, or they might find themselves compelled, as a result of an alliance or military treaty, to defend themselves or be exposed to nuclear attack.

263. There are many details that should be clarified—for instance, the definition of terms, especially those whose meaning may be ambiguous. There should be clarification of the terms “peaceful” and “non-peaceful” use of nuclear energy and what is meant by “region” and “transit”.

264. With respect to nuclear-free zones, we should like to express our satisfaction at the response of the nuclear States to the appeal by the General Assembly to ratify Additional Protocol II [*resolution 34/74*] of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We also express our hopes with respect to the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1652 (XVI); with respect to the implementation of resolutions relating to the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East; with respect to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 3265 (XXIX), on the declaration and establishing of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia; and with respect to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 3477 (XXX), on the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. We also call on Governments and international organizations and on the Committee on Disarmament to ensure the implementation of General Assembly resolution 3472 (XXX) in regard to conducting a comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects.

265. Despite the fact that four years have elapsed since we adopted by consensus the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, which set forth the elements of the international strategy for disarmament, we find that nothing tangible has been done to carry out the purposes established by the Final Document, especially paragraphs 50 to 71 in its Programme of Action. Nuclear tests continue unabated, and there are still many obstacles to the elaboration of a con-

vention in this respect. The topic was not discussed in the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva in a way leading to the desired results. The Committee's negotiations were marginal to the tripartite negotiations. However, we are given some hope by the fact that the Committee on Disarmament reached agreement last April to initiate negotiations on all general aspects of nuclear disarmament, especially those set forth in paragraph 50 of the Final Document.

266. We share the view expressed here that a comprehensive nuclear-test ban is the first and most important step to the cessation of the arms race, especially qualitatively. The achievement of such a ban requires more intensive negotiations. Such a ban would be an important measure to prevent the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. It would make it impossible for the nuclear-weapon parties to the agreement to produce new kinds of nuclear weapons. We think that the suggested reduction by one third in the arsenals of the two super-Powers would create positive momentum towards nuclear disarmament. We express the hope that the negotiations on medium-range missiles, to be resumed at Geneva, will succeed. We regret that the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held in 1980, did not adopt practical measures to attain all the aims of the Treaty.

267. We welcome and fully support sincere talks by the nuclear States aimed at reducing military power and at disarmament. The proliferation and increased production of nuclear weapons have become worldwide topics that involve the fate of mankind and its survival. Human beings are constantly concerned about whether they will continue to exist. It is not wise to leave the fate of our world and of our civilization entirely in the hands of this or that Power which possesses the nuclear weapon. Certainly, bilateral agreements which help to consolidate international peace and security and which do not harm the rights and interests of others represent a noticeable development in this area, provided that the details of those agreements are known to the international Organization. In this respect the non-aligned movement and its policies have made a valuable and unlimited contribution to the concept of disarmament.

268. The non-aligned movement, of which Iraq is proud to be a prominent member, being aware of its own interests and requirements, has long realized the danger inherent in the arms race and its destructive effects on the socio-economic development of the whole world and consequently on the promotion of the sovereignty and independence of all States. The non-aligned movement considers the arms race a form of terrorism, as part of the States of the world are turned into slaves and the other part into hostages.

269. Out of that concept came the initiative of the non-aligned movement, at its Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government, for the convening of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. This movement will also be the driving force behind the current special session.

270. My delegation believes that the declarations on guarantees by the five great Powers at the tenth special session of the General Assembly were made in such flexible terms that the various States which have

proclaimed guarantees can interpret circumstances and events in such a way as to be relieved of their obligation to implement the declared guarantees. They also contain various terms and implications that do not constitute sufficient guarantees to non-nuclear States, while the non-nuclear-States which have proclaimed their renouncement of the nuclear option and have submitted their nuclear activities to the control of IAEA and to nuclear inspection have done so in an international context.

271. For that reason we deem it necessary to make these guarantees legally binding, with a positive effect in preventing nuclear proliferation and in encouraging the trend towards comprehensive nuclear disarmament. We hope that the great Powers making the declarations will prove to be aware of their legal commitment and will in good faith pursue negotiations to achieve early positive results.

272. My delegation calls upon Member States to take steps to reduce their military budgets in implementation of General Assembly resolutions 3093 (XXVIII), 3254 (XXIX) and 3463 (XXX). Concerning the prohibition of radiological weapons, we believe it high time to conclude a convention on the question, provided that the negotiating parties show flexibility and good will. My delegation hopes to see the conclusion of a convention banning chemical weapons, especially since the international community has already achieved the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare³ and the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

273. In conclusion, my delegation hopes to benefit from the results of the studies conducted within the United Nations framework by groups of experts, especially studies on the relationship between disarmament and development, and the structural measures of disarmament and their practical implementation, in a way that helps to achieve the desired results in the context of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. We affirm that Iraq will do its utmost to ensure the success of the work of the international community at its present session.

274. Mr. ROJAS GALDAMES (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to convey to Mr. Kittani the heartiest greetings of the delegation and Government of Chile and to say how pleased we are to see him elected once again to preside over this important special session of the General Assembly.

275. May I also extend to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, Chile's appreciation for his tireless efforts in favour of peace and understanding among nations. As Latin Americans we offer him our solidarity and our utmost co-operation in all such efforts.

276. Chile learned with great sadness of the death of His Majesty King Khalid of Saudi Arabia, a country with which we maintain a close and cordial relationship. On behalf of the Government and people of Chile, I wish to convey to His Majesty King Fahd, the royal family and the Government and people

of Saudi Arabia the deepest sympathy of our entire country over this irreparable loss.

277. This special session of the General Assembly on disarmament is taking place at a moment in our history—perhaps like none since the creation of the United Nations—when we face the greatest of dangers and the most pressing of concerns. Three large-scale military confrontations are taking place, in the Middle East, Asia and the western hemisphere. In them the most modern and devastating means of destruction are being employed, and heavy losses in human life and incalculable material damage have resulted. In addition, numerous other conflicts in various areas of the globe are adding their consequences of suffering, oppression and death.

278. It is in these circumstances that more than 20 heads of State or Government and nearly 50 ministers for foreign affairs, as well as ambassadors and some of the most reputable experts in disarmament matters, are meeting here.

279. I speak to the Assembly in the voice of the Government of Chile.

280. Mine is a peace-loving country and a faithful supporter of the rule of international law. We abominate war. We condemn and reject the use of force as a means of solving international disputes. We unreservedly abide by the principle of the peaceful solution of disputes enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations and in other international documents. Among these, we emphasize resolution 2625 (XXV), of 1970, which approved the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and reiterated this imperative norm.

281. Chile has made the unrestricted application of this principle a fundamental precept of its foreign policy. For that reason, it promotes and rigorously applies the use of the means of peaceful settlement of disputes, as mentioned in Article 33 of the Charter, such as negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial settlement. We have subscribed to bilateral treaties of arbitration and judicial settlement of disputes and accepted their conclusions, convinced that arbitration and judicial processes represent the most effective and just way to resolve them.

282. It is obvious that a people imbued with this spirit is not a people that seeks to participate in a devastating arms race. Already in 1902 we concluded an agreement with Argentina on the limitation of naval armaments, perhaps one of the first in the world. Later, Chile sponsored arms limitation agreements in Latin America, and in 1963, in view of the very grave threat represented by nuclear arms and their testing, the Government of Chile, together with those of Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador and Mexico, publicly rejected such dangerous activities. On 29 April of that year, the heads of State of those five Latin American countries simultaneously formulated an important declaration in which they asked the heads of State of the other American republics to accede to it so that Latin America could be recognized as a nuclear-free zone.¹⁰ That Declaration may be considered as the immediate forerunner of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

283. Since then, we have supported and co-sponsored United Nations resolutions in favour of conventional and nuclear disarmament.

284. In addition, Chile is party to the Antarctic Treaty signed on 1 December 1959, which shields the Antarctic from atomic dangers; to the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, signed in 1972.

285. More recently we supported the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, in 1978, because we consider it highly valuable. We believe that it contains the necessary elements for preparing a comprehensive programme of disarmament and a compendium of the recommendations and decisions drawn up on this subject.

286. The growing militarization of outer space has also been of constant concern to Chile because it flagrantly violates the norms and existing agreements on space law. Our country has presented concrete proposals designed to ban and penalize the extension of the arms race into outer space. For that reason, we wish to reiterate once again the need to supplement existing legislation with clear and carefully defined provisions which safeguard an area that has been declared the "common heritage of mankind".

287. We view with satisfaction the agreement reached by the big Powers to resume conversations on the limitation of nuclear arms, and we sincerely hope that those talks will lead to an effective control of nuclear disarmament through agreement on a gradual reduction and will eventually lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons. However, we cannot forget that the dangers which a nuclear war represents do not originate exclusively in the Powers which can now possess atomic weapons. We must also take into consideration the enormous risk involved in nuclear development on the part of any State. We therefore consider it fundamental that, in the field of disarmament, effective support should be given to IAEA in order to reinforce politically its function of monitoring the nuclear plans of all States through the application of a system of safeguards or inspection of installations and equipment, as provided for in the rules and regulations of that Agency.

288. In this regard, we must make an exception by stating that the safeguards stipulated by the Non-Proliferation Treaty do not apply to those countries which are not parties thereto, but we must state that it is necessary to encourage the widest utilization of the safeguards provided for in the relevant rules and regulations of IAEA. These should be accepted by all the States which, acting responsibly, seek to avoid the dangers of non-pacific nuclear development.

289. I therefore reiterate my Government's support of the efforts already carried out in favour of disarmament, which constitute promising advances in this complex matter, but I cannot refrain from stating most energetically that it is urgent to find solutions for the points of disagreement that still persist. These disagreements, added to the existing dangerous and explosive international tension, make it imperative that

the presence in this meeting of the world's most outstanding leaders should lead, without propagandistic boasting, to a genuine political expression capable of avoiding or restraining the tensions and threats of destruction confronting humanity.

290. The subject of disarmament is of almost incalculable importance, since the security of States is indissolubly linked to the confidence that exists in the means of effective control available for its implementation. Without any doubt, it has been the arms race that has contributed most ominously to the weakening of some fundamental principles of international law.

291. It is not strange, therefore, that, in some cases, those who feel sufficiently or relatively strong in relation to the other party to a dispute or controversy should avoid resolving it by peaceful means and choose the course of direct action.

292. All the events of recent decades indicate that once a conflict becomes intense, it is too late for effective action on the part of the United Nations. For that reason we feel the need for a much stronger relationship between the obligations which the States Members of the United Nations have contracted under Chapter VI of the Charter—"Pacific settlement of disputes"—and the "Action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression", falling within the purview of the Security Council, as provided for in Chapter VII.

293. The Council must not remain ignorant of or aloof from the way in which Member States are facing or have faced the primary obligation, that of having recourse to peaceful means of settling disputes.

294. The recent situation that arose between Argentina and the United Kingdom is an example which serves to pinpoint the omission to which I am referring. All these reasons make us regret a situation which greatly concerns the countries of Latin America and most especially Chile, which is a friend of the two nations now pitted against each other in a bloody struggle which most certainly endangers peace in the continent and detracts from and erodes international documents of the utmost importance for inter-American co-existence and which also threatens to unleash an arms race in our part of the world.

295. Chile once again affirms that it is absolutely and strictly neutral in this unfortunate conflict which impairs and prejudices the interests of the countries of the West. In this context, Chile has supported various peace initiatives that have been proposed and congratulates the Secretary-General on his intensive and most laudable efforts in the performance of his duties and in the fulfilment of the mandate given to him by the Security Council to find a just solution to the dispute.

296. My Government will continue to extend its full co-operation in the search for a path that will lead to a solution and an honourable conclusion of this conflict. Chile will also continue to give humanitarian assistance to its many victims.

297. It is also with great concern that Chile has followed the recent worsening of the situation in the Middle East, a situation which has brought renewed suffering upon the people of Lebanon after so many years of being shattered by bloody struggles. We wish

to reaffirm our support for the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the efforts of the Lebanese Government to maintain the territorial integrity and independence of the country.

298. In view of the close link between disarmament and the peaceful solution of conflicts, I feel it is absolutely necessary for the United Nations to devise an efficient system for preventing international conflicts, which would strengthen the powers vested in it by the Charter.

299. My country is greatly interested in the studies proposed in the Assembly a few days ago by the Prime Minister of Japan [*5th meeting*] concerning the role of the United Nations in the prevention of international disputes and their peaceful settlement, the system of co-operation among Member States in the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations and the possibility of establishing machinery whereby both global and regional military situations can be monitored and made public, where necessary.

300. The Chilean Government has for some time been advocating such machinery and suggesting certain initiatives in the Security Council which could give it shape. Chile will continue collaborating with great resolve, offering ideas and proposals which in the future would permit the forestalling of conflicts and serve the yearnings for and objective of peace which the Organization pursues.

301. Humanity is facing a formidable challenge, and the present generations must approach it in a responsible and serious fashion. Disarmament, the peaceful solution of disputes, non-use of force and strict compliance with commitments is the road we must perforce follow to ensure world peace.

302. The United Nations effort to make peace prevail must be constant. Nothing must deter us from pursuing this purpose decisively. We know that in the millennia of human history there has been a total of no more than 300 years of peace. But the nuclear danger and its threat to destroy all life on the planet we inhabit require action and a firm political will to overcome the mistakes and hesitations of the past.

303. The time has most certainly come when we must apply effective procedures which will compel States to submit their disputes to the peaceful means of solution stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations.

304. Chile reaffirms its will to respect these principles which have always guided its foreign policy.

305. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We have heard the last speaker for this afternoon. A representative wishes to exercise his right of reply. May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes and should be made from one's seat.

306. I give the floor to the representative of Morocco.

307. Mr. M'RANI ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): In his statement, in principle devoted to disarmament, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mozambique launched various verbal attacks against many countries, including my own, with regard to problems that in no way can be said to have

anything to do with the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, devoted very specifically to disarmament.

308. He made numerous judgements with respect to my country which are unjustified as well as fallacious and deceitful. In so doing he forgot one essential point in the history of his country and mine. He forgot this intentionally, because the unkind words he spoke about my country would not have been uttered by him otherwise. He intentionally forgot that it was at Casablanca, Morocco, that the first seeds of African unity were sown, when the fathers of independent and sovereign Africa—I am speaking about Ahmed Sekou Touré, Kwame Nkrumah, Gamel Abdel Nasser, Modibo Keita and Mohammed V—created the first free liberation-oriented African organization. He forgot that through the work of this group at Casablanca the independent countries of Africa mobilized against colonialism in all its forms, and against racism. At Casablanca they first organized assistance by free Africa to the freedom fighters. He has forgotten something even more unpardonable: that his own liberation movement of Mozambique, FRELIMO, received its first assistance and first weapons for its liberation war right at Casablanca, and since then my country's role, the role of a genuinely sovereign and free country, a genuinely democratic country and a genuinely non-aligned country has been consistent on all fronts, in Asia, in the Caribbean, in Africa and in the Middle East, on the Golan Heights, at the Suez Canal, among the Arab peoples and the Palestinian people.

309. With respect to the question of Western Sahara, my country has offered and continues constantly to offer an internationally monitored referendum in order democratically to arbitrate this false problem created in the region. Mozambique and its leaders are blindly trying not only to prevent at any cost a free democratic consultation of the peoples of the Sahara, but have at the same time revealed themselves as the grave-diggers of the OAU, which is now floundering in illegality and is now paralysed, not to say in its death throes, because of their manoeuvres aimed at blocking the referendum and denying the democratically and freely expressed will of the people of the Sahara region, which scares them.

310. The Mozambican Minister also spoke of my country's commitment to great Powers against the freedom of African countries. Recalling the history of independent Morocco, as I have just done, including *vis-à-vis* Mozambique itself and FRELIMO, should suffice to discredit, if not to ridicule, such false accusations cast at such a country as Morocco.

311. Morocco, thank God, still has full freedom of action in the defence of its national patrimony and the safeguarding of its independence and territorial integrity. Neither Mozambique nor any other force in the world will prevent us from making the necessary arrangements to take the measures which the situation that has been imposed on us demands and to take them calmly, in full sovereignty and full freedom, but never against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or freedom of any Arab people, any African people or any other people whatever. History will once again give proof of this, and will, we are convinced, show in their true light the grave-diggers of Africa and of the OAU, of the Mozambican ilk, who today have dared to strike their destructive and divisive blow even within this Assembly, at a session devoted to a special problem that is the major concern of the whole of mankind at this time, the problem of disarmament.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.

NOTES

¹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1982, document S/15259.*

² 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.

³ League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138, p. 65.

⁴ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.

⁵ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1.

⁶ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43.

⁷ See CD/139/Appendix II/vol. II, document CD/130.

⁸ A/CN.10/38. See also A/CN.10/51.

⁹ See A/36/431, annex. This study was subsequently issued as a United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.2.

¹⁰ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 74, document A/5415/Rev.1.