



*President:* Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**General debate (continued)**

1. Mr. ARYAL (Nepal): Mr. President, allow me, first of all, to convey to you and through you to the distinguished gathering present here the cordial greetings and best wishes of His Majesty King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah Dev for the success of this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

2. I should like to associate myself with all the eloquent speakers who have preceded me in congratulating you, Sir, on your election to the high office of the presidency of this very important session. As a member of the non-aligned group of countries, we are particularly happy to see you, a distinguished statesman of Yugoslavia preside over this session.

3. Yugoslavia, with which Nepal has close friendly ties, has consistently played an active role in furthering the cause of disarmament and has made noteworthy contributions in such deliberations. I feel certain that you will draw on your long and valuable experience in this field to make this session both fruitful and meaningful and wish to assure you, Mr. President, of my delegation's fullest cooperation.

4. It is a matter of great satisfaction that the call made by the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, at Colombo in August 1976, for a special session of the General Assembly to review the problem of disarmament and to promote the elaboration of a programme of priorities and measures in this field has materialized. The non-aligned countries, ever since the fifth summit conference, had raised their voice to advocate calling a special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. The non-aligned countries, most of them occupied with the problems of development and fighting for better standards of living for their nationals, have always pleaded for an end to the dangerous game of stockpiling nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons.

5. This special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has indeed been long overdue. The arms race has not only continued to grow like a hydra-headed monster but is also extending itself to wider geographical areas posing a colossal threat to mankind. It is being fed by a world military expenditure amounting to a staggering

\$400 thousand million annually, which is estimated to be about 20 times the total official development assistance provided by the developed to the under-developed countries. Since 1945 about one third of the total military expenditure has been spent on the development and production of major weapons, new and improved versions of which are being constantly introduced. The past decade has witnessed the increase of the international arms trade by 15 per cent annually leading to global militarization. Furthermore, the estimate that there are at present tens of thousands of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the world today, equivalent to 1 million Hiroshima-type atomic bombs, is a cause of serious alarm.

6. Against this grim scenario it is sad to note that despite the constant efforts of the United Nations, progress in disarmament negotiations has been painfully slow and is lagging far behind the technological innovations in the military sphere. While existing arms control measures have helped towards better understanding, it has not been possible to make any significant headway towards the achievement of the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which is the primary objective of the United Nations. The objectives of the Disarmament Decade have so far fallen far short of its expectations.

7. This special session devoted to disarmament, which is the first of its kind in the history of the United Nations, provides the long sought after opportunity to come to grips with the seemingly insurmountable problem of disarmament in all its aspects. It must address itself to redressing the current impasse in disarmament negotiations.

8. My delegation has always been firm in its conviction that the problem of nuclear disarmament should be dealt with as a matter of utmost urgency. Continuing increase in the stockpiles of nuclear weapons poses a serious threat to the survival of mankind. It is for the nuclear Powers to shoulder the responsibility for the de-escalation and reversal of the nuclear arms race by reducing their nuclear stockpiles and by totally refraining from any further development of such weapons.

9. The two major nuclear Powers are spending thousands of millions of dollars for new atomic weapons, and for strategic and tactical means of delivering them, in an effort to acquire a first-strike capability. The concept of deterrence has been blown up out of all proportion. The fact that nuclear weapons could be used for terrorism and blackmail is its other ominous aspect. We fully share the conviction that nuclear Powers possessing the largest stockpiles of deadly and sophisticated weapons must dem-

onstrate to the world their sincere desire for disarmament not by words but by deeds. It is indeed regrettable that so many years after the first round of strategic arms limitation talks, an agreement still remains to be concluded within the framework of the second round. Qualitative developments in strategic weapons are even more dangerous than the size of nuclear arsenals and we urge the super-Powers to agree immediately on significant reductions and qualitative limitations and thus pave the way for the total destruction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons as soon as possible.

10. Another disarmament measure that should have been implemented long ago is the ban on all nuclear-weapon testing. It was widely felt that in the wake of the conclusion of a partial test-ban treaty in 1963<sup>1</sup> a comprehensive test-ban treaty would soon follow. But despite repeated resolutions of the General Assembly this goal remains elusive. In resolution 32/78, it is noted with satisfaction that negotiations had commenced among three nuclear-weapon States with a view to the drafting of an agreement on a comprehensive test ban, and in paragraph 3 it is declared that "the conclusion of such an agreement and its opening for signature would be the best possible augury for the success of the special session . . . devoted to disarmament". But such expectations have not been fulfilled. We believe that the issues impeding the successful conclusion of such a treaty—such as verification and the question of peaceful nuclear explosions—are not insurmountable obstacles. Obviously, the broadest possible participation by States in such a proposed treaty would be absolutely essential to successful prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

11. As a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex], Nepal is deeply concerned over the proliferation of nuclear weapons, both vertical and horizontal. We reiterate our call for universal adherence to the Treaty. An acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations by the nuclear and non-nuclear States would provide the firm basis for the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime. We firmly believe in the principle that States should not convert civil nuclear facilities to the production of nuclear weapons; and all States have the right to develop their programmes for the peaceful use of nuclear technology for economic and social development and should have, without discrimination, access to technology and materials for the peaceful use of nuclear energy under effective and non-discriminatory safeguards. My delegation, while sharing the view that transfer of nuclear technology and non-proliferation objectives are complementary, would stress the necessity of strengthening safeguard measures which should be strictly adhered to so that the non-proliferation régime is not eroded.

12. Furthermore, a legally binding commitment by the nuclear States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States would be a major contributing factor towards the strengthening of the non-

proliferation régime. We further believe that a solemn commitment by all nuclear Powers that they would not be the first to use nuclear weapons would greatly enhance a climate of trust and confidence.

13. An early conclusion of the proposed convention on chemical weapons is yet another urgent measure. In spite of the fact that negotiations have been going on for many years, they have not come to fruition. Conventions on prohibiting radiological weapons and weapons of mass destruction need also to be speedily concluded.

14. It is pertinent at this juncture to point out, however, that while, on the one hand, efforts are being made to eliminate weapons of mass destruction from the face of the earth, on the other hand, the military use of outer space is a cause for serious alarm. It is said that some 75 per cent of all satellites launched have military uses, and that the outer space Treaty<sup>2</sup> has done little to check this number. We do recognize the important role of satellites in verifying arms control agreements, but their development for military purposes must be stopped before it is too late.

15. My delegation believes that, along with nuclear disarmament, measures must be taken for the limitation and the reduction of conventional weapons. It has been pointed out that there were 119 wars between 1945 and 1975 in which more people died than in the Second World War, and that during that period there was not a single day in which one or several wars were not being fought somewhere in the world. Eighty per cent of total military expenditure is on conventional forces. The world community can ill afford to watch the draining of such an enormous amount of finances which is direly needed for alleviating poverty, disease, illiteracy and hunger in a large part of the globe. This waste has been triggered by a sense of insecurity pervading the world atmosphere, enveloping both the developed and the developing countries. Attempts to limit conventional arms build-up have been meagre, and it is imperative that major arms-supplier countries exercise restraint on the production and transfer of conventional weapons, while taking into consideration the security of the recipient States. Inhumane weapons such as napalm and incendiary weapons must be totally prohibited.

16. That there exists an integral link between disarmament and development cannot be denied. This has been highlighted by many speakers before me and has been a recurring theme. According to a United Nations report, the transfer to development assistance of a mere 5 per cent of the current military budgets of the industrialized countries would meet the target set for the 1970s by the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade [resolution 2626 (XXV)] that is, 0.7 per cent of the gross national product. Curtailment of military expenditure would release much-needed resources for the socio-economic development of the world, especially of the developing countries, and thus contribute towards the establishment of a new international economic order.

<sup>1</sup> Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43).

<sup>2</sup> Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (resolution 2222 (XXI), annex).

17. But such an objective would remain chimerical unless concrete steps were taken towards the reduction of the military budgets of the major militarily significant States, particularly States members of the Security Council. A genuine effort could be made in this direction by freezing and then gradually reducing military budgets. My delegation has repeatedly advocated that a freeze must be imposed on the level of military spending if we are to make any significant headway in this direction. In the absence of such a freeze any reduction would be ineffective in view of the over-all increase in military expenditure. We hope that an acceptable standardized reporting instrument for military budgets will soon evolve to the satisfaction of all.

18. Without disarmament there can be no international security. Scientific and technological developments in the field of armaments have created a global psychological crisis of insecurity and fear. The universal quest for security has brought all of us, albeit unwillingly, to a situation of universal insecurity. If the logic of the psychological and material factors that are progenitors of this situation be admitted, we have every reason to fear that those very factors would lead to our total annihilation. Can there be any choice before us other than to destroy armaments or finally be destroyed by them?

19. The relaxation of tensions is a prerequisite for disarmament. We appreciate the positive effect that détente has had on the global political atmosphere, and we have always advocated that this beneficial process should not be limited but should be extended to all parts of the world. However, it is regrettable that despite the conducive atmosphere generated by the Helsinki Declaration in 1975<sup>3</sup> no disarmament measure has been forthcoming.

20. My delegation fully subscribes to the view that the role of the United Nations must be further strengthened especially in disarmament matters since it is inextricably woven with international peace and security. This august body cannot be bypassed in negotiations affecting the world at large. It must constantly be informed of all major disarmament proposals to enable the international community to play a constructive role. Disarmament negotiations should not be considered a monopoly of the nuclear, militarily significant and medium Powers and exclude smaller countries and powerless ones, which also have an equal stake in the future.

21. We reiterate our firm faith in the Charter of the United Nations. Paragraph 1 of Article 1 clearly lays down that the main purpose of the United Nations is: "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace. . .". Nothing threatens peace more than the arms race and the absence of political will among the major Powers, especially the nuclear ones, to progress towards disarmament. All States must fully implement the resolutions of the General Assembly.

22. The threat or use of force by armed forces or by any other means constitutes a serious danger to peace and must

be eliminated through enforcement of Article 42 of the Charter.

23. Nepal considers the United Nations to be a guardian of small nations and has spared no effort to further strengthen this world body. Our contribution in the past and at present to the United Nations Peace-keeping Force demonstrates the sincerity of our desires.

24. The present United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon shows the validity of peace-keeping operations, which should be strengthened to prevent areas of tension from exploding into major conflagrations. However, experience has shown that there has been unavoidable delay in organizing United Nations peace troops and despatching them to the designated areas. Such a situation could be averted by establishing a permanent United Nations peace force.

25. My delegation welcomes the suggestion made by the Secretary-General [*1st meeting*] that for every thousand million dollars spent on arms one million dollars should be devoted to national and international disarmament efforts. We also view with interest his suggestion for the establishment of an advisory board composed of eminent persons to develop a comprehensive approach to international study in the field of arms control and disarmament.

26. We believe that the international community should be made increasingly aware of the inherent dangers of the arms race and should be imbued with a sense of participation in all disarmament matters, which are the common concern of all mankind. While emphasizing the role of the United Nations in this sphere, we also believe that it should be supplemented by governmental organizations as well as non-governmental organizations and research institutes. We therefore welcome the participation of the non-governmental organizations and research institutes in deliberations at the committee level at this special session in the hope that they will make further contributions in generating world-wide interest in the cause of disarmament.

27. Ever since Nepal became a Member of the United Nations we have taken a keen interest in disarmament negotiations. We are signatories of the partial test-ban treaty, the outer-space treaty, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the sea-bed treaty<sup>4</sup> and the biological weapons convention,<sup>5</sup> and we have welcomed all efforts aimed at reversal of the arms race to bring about disarmament. We welcomed the Tlatelolco Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons in Latin America, and we have consistently supported the denuclearization of Africa and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East and South Asia. We hope that the 1971 Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [*resolution 2832 (XXVI)*] will soon be implemented and that all foreign military bases will be withdrawn forthwith. We have supported the proposed zone of peace, freedom and neutrality of the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations.

<sup>4</sup> Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof (resolution 2660 (XXV), annex).

<sup>5</sup> Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex).

<sup>3</sup> Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

28. Such regional arms control measures complement multilateral disarmament efforts and must be encouraged and recognized by the international community as early as possible.

29. However, we believe that national initiatives can also play an important role, and the three-year-old proposal of Nepal that it be declared a zone of peace should be taken in this light. A small land-locked country with limited resources, our aspirations stem from our genuine desire to institutionalize peace in order to harness and mobilize all available resources for development purposes. As a peace-loving country, our main preoccupation today is progress. We harbour no ill feelings towards anyone, and we advocate friendship with all. Non-alignment and peaceful co-existence are the solid foundations upon which our foreign policy is based. Nepal has never been a member of any military bloc or of armed alliances.

30. We have always been in favour of promoting understanding between nations, especially with our neighbours. We firmly hold the view that the creation of such zones of peace in the world contributes to a tension-free world and has a positive effect on the reversal of the arms race while enabling countries, especially the least developed ones, to concentrate fully on development. This is the rationale that underlies our zone-of-peace proposal, and we appreciate the support extended to us by several friendly countries.

31. My delegation takes full cognizance of the fact that disarmament is an extremely complex problem. But it is high time that the world faced this challenge with renewed zeal. We earnestly believe that given genuine co-operation on all sides progress towards disarmament can be achieved. While addressing the fifth summit conference of non-aligned countries, His Majesty King Birendra aptly observed: "If a world where the mighty and the not-so-mighty are piling up weapons of destruction presents a grim prospect, a world where countries are genuinely co-operating with each other opens a vista of unparalleled fulfilment for man."

32. A new and fresh approach to disarmament must be found and pursued with vigorous determination. The programme of action and the machinery for disarmament negotiations must be geared towards the achievement of the maximum positive results in the shortest possible time. Structural changes in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament are necessary to ensure a wider participation by States, especially the nuclear ones.

33. The efforts of the Preparatory Committee for this special session in preparing a draft final document are commendable and we are confident that constructive contributions by all delegations will lead to the adoption of a final document on the basis of which disarmament will be more nearly within our reach.

34. At this special session devoted to disarmament the General Assembly should spare no effort in charting a course towards the avowed goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Let us not grieve over lost opportunities but instead move reso-

lutely ahead along the path of sanity to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

35. Mr. AL-ALAWI (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, the delegation of the Sultanate of Oman is happy that you have been elected President of this tenth special session. We trust that you will guide it with efficiency and wisdom. You have recently presided over three successive and important sessions with efficiency and wisdom, thus adding to your record of successful service in the United Nations. We are sure that your unanimous election will add another chapter to your fine record, for you are known for your qualities of statesmanship and diplomacy. Your election is also a tribute to, and a recognition of, the important role played by Yugoslavia in disarmament.

36. I should also like to express our great gratitude to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim, for his continuous efforts in the service of the objectives and principles of the United Nations and in the cause of the international community as a whole. The Sultanate of Oman welcomes the constructive proposals and the studies he has submitted for discussion at this session.

37. The Sultanate of Oman has always supported all sincere attempts to reduce international tensions. It will take part in the efforts to create a new society based on security, peace and justice, a society that ensures the right of each State to live within secure borders, free from foreign interference in its internal affairs. Against that background, we welcome the special session devoted to disarmament. We hope that it will lead to concrete results and give a new impetus to the current efforts and negotiations in the matter of disarmament. We trust that it will live up to the hopes raised in this respect.

38. My delegation took part in the initiative resulting from the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Colombo, an initiative that paved the way for the resolution adopted by the General Assembly to convene this special session. We have followed with great interest the fine work of the Preparatory Committee in preparing the draft declaration and programme of action on disarmament which have been submitted to this tenth special session. We hope that the Assembly will adopt the declaration in its final form at the end of the session.

39. This special session could prove to be one of the most important in the history of the General Assembly if our efforts are crowned with success and if we can achieve positive results leading to a reduction of the concern felt by humanity today over the increasing arms race and the lack of progress, especially in the matter of the nuclear arms race. There is today a universal call for disarmament. It is a universal necessity. This fact was emphasized by the Secretary-General in his report to the thirty-second session, in which he said:

"... the United Nations cannot hope to function effectively on the basis of the Charter unless there is major progress in the field of disarmament. Without such

progress world order based on collective responsibility and international confidence cannot come into being. The question of disarmament lies at the heart of the problem of international order".<sup>6</sup>

40. We consider the nuclear arms race and the so-called balance of terror upon which the present international system is based to be unsatisfactory. They can lead the world to catastrophe. Moreover, the arms race absorbs a tremendous amount of human and material resources which should rather be devoted to economic and social development. It is enough to say that military expenditure absorbs \$400 thousand million a year, funds which should be devoted to construction and development, especially in the third-world countries.

41. This Organization has repeatedly expressed the desire of the peoples of the world for positive steps and real progress towards complete and general disarmament under international control. It has also expressed the desire for positive results in banning nuclear tests and putting an end to the accumulation of nuclear arms, and for the destruction of such weapons, as well as the creation of the collective security system that would create the proper conditions for the attainment of the goal of disarmament.

42. In spite of that unanimous request, achievements in this matter are, regrettably, very meagre. The peoples of the world look forward to more serious attempts to put an end to the arms race, especially in regard to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. They want to see weapons of mass destruction eliminated. We hope that during this session the Assembly will succeed in laying the foundation for a world conference on complete and general disarmament.

43. We note that the disarmament negotiations have achieved no substantial progress, especially in recent years. This has led to the production of more armaments, especially nuclear weapons. Thousands of millions of dollars are being spent on research to develop not only the existing weapons but more weapons of mass destruction. At the same time the non-nuclear-weapon States have increasing fears and doubts about the effectiveness of the security guarantees given to them. What these States need are clear-cut international guarantees of peace and full security against nuclear attacks.

44. In this connexion Oman supports legitimate proposals for the creation of peace zones and nuclear-weapon-free zones. In the past my delegation has supported and continues to support calls for the creation of such zones in the Indian Ocean, the Middle East and Africa, and we hope that the current efforts will lead to the attainment of that objective, following the example which Latin America set in 1967. We in the Sultanate of Oman are increasingly concerned about the lack of stability in the Indian Ocean, the Middle East and some regions of Africa, because these areas are very close to our country.

45. We believe that any efforts to promote regional disarmament must take into account the specific conditions and the specific defence needs of each region, for in the absence of a system of serious international guarantees each State should have the right to determine its own defence needs and to work towards meeting those needs.

46. Another fact which must not be disregarded is that any serious efforts to achieve disarmament must take proper account of the conditions of peace and security which should prevail in the world. So long as the law of force prevails in certain areas, so long as some States, ignoring the resolutions of this Organization, occupy the territory of others, and so long as attempts are made by some States to intervene in the internal affairs of others, the feeling of insecurity and the lack of stability, peace and justice will persist.

47. In this regard we join those who have expressed concern at the continued efforts of Israel to increase its arms supplies and to develop its nuclear potential while it occupies the lands of our brother Arab States and fails to respond to serious efforts to establish a permanent and just peace in the Middle East.

48. Any serious efforts to achieve disarmament or to control arms, whether at a global or a regional level, should take account of security considerations, and should be carried out in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Simultaneously with such efforts attempts should be made to create an international security system capable of meeting the security needs of small States, because their needs and fears cannot be disregarded. Such efforts will have to be made if we are sincere in our desire to achieve serious progress in this field, whether at the global or at the regional level.

49. The current disarmament efforts and negotiations should be broadened so as to secure the widest possible participation of States in order that the desired objective may be achieved. That is why we support the request that the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament negotiations be strengthened. We think it is necessary to reassess the effectiveness of the existing negotiating machinery, especially that of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva, so as to make possible the participation of all the nuclear-weapon States in its work. That would make the Committee more effective and more efficient. We feel that the procedures adopted by United Nations committees, especially those relating to chairmanship and reporting, should be adopted by the Conference. The Conference has played its part, for a certain time, but the time has come to review it so that it may be made more efficient and capable of generating confidence.

50. It is right that priority should be given to the question of nuclear disarmament because nuclear weapons constitute the greatest menace to the world. However, non-nuclear weapons are also becoming increasingly dangerous. In this regard we regret that the efforts that have been made so far have not fulfilled the expectations they raised. For example, only very limited progress has been achieved in the field of the banning of bacteriological

<sup>6</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-second Session, Supplement No. 1, sect. IV.*

weapons, and the efforts to reduce the stocks, and ban the use, of chemical and incendiary weapons have failed. So have the efforts which have been made for several years to prohibit the use of certain conventional weapons which cause unnecessary suffering; I refer to incendiary devices, radiological weapons, cluster bombs and other inhumane means of destruction which do not distinguish between civilian and military targets. This was evident during the four meetings which were held within the framework of the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts. We hope that humanitarian considerations will take precedence over purely military considerations. Our objective is to work out conventions limiting and banning the use of these destructive weapons.

51. We support resolution 32/152 adopted by the General Assembly during its thirty-second regular session by which it was decided to convene a preparatory conference to deal with the subject of banning the use of these types of weapons.

52. In conclusion, I want to point out that the success of this session, as is the case of any effort in the field of disarmament, depends primarily on the political will of all States, especially the great nuclear Powers. That is why we urge those countries to make more serious and sincere efforts, and to take effective measures, to halt the arms race and thus free the world from the fear of destruction and provide security guarantees. All the peoples of the world should be enabled to live in peace and prosperity. Thus, we would be able to devote our efforts and resources to the building of a more just world and to the establishment of a new international economic order. We know that it is very difficult to find solutions to all the problems which we face at present, but we hope that this special session will at least mark the beginning of serious attempts to take effective steps towards solving them and will thus fulfil the expectations which it has raised.

53. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, we are indeed privileged to have you guide our deliberations during the tenth special session devoted to the question of disarmament. You have proved yourself to be one of the most admired and respected Presidents since the United Nations was founded 33 years ago.

54. Before proceeding further, I must say that I would be remiss were I not to laud the unflagging efforts of our dynamic Secretary-General, Kurt Waldheim, who, since he assumed office, has unremittingly dedicated himself to the achievement of world peace. I do not know where Mr. Waldheim gets his undiminished energy. I looked around his residence and his office on the thirty-eighth floor of the Secretariat building, and I found no oil wells there. Nor did I smell oil in the office of our President. It must be that the source of their energy derives from their deep-seated desire for world peace. I therefore call on the leaders who are complaining about the price of oil to follow the example of our indefatigable Secretary-General and tireless President and in so doing rouse their own desire for world peace. If they do so, I can assure them that the quantity of oil used in the arms industry will greatly diminish and world peace will have a better chance of being established.

55. I have delayed making my statement until I had had the opportunity to listen to the prominent leaders and other knowledgeable speakers who have addressed this Assembly. The pertinent facts underlying the arms race have been exhaustively enumerated and the need to build up international confidence in order to reduce armaments has been recalled time and again from the time when the Charter of the United Nations was signed in 1945 until the present special session. Statistics have been cited and pertinent arguments adduced to show how we should proceed in order to achieve our goal. I ask: with what results?

56. The more we talked, the more the nations armed. What should we do? Should we keep silent? If we keep silent, things might get worse. Many of us have beguiled ourselves with pious hopes that the animal species which evolved into *homo sapiens* would ultimately opt for survival instead of treading the path that may lead to collective suicide. Are we justified in nurturing such hopes when secret research and development in the field of armaments continue, even though the multifarious weapons of mass destruction available in the arsenals of the super-Powers and lesser Powers are more than sufficient to wipe out man from the face of the earth?

57. What assurance do we have that rulers and others who wield power may not suffer from nervous tension leading to deep depression, which would make them act abnormally? To amplify what I mean, I can do no better than quote from an extemporaneous statement that I made at the First Committee on 3 November 1977.<sup>7</sup> I stated the following:

“... Had it not been for the deterrence of terror I am afraid there would have been a global holocaust beside which the two world wars would have appeared like child's play.”

I then went on to say:

“At this point I should like to emphasize that those who are in the seat of power, regardless of the ideology to which they belong, are human beings and as such are subject to the weaknesses and frailties of man—and of the man in the street, who is subject to their rule.”

Let us not forget that leaders

“are subject to pressure from groups within the State regardless of their ideology, and anyone continuously under pressure may become frustrated, and a frustrated leader cannot act normally. . . . And, by miscalculation, we may still have a conflict. Remember that in Sarajevo—and I remember that day as a child because I am a contemporary of two world wars—it was one bullet that began the chain reaction which paved the way for the First World War—one bullet in Sarajevo.

“You would say the deterrent of terror is sufficient. I would agree if the leaders had nerves of steel . . .”

but we have established that they are human and, as such, are subject to tension and abnormal behaviour.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, Thirty-second Session, First Committee, 24th meeting.

58. Therefore, what shall we do? Shall we continue parrotting platitudes inside and outside the United Nations, resorting to such hackneyed phrases and idioms as "détente", "advancing step-by-step while gathering momentum to go further by developing the political will for bringing about world peace". Those are the hackneyed phrases that have been quoted time and again. Still, it is better to keep talking of ways and means to achieve our goal, because we cannot afford to lose patience.

59. Speakers who preceded me covered the whole gamut of what should be done about nuclear weapons, the cessation of nuclear tests and related matters such as methods of inspection and verification. Some spoke about the military balance between the so-called Eastern and Western blocs, called for mutual restraint, and urged non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Others pointed out to us that conventional weapons account for about 80 per cent of the world's military budgets—and let us not forget that except for Hiroshima and Nagasaki the last two world wars were fought with conventional weapons. Most of the procedures suggested for achieving results could hardly be improved upon but it seemed as though most of the speakers, due to the complexity of the subject, were trying to treat the present symptoms with tranquillizers instead of providing genuinely effective remedies. True, a number of speakers alluded to pervasive mistrust and lack of confidence as being the major factors militating against the attainment of our objective. Most of what has been said is relevant to the unsatisfactory situation in which the world finds itself. Unburdening oneself in talk is good; silence is bad.

60. For heaven's sake, what should we do? The United Kingdom Prime Minister said that perhaps three years from now we might convene another special session on disarmament because, he seemed to think, tangible progress to that end could not be made in a relatively short period of time. We agree with him that we should keep trying, but there is no assurance that major military confrontations can be avoided. It is 20 times three years, or nearly 60 years, since the First World War came to an end in 1919. It took 20 years for the Second World War to erupt in 1939. But have we achieved peace since the Charter of the United Nations was signed in 1945? How many wars and large-scale bloody conflicts within States have we had since then? It pays one to count them, because hundreds of thousands of lives have been lost and no one knows when the carnage and devastation will cease. Why all this? It is because, unfortunately, despite repeated avowals for peace, most leaders of the world still predicate their policies on the balance of power and spheres of influence. Those policies have thrust many nations into military conflicts and in my own lifetime into two world wars. Have most of the leaders of the major Powers, and of the lesser Powers for that matter, learned from past mistakes? Very little, I am afraid.

61. The world is divided into spheres of influence, as I have mentioned time and again, as if each region were a checkerboard on which those leaders play their chess games, not with wooden pieces but with the destinies of peoples, many of whose rulers have unfortunately become

clients of one major Power or the other. But such policies have backfired. How often have we seen those clients, induced or enticed by big-Power aid, eat the bait and ignore the hook; or if they were caught by the hook their peoples sooner or later rebelled against them and untold suffering was inflicted on the innocent. And who else but the peoples of the donor Powers—listen to me, those who were donors, this is something good for you—had to bear the brunt of more and more taxes to pay for such adventures, or I should say, misadventures. Hence the donor and the recipient were losers in lives or in substance, and quite often in both. The speeches we have listened to or read remind me of an old Arabic proverb which, paraphrased in English, says "Read or listen and thou shalt be gladdened. Try to find the truth and thou shalt be saddened". Still we cannot afford to be cynical. How can the leaders or those in the seats of power translate words into action when they do not seem to be able to cope with the problems created by two world wars and lesser military conflicts?

62. Those wars, aside from playing havoc with the mores of peoples, have made even the victorious, as well as the defeated, nations fiscally insolvent. Look at the economic disarray that has been caused by war: eroding and sometimes galloping inflation, increasing national debts, unemployment, collusion and rampant venality in business and government, to mention only a few of the ills that afflict peoples everywhere in the wake of wars. The social fabric has been tattered through the gluttony of the greedy and the often uncontrollable ambition of the powerful and those who become drunk with vainglory, casting by the wayside, as most of them do, the ethics and moral code that are necessary for regulating any viable social order, regardless of ideology.

63. Why not start to reform by each country trying to live within its own means, instead of the rulers diverting the attention of their peoples by extolling their own political systems and finding fault with the political systems of other countries? Let each Government set its house in order, economically, socially and politically, so as to become an example to others, instead of waging wars by proxy or interfering in the internal affairs of other States, resorting to nefarious propaganda and other despicable means to achieve its ends.

64. Intelligence services are no doubt necessary to make sure that no foreign Government is surreptitiously trying to resort to subversion. Gathering such information is not illicit, but let us be frank: is not a good part of the budgets of intelligence agencies allotted to overthrowing foreign Governments by coups d'état or by the disbursement of secret funds for financing all kinds of activists with a view to establishing new régimes or even creating an anarchical state of affairs?

65. Four hundred thousand million dollars are spent on armaments, and God knows how many more billions are allotted to covert and overt subversion. What a prodigal waste of human effort and substance. And for what? For maintaining the balance of power, preserving spheres of influence, labouring under the false idea that this is the way to maintain the balance for world peace.

66. If world peace could be so attained, we would not have convened this special session to see how we can get out of the precarious state which may lead to a global conflict. The old approach to solving world problems is bankrupt. But how to attain world peace, which in the nuclear age has become indivisible? How can we adopt a new international order without lulling ourselves by a deceptive *status quo*—which, in effect, is merely a rhetorical term, as the world of today is subject to unforeseen catastrophic changes in view of the hazardous technological age in which we live? In other words, how can we utilize what I would call a respite from war to lay the foundation of world peace?

67. Exhortations are not enough if we do not translate our words into concrete action.

68. I venture to lay down before this Assembly a programme which may appear unorthodox in its approach but is quite feasible if the leaders are willing to put it into action. Some features of this plan or programme have already been presented by me in various Committees of the General Assembly. If I recapitulate what I have already said, I do hope that some benefit may be derived from repetition.

69. First, a United Nations convention should be elaborated so that mothers would be polled about whether or not to wage war. I am sure that 95 per cent of mothers would not want to see their sons marching off to war to kill and be killed.

70. Secondly, another United Nations convention should be contemplated that will free anyone below the age of 35 from conscription unless he is strictly needed for self-defence. Armies should be drawn mostly from men between the ages of 40 and 50. Young men should not be sacrificed, when modern warfare is a push-button operation in which the traditional role of the infantry is gradually being phased out. Incidentally, it is the middle-aged leaders who usually make the final decision about waging war. If such a convention is adopted, they will think a hundred times before they plunge into war, unless, as I mentioned, it is thrust upon them by the dictates of genuine self-defence.

71. Thirdly, another convention would regulate the research of scientists, who would take a solemn oath that any discoveries of theirs would be disclosed to the United Nations if such discoveries might bring about mass destruction. And these scientists should enjoy immunity for their disclosures.

72. No doubt many of you might consider these points Utopian or too idealistic. But why not sow the seeds of such suggestions? Perchance they will find the fertile soil in which to grow in the minds of men.

73. Coming to more practicable suggestions, I turn to the fourth point, which has to do with the mass media, whose managers frequently engage in propaganda. Why not institute what I might call "the voice of the United Nations for world peace", transmitted multilingually by satellite?

There would be radio and television broadcasts about the activities of the United Nations and its dedication to world peace. What is wrong with that—instead of being subjected to the raucous voices of States peddling propaganda day in, day out?

74. Fifthly, if the leader of the major Powers really wish to dispel the mistrust that prevails amongst them, why do they not, as a first step, disclose to the United Nations the inventory of the weapons stockpiled in their arsenals, instead of depending on their spies to furnish them with estimates that are most likely to be inaccurate?

75. Once such disclosures are made, is it unreasonable to invite the leaders solemnly to declare, during every session of the United Nations and on any other occasion, that they will not use nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction and that they are prepared to end the arms race? Otherwise we have no assurance that they will not continue surreptitiously to devise and pile up more and more weapons.

76. I repeat: first, the major Powers should let the United Nations know what mass destruction weapons they have in their arsenals and then solemnly promise that they will not be the first to use such weapons.

77. Sixthly, if it is too much to expect that such suggestions would be acceptable because of the mutual mistrust that could not be dissipated, the United Nations should work out a plan to impress children and the youth to become collectively the champions of world peace.

78. Last year, in a proposal I submitted to the First Committee,<sup>8</sup> I asked that the United Nations prepare a film portraying actual horror scenes from the two world wars. Such films would be shown in schools and on television all over the world to impress the young—and the old, for that matter—with the untold suffering of the troops and civilians—the killed, the maimed, the sick and destitute refugees, the anguish and despair of victims and survivors, the heart-rending tears of the bereaved, and even the deep sadness of unheard spectators; the devastation of cities, the burning of crops and the defoliation of forests—the catastrophe which is war. Such would be the subject-matter of the film.

79. Since the First Committee was not prepared to vote funds for the preparation of such a film, it had no objection to referring it to the Secretary-General to find out how much such a project would cost. Recently I was seated at a luncheon next to a Secretariat expert on disarmament who assured me that the cost of preparing such a film was negligible and that, no doubt, it would create a deep aversion to war in the young and the old. What leader could object to such a film?

80. Seventhly, artistically produced posters with peace slogans would be another visual means that could be hung in schools, public offices, homes, shops and stores to impress upon peoples all over the world that there can be no

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, Thirty-second Session, Annexes, agenda items 33, 34, 38-49 and 51-53, document A/32/380, para. 8.



alternative to world peace, if man opts for survival on this planet. What leader could object to such posters?

81. Eighthly, again we must enlist the aid of mothers to help us develop a new outlook with a view to ushering in an era of stable peace, lest the cave-man mentality prevail in times of crisis. Remember that had it not been for mothers we would not be here. A mother is the giver and protector of life. I submit that the ministers of defence should recruit mothers, not merely as office clerks or military adjuncts, but as full-fledged members in the echelon of policy-makers. I am sure that intelligent women, with the deep motherly instinct they possess, would exercise restraint on any defence officials who might resort to drastic action stemming from the cave-man mentality.

82. Ninthly, the funds saved from the progressive reduction of arms should be spent for two purposes. First, to extend aid to developing countries on a sound basis, bilateral, multilateral or through the agencies of the United Nations. The aid should be such as not to be used to curry favour for political ends but to build up shaky economies on a sound basis. The covetous and greedy should be restrained, if not curbed altogether. The poor and hungry should be succoured everywhere in the world by such savings derived from disarmament, and work should be provided for them lest the mischievous activists everywhere enlist them to make trouble and engage in aggressive acts.

83. Tenthly, since the end of the Second World War many so-called summit meetings have been held all over the world. In the old tradition of diplomacy, the leaders most often semantically said things they did not mean and meant things they did not say—hence their efforts were quite often ineffective, if not futile. Politics on the national and international levels should be developed as an art for harmonizing legitimate interests—unfortunately, quite often it has been used as an art of deception. That is why many politicians have lost their credibility with the public.

84. Some of the points I have made in this peace programme, or plan, which I have outlined before this Assembly may seem to many to be somewhat unconventional. But what is wrong with trying to find new avenues instead of treading the old rugged paths that have led to misunderstandings and conflicts among nations? I have no monopoly on new ideas to get us out of the rut. Everyone should try to break new ground and turn a new leaf. We should put our faith in the young and eventually leave the world better than we found it.

85. War preoccupied the ancient prophets. Is it not high time that we should find guidance in what Jesus of Nazareth said 2,000 years ago: "Love your enemies. . ."? In other words, if you treat your enemy as a human being, as you would treat yourself, you would make him your friend. And let us not forget that through another prophet, none other than the Prophet Mohammed—may God bless him—the Koran opens with the exhortation: "In the name of God, the merciful and compassionate . . .".

86. Leaders of the world, why do you not heed the voice of wisdom? It was high time you turned a new leaf and left

behind you the old, antiquated approach to bring about peace.

87. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person. That is found in the third article that we elaborated at the Palais de Chaillot, in Paris, 30 years ago.

88. Let there be life; let there be love and brotherhood; let there be world peace.

89. Mr. KOH (Singapore): The representatives of the 96 States who have spoken before me have been unanimous in condemning the arms race. If all of us are against the arms race, then the question is who is responsible for the arms race? Each of the two super-Powers seeks to put the blame on the other. The States parties to the Warsaw Treaty seek to put the blame on members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and vice versa. The representatives of developing countries seek to put the blame on the two super-Powers and on the other industrialized countries.

90. The first point I want to make is that the arms race is a universal phenomenon. It is not confined to the United States and the Soviet Union. It is not confined to NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. The truth is that with very few exceptions, all of us participate in the arms race and are therefore responsible, to varying degrees, for its continuance.

91. By now we are familiar with the fact that the world is spending approximately \$400 thousand million annually on armaments. Of this amount, approximately half is accounted for by the United States and the Soviet Union alone. The two super-Powers, together with the other industrialized countries, account for approximately 77 per cent of the world's total military expenditure. The third world's share of global military expenditure has been on the increase. It has grown from 15 per cent to 23 per cent during the last decade. Over half of the developing countries devote more than 10 per cent of their public funds to military expenditure. A quarter of the developing countries devote more than 25 per cent of their public funds to military expenditure. Despite severe food shortages, developing countries use five times as much foreign exchange for the import of arms as for agricultural machinery.

92. I have therefore come to the following conclusions. First, the arms race is a universal phenomenon, although half the world's total military expenditure is accounted for by the United States and the Soviet Union alone. Secondly, we are all responsible, though of course to different degrees, for the arms race. Thirdly, if we are to reduce the arms race, we must all examine our own conduct critically, and not merely seek to put the blame and the responsibility on others.

93. We must ask ourselves why nations arm themselves. We must try to understand the reasons which promote and perpetuate the arms race. Nations arm themselves because they fear that other nations will attack them by force of arms. Are nations justified in harbouring such fears? If we examine the record since the end of the Second World War

and the establishment of the United Nations, we are driven to the conclusion that such fears are indeed justified.

94. In the period since 1945, 133 wars have been fought, involving 80 countries and killing 25 million people. I ask: have the two super-Powers deployed their armed forces in combat outside their territory since 1945? Yes, they have. Have the other three permanent members of the Security Council deployed their armed forces in combat since 1945? Yes, they too have. Have the countries of the third world taken up arms against one another? Yes. As the Prime Minister of Canada said to us the other day: ". . . violence within and between States is a regrettable fact of life" [6th meeting, para. 45].

95. As long as violence within and between States remains a fact of life, how can we possibly expect nations not to acquire arms in pursuit of their right of individual and collective self-defence?

96. The United Nations was established in 1945 primarily for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. This is clearly set out in the preamble of the Charter and in Articles 1 and 2, which lay down the principles and purposes of the Organization, and in the provisions defining the powers and responsibilities of the Security Council and of the General Assembly.

97. The system for maintaining international peace and security, envisaged by the Charter of the United Nations, comprises several elements. First, the Member States are obliged, morally and legally, to respect certain principles. These include the principle according to which Member States are to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force, the principle according to which Member States are to settle their international disputes by peaceful means, and the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States. Secondly, the Charter sets forth a number of ways for dealing with specific threats to international peace and security. The Charter confers on the Security Council the primary responsibility in this area. Thirdly, the Charter lays down a number of procedures for the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

98. A perusal of the United Nations record during the past 32 years shows that all three elements of the United Nations system for maintaining international peace and security have failed to work effectively. Concerning the first element, I wish only to observe that numerous Member States have broken their obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force. They have failed to live up to their obligation to settle their disputes by peaceful means. They have interfered in the domestic affairs of other States.

99. As for the second element, I have come to the regrettable conclusion that the Security Council has seldom been able to discharge its responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. What has gone wrong with the Security Council? First, the Security Council can work only when there is a congruence of national interests among the five permanent members. In our divided world, it is very rare for the five major Powers to have such a congruence of national interests. Secondly, the Security

Council is sometimes unable to impose sanctions against those who violate the principles of the Charter and threaten international peace because the offenders are the permanent members of the Security Council or their allies or their friends. Thirdly, the 15 members of the Security Council are not impartial guardians of international peace and security. They are the representatives of Governments of States and they are motivated largely by their short-term national self-interest rather than by the interests of the international community.

100. As for the third element, it is sufficient for me to say that of the 149 States Members of the United Nations, only 45 have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. At the present time the Court does not have a single case before it. The reluctance of United Nations Members to refer their disputes to the Court stands in sharp contrast to their readiness to resort to force to settle their disputes.

101. I have sought to establish that we live in a violent world in which States have resorted and continue to resort, to force in their international relations. Secondly, I have sought to establish that the system, envisaged by the Charter of the United Nations, for maintaining international peace and security has failed. This brings me to the question: what can we realistically expect to achieve in the field of arms control and disarmament? In 1961, the United Nations embraced the goal of general and complete disarmament. Is this a realistic goal? The ideal of general and complete disarmament can only be realized under two circumstances. First, when men lose their proclivity for violence. Secondly, when we have a world government, and nation States are disarmed. The only arms allowed will then be in the possession of the world government. Neither event is likely to come to pass in the foreseeable future. Therefore, although I will continue to dream of a world without arms, I will strive for a less lofty goal. My goal is to slow down the arms race and to make the world a safer place for us all.

102. I turn first to the nuclear arms race. The nuclear arms race has five participants: China, France, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union. There is, however, a race within the race. The inner race is run by only two participants, the United States and the Soviet Union, which are running neck and neck. Between them, they possess 14,000 nuclear warheads, sufficient to destroy every city in the world seven times over. And yet they are augmenting their nuclear arsenals by three bombs a day. Because a nuclear war would threaten the whole of mankind, every one of us therefore has a right to speak out against the nuclear arms race. We have a right to demand that the two super-Powers speedily conclude their second strategic arms limitation treaty. We have a right to demand that they proceed thereafter to negotiate and conclude a third strategic arms limitation treaty which should actually reduce their existing arsenals of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. In the meantime, the two super-Powers should agree to limit and progressively reduce their military spending on new strategic nuclear-weapon systems and should agree also to stop the flight-testing of all new strategic delivery vehicles. We hope that the current nego-

tiations between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union will produce a comprehensive test-ban treaty and we hope that all the nuclear-weapon States will accede to such a treaty.

103. Turning to other weapons of mass destruction, we support the proposals for a treaty to ban radiological weapons, a treaty to ban chemical weapons and a treaty to ban napalm and other incendiary weapons.

104. I said earlier that we must all examine our own conduct critically. We must ask ourselves what we can do for arms control and for disarmament. What can the third world do for arms control and for disarmament? There are a number of specific actions which we, the countries of the third world, can take.

105. First, I observe that no member of the third world has acquired or acknowledged that it has acquired nuclear weapons. As we are all agreed that nuclear weapons are evil and threaten the very survival of mankind, the third world should maintain a moral consensus against any of its members acquiring such weapons. A country which acquires nuclear weapons should be condemned and not rewarded.

106. Secondly, the developing countries of Asia and of Africa should emulate their colleagues of Latin America who have, through the Treaty of Tlatelolco, created the first nuclear-weapon-free zone in an inhabited region. The developing countries of Asia and Africa should consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones either on a regional basis or, where appropriate, on a subregional basis.

107. Thirdly, the developing countries should take positive and constructive steps to reduce the conventional arms race taking place amongst them. In this regard, the example of eight Latin American countries is worthy of study. In December 1974, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, Peru and Venezuela adopted the Declaration of Ayacucho. In the Declaration, they expressed their desire to create "conditions which will make possible the effective limitation of armaments and an end to their acquisition for offensive purposes". President Pérez of Venezuela recently invited the eight signatories of the Declaration of Ayacucho to meet informally in New York during this special session in order to find out whether all the countries of Latin America are prepared to enter into a commitment in respect of conventional weapons. I hope that this Latin American initiative will yield results. I hope that developing countries in Asia and in Africa will examine the possibility of negotiating regional or subregional agreements to check the conventional arms race.

108. Finally, the countries of the third world should take heed of what was said by the Foreign Minister of Indonesia, Mr. Mochtar Kusumaatmadja, the other day. He said:

"... questions of regional stability and security ... depend first and foremost on the States in the region concerned. If they can exert concerted efforts to generate a climate of co-operation and devise institutions for

the peaceful resolution of disputes, the stability and security of the region will be strengthened." [11th meeting, para. 22.]

Mr. Kusumaatmadja went on to speak about the Association of South-East Asian Nations, which for the past 11 years has been engaged in regional co-operation in the economic and other non-military fields. He said:

"The Association has been able to attain a degree of cohesion among its members by pursuing simultaneously the goals of preventing interference by external powers and containing intra-regional differences." [Ibid., para. 23.]

109. The third world's contribution to the cause of arms control and disarmament should not be confined to delivering moral sermons to the two super-Powers and to the other nuclear-weapon States. The third world should take resolute action to keep itself free of nuclear weapons. The third world should exert strong moral pressure against any of its members who may be tempted or are preparing to acquire nuclear weapons.

110. The third world should also promote regional or subregional agreements to halt or to reduce the conventional arms race. The pre-conditions for such agreements are mutual trust and confidence. Unfortunately, conditions of mutual trust and confidence do not exist in many parts of the third world today. The third world is riven by conflicts and disputes based upon conflicting territorial claims and racial, tribal, religious, linguistic and ideological differences. We, the countries of the third world, must learn to settle our disputes by peaceful means. We must try to live peacefully and amicably with our neighbours. We must build regional and subregional institutions for economic co-operation and for the pacific settlement of disputes.

111. We must not allow this special session on disarmament to become yet another United Nations exercise in propaganda and collective hypocrisy. Representatives of States are in the habit of saying one thing at the United Nations and doing the opposite at home. The general debate on disarmament has been marred by this duplicity and by a tendency to put the blame on others. We must be realistic in our approach, but we should not accept the present reality as immutable. We must neither give way to cynicism nor be swept away by romantic fantasies. We must face the reality that we live in an imperfect world in which violence is a fact of life. We must face the fact that the United Nations has failed to provide nation States with a degree of security that would allow them to dispense with arms. The road to disarmament must pass through worldwide détente. We need détente between the United States and the Soviet Union. We need détente between the NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries. We also need détente among the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, for the unfortunate fact is that all the actual armed conflicts taking place in the world today occur in the third world.

*The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.*