



President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT: This afternoon the Assembly will hear an address by Mr. Spyros Kyprianou, President of the Republic of Cyprus. On behalf of the General Assembly, I have the honour to welcome him to the United Nations and to invite him to address the General Assembly.

2. Mr. KYPRIANOU: We are here today to advocate unswerving dedication and adherence to the process of disarmament against a grim background of war, confrontation and a continued frantic armaments race. The unprovoked, all-out attack by Israel against Lebanon and the Palestinians who live in that area and the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands war constitute the most recent explosions in a horrid series of events which threaten to disrupt the normal evolution of life and civilization on our planet. These recent explosions have added immensely to the threat to international peace and security which already existed as a result of other international problems, such as the situation between Iraq and Iran, the overall Middle East situation and a number of others, including the Cyprus problem, which is—and no one should make any mistake about it—a source of potential danger in that sensitive part of the Mediterranean. This is due to the fact that the occupation troops have been in Cyprus since 1974, occupying a great part of my country, despite the repeated resolutions of the United Nations, the provisions of the Charter and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki in 1975. The extremely serious problems with which the world is faced today prove beyond any doubt the absolute necessity of solving international problems with the urgency that is required and in conformity with the principles and resolutions of the United Nations.

3. The gravity of the international situation caused by the ever-escalating arms race, the unrestrained use of force in international relations, which is contrary to the provisions of the Charter, and the absence over the years of any progress in disarmament efforts, especially in the nuclear field, prompted the small nations of the world, especially the developing and the non-aligned, to take the initiative in convening the first special session on disarmament in 1978. The decision was in line with the interests and objectives of the non-aligned countries because the threat of war not only jeopardized their very survival but also necessitated a stupendous military buildup and consequent

waste of funds and resources which could otherwise have been funnelled into social and economic development.

4. Mankind is confronted with an unprecedented threat of self-extinction because of the massive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced. In 1945 two nuclear bombs with a total explosive power of 30,000 tons destroyed the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, killing 300,000 people. Since then, world nuclear arsenals have grown to the equivalent of over 1 million Hiroshima bombs, and the rate of increase of military expenditure has been escalating for the past decade so that today over \$600 billion are spent each year on armaments, three fourths of which by the six main military spenders.

5. Nuclear arsenals are so huge as to make any further quantitative increases meaningless, at least from the military and strategic points of view, because the present stockpile of weapons is enough to destroy all life on earth. But improvements are constantly made in the quality of weapons to render them more accurate, more deadly and more destructive.

6. Although a nuclear world war would be utterly catastrophic, there are many who fear that it is becoming increasingly likely because of the misconception that a limited nuclear war can actually be won. Thus the temptation to strike first increases dangerously and, furthermore, the chances of nuclear war by miscalculation or accident rise accordingly. It is very pertinent to note that data on accidents of nuclear-weapons systems given in the 1977 Yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute suggest that there have been 125 nuclear-weapon accidents in the past 30 years, that is, one every three months.

7. While opinions may vary as to the reasons for the increase in armaments, there is a general consensus that the international situation has indeed worsened since the tenth special session, in 1978. Instead of promoting détente, which was the case some years ago and which raised so many hopes in the world, suddenly this trend was reversed and it looked as if we were gradually coming back to the cold-war period, with a very clear increase in international tensions. And it is a cardinal truth that there is a direct relationship between the arms race and the increase of international tensions.

8. The presence in this Hall of so many heads of State or Government and foreign ministers is indicative of the seriousness of the situation and, at the same time, of the auspicious fact that the leadership of the world has its sights set on mankind's supreme trial. The very fact that there have been two special sessions devoted to disarmament and that

all States Members of the world Organization are participating in the debate on this question on an equal footing demonstrates the desire of all nations to involve themselves in the growing search for a solution to this problem, which in the last analysis is a matter of survival.

9. Parallel to unprecedented governmental concern, the emerging waves of popular protest against nuclear armaments indicate the growing concern and the increasing awareness of the grave dangers which loom over mankind because of the arms race. They demonstrate, on the one hand, the consequences of the lack of even a modicum of international order and security, as required by the Charter, and, on the other hand, the awakening of the peoples of the world to the now fast-approaching dangers of a nuclear conflagration, with all its implications of utter catastrophe for all. It is, in a sense, the awakening of individual man to his inherent responsibility and right to be actively concerned in matters involving the very survival of the human species on this planet. The peoples of the world, irrespective of their politico-social affiliations in a fragmented and polarized international community, are becoming aware of their common interest in and paramount concern for the continuance of human life, which are now as never before brought into focus, because excessive military polarization is incompatible with the compelling demands of a nuclear age.

10. Those voices of reason which are unaffected by the erosion of the moral fibre of mankind caused by the arms race are a constant reminder to mankind to come to its senses at the eleventh hour. They underline the contradiction between the urgent need for disarmament and the absence of any progress in this regard. They also demonstrate the outright cruelty of man towards his fellow man, when billions spent for armaments could feed millions of starving women and children. They form part of a healthy and formidable growing campaign in the world to reject the old discredited policies of force, domination and oppression and to replace them with the wish for peace, brotherhood and goodwill which humanity has been striving for centuries to attain and which are especially needed in today's turbulent world. Disarmament is no longer a matter for big Powers or Governments. The instinct of self-preservation of human society and its political and economic interdependence are internationalizing the problem of armaments and drawing people together against the threat of mankind's extinction.

11. In today's world, unfortunately, all conditions are present to make civilian populations the victims of any nuclear war. Therefore, the peoples of the world have a profound interest in progress in disarmament, and the work of this session should be influenced by the world's demand for a nuclear-weapons freeze.

12. We feel that the main purpose of the second special session on disarmament should be, above all and urgently, to end the ominous danger of the arms race and to set in motion the disarmament process set out in 1978 in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session [resolution S-10/2], the adoption of which was a unique and significant development, it having secured the support of all the States Members of the United Nations.

13. The adoption of measures to halt the ever-escalating arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, should be regarded as a first step in any logical effort towards disarmament and the elimination of the fear of nuclear devastation. Efforts to achieve disarmament cannot possibly succeed so long as the ever-increasing stockpiling of nuclear and conventional weapons goes on. Progress in disarmament entails in the first place halting the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, and stopping the production and refinement of nuclear and other weapons.

14. It is not reasonable to expect a shedding of arms while the arms race continues unabated and more sophisticated weapons of destruction are being produced.

15. Efforts since the Second World War to reach agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control have not yielded positive results. We are thus endowed with a history of long discussions and arduous negotiations on this subject, a history very instructive in its substance but hardly encouraging in its results. What is more, the gravity and magnitude of the dangers hanging over mankind increase every day. It is a fact that a number of international agreements have been concluded concerning partial measures of arms control and the exclusion of armaments from certain geographical areas where such weapons have not previously existed: agreements such as the Antarctic Treaty, the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and others. However positive, those collateral measures could not have any essential effect in slowing down the arms race. What is worse is the fact that even those glimpsed promising efforts have recently been nullified by the distrust aroused by the global dimensions assumed by the arms race. Why have these well-meaning endeavours proved unsuccessful? Why has mankind failed in this prime effort? The answer lies in the lack of international collective security. The world lives under the constant threat of being involved in a holocaust. The use of force hovers ominously over all mankind. New acts of aggression take place each year; territories and countries continue to remain under foreign occupation; and there is utter disregard for the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations, the Organization that was created to rid mankind of the scourge of war. We are living in a world of continual crises, in which aggression remains unremedied and terrorism, anarchy and insecurity are a way of life because of the ineffectiveness of the Security Council.

16. In the economic domain, the large military expenditures deplete our natural resources and aggravate economic problems, causing political and social instability, which in turn contributes to international unrest and the exacerbation of an already dangerous situation. Even when minor conflicts occur, security considerations become salient because of the high level of military preparedness on all sides. Local conflicts tend to become linked to regional or global confrontations and to the fear of nuclear confrontation.

17. The primary, most essential and pre-eminent role of the United Nations is the maintenance of interna-

tional peace and security, which is linked to disarmament and, as a matter of fact, forms its *sine qua non*. Without international security and order we cannot advance towards disarmament and the elimination of the weapons which plague the world community.

18. Disarmament cannot conceivably be promoted without setting into motion the system of international security through the United Nations, because nations cannot be expected to cease arming themselves in the absence of alternative means of security. In reviewing the history of disarmament we cannot fail to note that disarmament agreements have been the result of an existing sense of security, and the fact that disarmament agreements are few and on collateral measures only indicates that a general sense of security has been lacking.

19. Only after collective security had established confidence that States would not become victims of aggression could disarmament be tackled effectively. This confidence among nations is lacking because since its establishment, the United Nations has been unable to provide a system for ensuring international peace and security. The international community has thus been led into a world of force.

20. It has been the consistent position of Cyprus over the years that the Security Council must be given the means of enforcement action in the maintenance of peace and security through the availability of a United Nations force, as called for by the Charter. Such a development, which would act as a deterrent to the arms race, is unfortunately lacking. In their foresight, the drafters of the Charter met the need for such a development by providing for the maintenance of peace and security, which is the primary purpose of the United Nations. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)] recommends in its paragraph 9 that the Security Council take steps to facilitate the conclusion of the agreements envisaged in Article 43 of the Charter in order fully to develop its capacity for enforcement action as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Security Council has the responsibility and the duty to establish the relevant system by taking measures to enforce its decisions, in compliance with basic provisions of the Charter. Let us make no mistake: this can be achieved only if its permanent members decide to co-operate for the purpose.

21. In this connexion, the provisions contained in General Assembly resolution 35/156 J, adopted by consensus, may be recalled.

22. Renewed efforts should be exerted at the twelfth special session strictly to adhere to the principles of the non-use of force in international relations, the peaceful settlement of disputes among States and the effective implementation of United Nations resolutions. On the latter, I reiterate my proposal for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly on the effective implementation of United Nations resolutions.

23. The establishment of zones of peace at the initiative of States which intend to become part of such zones should in the meantime be promoted. Cyprus, along with other non-aligned European countries and other Mediterranean countries, supports the establish-

ment, for example, of a zone of peace in the Mediterranean.

24. Furthermore, the deliberations in the twelfth special session should seek means to achieve progress on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Nineteen years have elapsed since the signing of the partial test-ban Treaty by the original parties, a development which represents both an achievement and a failure. It is an achievement because it did contribute to saving the atmosphere from further contamination. It is a failure because instead of reducing nuclear testing it greatly increased it, as underground nuclear tests took place at an accelerated pace. Probably the most positive element is the fact that the Treaty was the first step towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

25. We consider the suspension of all nuclear testing to be of vital importance to the problem of the arms race, because pursuing qualitative improvements to the weapons of global destruction through nuclear test explosions leads to the creation of more sophisticated weapons which are more difficult to counter. The continuance of nuclear testing may have an adverse impact on the will of the parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty to maintain their adherence to the Treaty.

26. The risk of horizontal proliferation is also to be emphasized. The technology of nuclear weapons is now widely known, making it possible for not only Governments but also criminal groups to manufacture nuclear explosives. All efforts should therefore be directed towards strengthening the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The major Powers should not aggravate the situation by continuing to build up their already formidable arsenal of nuclear strength. And until the goal of collective international security is achieved the great Powers, and in particular the super-Powers, have the full responsibility and at the same time the obligation to do their utmost to put an end to the arms race by reaching bold agreements through meaningful negotiations that would lay the foundations of the process for ultimate complete disarmament. Everything must be done by the super-Powers to lead the international community back to a situation of *détente*. Despite the efforts at Geneva, it is our view that in the present circumstances it would be advisable for the two leaders of the two super-Powers to meet in person in a determined effort to reach understanding and make some progress in the right direction, however limited such progress may be. They have the responsibility to act urgently in the interests of humanity.

27. Political judgement and true appreciation of international interests in a nuclear world require a readiness to face facts, to deal with reality.

28. The reality is that we are in a world completely transformed by the advent of the nuclear weapon. Armaments have always been part of the structure of States. Over the millennia the use of force and war have been instruments of policy. A moment came, however, when an excess of technology, resulting in the splitting of the atom, led to weapons of such total destructiveness that they surpassed all limits of their potential use by man. As any armed conflict may escalate to nuclear conflagration and total catastrophe, war has now become obsolete. This reality calls for the abandonment of the concept of force and war in international relations. Compliance with the

Charter's prohibition of the use of force has thus become by the very nature of present-day life a compelling necessity for survival. This special session will have to transcend the usual clichés, which over the years have proved unproductive and not conducive to any reduction of nuclear or non-nuclear arsenals. War will have to be effectively outlawed. The usual excuse of lack of political will is not enough. We shall have to go deeper and seek the root causes of the arms race.

29. One significant cause is the total absence of an alternative to armaments for ensuring security. Nations cannot disarm in a vacuum. There is thus a need for effective collective measures within the system of international security, as required by the Charter.

30. The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session is emphatic in its Declaration in asserting that "Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces" [*resolution S-10/2, para. 13*].

31. It is therefore incumbent upon this second special session on disarmament to delve into the reasons for non-compliance with this significant and salient part of that Declaration. The primary requirement is to make available to the Security Council the means to give effect to its decisions. This is basic to the system of international security and order through the United Nations. It is expressly stated in the Final Document that in the implementation of measures to halt and reverse the arms race there should be strict observance of the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter, with full recognition of the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

32. During this special session the General Assembly should take a decision calling upon the Security Council to give prompt consideration to the conclusion of agreements for a United Nations force under Article 43 so as to render operative the Charter system of international security. Such action by the Security Council is vitally necessary. It should be more widely realized that in our present-day interdependent world of a nuclear and space age, an effectively functioning international Organization has become a compelling necessity for all.

33. In the world today all must do their utmost for peace, both the big Powers and the small Powers, and each one of us has the means to put forward ideas and proposals and to act accordingly in order to promote the cause of peace and security in the world.

34. Cyprus, which was invaded by Turkey in 1974, still remains with a great part of its territory under the occupation of Turkish forces. Addressing the first special session on disarmament on 24 May 1978, I said:

"I come from a very small country which is situated in a very sensitive area of the world, and we are deeply concerned about what goes on in the field of disarmament and, therefore, in the field of security. We have a problem of our own, which is an international problem. It is a problem which con-

cerns our people; it concerns the area; it concerns the United Nations; it concerns the entire world. And we feel quite sincerely that through strict implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations, and especially General Assembly resolution 3212 (XXIX), as endorsed by the Security Council, the Cyprus problem will be solved and at the same time Cyprus will cease to be a source of friction and conflict in the world.

"Taking advantage of this special session on disarmament, I would go a step further and publicly call upon the United Nations to act, and call upon the General Assembly, the Security Council and its permanent members to act, and call upon the United States and the Soviet Union to act. I propose total demilitarization and disarmament of the Republic of Cyprus and implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations. I propose a mixed police force of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, a police force composed in accordance with the proportions of the population and under the permanent guidance and control of an international United Nations police force. I make this proposition publicly, before all. If the world wants peace, Cyprus is ready to make its contribution, which would be a contribution to our own people because it would solve our problem and therefore remove the causes of our tragedy. But at the same time it would remove the cause of wider friction and wider conflict in the interests of world peace and security." [*2nd meeting, paras. 144 and 145.*]

35. I repeat the same today. I strongly believe that the aforesaid approach provides a rational way out of the problem of Cyprus, which lies at the heart of a deeply troubled area.

36. The international community must have been informed of the most commendable and generous proposal of the Prime Minister of Greece, Mr. Papan-dreou, who not only offered to withdraw the Greek military contingent stationed in Cyprus under the 1960 agreements—provided, of course, that the Turkish troops were withdrawn—but further proposed the stationing in Cyprus of a United Nations police force that would be as strong as necessary, stating at the same time that Greece would be prepared to undertake the additional expenses for such a force.

37. I would perhaps not have been in order if I were today to deal with the various aspects of the Cyprus problem or with the endeavours over the last eight years to solve it. I am confining my remarks to the aspects which directly or indirectly relate to disarmament and to international peace and security. These aspects are of direct concern to the United Nations and constitute at the same time the gist of the Cyprus problem. It is the duty of the United Nations to see to it that its resolutions are strictly implemented and to demand of Turkey that it end its aggression and withdraw its occupation troops from Cyprus.

38. We envisage a peaceful solution which would ensure conditions of happiness and prosperity for all the inhabitants of Cyprus. Such a solution is possible if Turkey abandons the philosophy of division and is made by the international community to understand that it cannot indefinitely dictate its terms by virtue of its superior military strength.

39. Cyprus, despite its size, is one of the stalwart fighters for the ideals of man in today's bedevilled international situation. Surely Cyprus is entitled to enjoy the same rights as every other truly independent country in the world, and its people are entitled to the same rights as all other free peoples in the world. We are not asking for anything more, but we shall agree to nothing less.

40. I wish to conclude by expressing the hope that this second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament will be crowned with success and that its deliberations will pave the way to achieving whatever is necessary to put the world on the right track of lasting peace and security.

41. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I wish to thank the President of the Republic of Cyprus for the important statement he has just made.

42. Mr. PUJA (Hungary) (*interpretation from Russian*): On behalf of the Hungarian delegation, Sir, I should like to offer you my best wishes on your election to the presidency of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I trust that this session will, under your guidance, accomplish its work successfully.

43. All sessions of the General Assembly are important events in international politics, as they provide opportunities for representatives of Member States to sum up the results achieved since the preceding session, assess the processes and prospective trends in world politics, state their views on major issues and define collectively the tasks for the forthcoming period. If this statement is true of regular sessions, it is even more true of the special sessions convened to promote solutions to particularly pressing problems of a global nature. This session is of particular relevance, for on its agenda are problems such as the removal of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, preserving peace, curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament, all of which are of the greatest importance to mankind at the present time.

44. Four years ago, when the first special session on disarmament was held, the peoples and Governments of the world were looking to the General Assembly with great expectations, entertaining hopes that its resolutions would be a turning point in the process of negotiating disarmament by speeding up and making more productive the talks under way on arms limitation and disarmament. Although the first special session on disarmament did not—and in the situation prevailing at that time it could not—live up fully to the expectations of all countries, it was nevertheless successful in several aspects. That session focused the attention of Governments and the world public on the pressing need for military détente and disarmament and formulated in the Final Document the vital and long-term objectives, principles and priorities of disarmament negotiations, as well as a detailed Programme of Action [*resolution S-10/2, sect. III*] on disarmament measures. That was a great achievement.

45. There is, however, another aspect of this matter. Now that we have assembled here to sum up the results of four years and to review the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted at the

first special session on disarmament, we are unfortunately not in a position to report much progress.

46. This special session is taking place in particularly disquieting international circumstances, in a period unfavourable to efforts aimed at curbing the arms race and promoting disarmament. Recent years have witnessed an increase in tension rather than disarmament and a deepening of détente. We have experienced the growth of the danger of war rather than the strengthening of peace and international security. Programmes have emerged for an unprecedented arms buildup rather than for action to curb the arms race and give effect to urgent disarmament measures. The responsibility for such developments lies in the extremist circles of imperialism.

47. The situation, already burdened with tensions and conflicts, has been further aggravated by Israel's aggression against Lebanon, the Palestinian people and other States in the region. The Government and public in the Hungarian People's Republic strongly condemn that brutal attack and demand the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces. I take this opportunity of assuring the victims of this latest Israeli aggression of the full solidarity of the Hungarian people and Government.

48. In present conditions there is a growing realization, wider and stronger than ever before, that the central issue of the international situation, the crucial factor in the survival of mankind, is whether it will be possible to stop the arms race, which is assuming increasingly dangerous proportions and is placing ever greater burdens on the peoples; whether it will be possible to remove the danger of war, above all that of a nuclear catastrophe, by adopting really effective disarmament measures; and whether it will be possible to lay firmer foundations for peaceful co-operation and for national and international security.

49. The world public is fully aware that the Hungarian People's Republic, like other socialist countries, is a sincere and consistent advocate of disarmament. My Government considers it a main task of its foreign policy to take an active part in and take initiatives to preserve the results of détente, the defence of peace, the consolidation of security and the strengthening of co-operation between countries and peoples. It is well known that the socialist countries, including Hungary, have put forward a whole series of far-reaching initiatives and proposals in an effort to advance the cause of arms limitation and disarmament and to promote the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament. It is not their fault that their efforts have failed to yield results.

50. I can reaffirm on behalf of the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic that, together with our allies the other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and other socialist countries, we are ready to agree, on a just and reciprocal basis, to the limitation, reduction or prohibition of weapons of any type. We support any initiative likely to promote the cause of disarmament.

51. Of the long list of urgent disarmament problems the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic

attaches paramount importance to the halting of the nuclear arms race. Therefore, we warmly welcome and fully support the proposals recently presented by the Soviet Union concerning the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons and medium-range nuclear missiles.

52. At its last session the General Assembly, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, adopted a declaration of outstanding importance—the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe [*resolution 36/100*]. That significant document declared the first use of nuclear weapons to be the gravest crime against humanity. My Government is of the view that this special session should call upon the nuclear-weapon States to comply without delay with their obligation, as laid down in that Declaration, to start negotiations in good faith on ending the production of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles, with as their ultimate goal the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

53. In the field of nuclear disarmament, we regard the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests as a task of particular urgency. It is heartening to note in this respect the decision adopted by the Committee on Disarmament last April at Geneva to have a working group start consideration of this item soon [*A/S-12/2, para. 38*]. We shall do our best to ensure that the working group contributes to the complete and earliest possible cessation of all nuclear tests.

54. Prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons is a task as important as ever. We urge all States which have not yet done so to become parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, thereby contributing to the attainment of the universality of that extremely important international treaty.

55. Appropriate measures for the non-deployment of nuclear weapons in the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would be another great contribution to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We are convinced that the destruction without delay of all types of nuclear weapons would be the most effective way of removing the danger of nuclear war. Until that goal is achieved, we lend our full support to any intermediate, partial measures, such as outlawing the first use of nuclear weapons.

56. The Hungarian Government supports initiatives to have nuclear weapons banished forever from various regions of the European continent. Consistent implementation of such initiatives would mean that Europe would be free of nuclear weapons.

57. Those countries like Hungary which, as parties to a valid international agreement, have undertaken not to obtain nuclear weapons, and which have no nuclear weapons of other countries on their territories, have every right to expect the nuclear Powers to undertake further obligations to guarantee their security. They have a right to unconditional guarantees that they will never, under any circumstances whatsoever, be subject to the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We continue to believe that the most suitable form for such a guarantee is a multilateral agreement. As a first step, however, declarations by the nuclear-weapon Powers, similar in substance and to be con-

firmed by a resolution of the Security Council, would be acceptable.

58. World public opinion was rightly indignant following reports that certain big Powers had decided to start the manufacture and deployment of neutron weapons. My Government is urging the General Assembly to adopt as quickly as possible a declaration outlawing that particularly inhumane weapon of mass destruction. In accordance with previous resolutions, the General Assembly should at this special session call on the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva to embark without delay upon the elaboration of a treaty on the complete prohibition of neutron weapons.

59. My Government deems it essential that renewed efforts be made towards the early elaboration and conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. The decision on the manufacture and deployment in Western Europe of a new type of chemical weapon known as binary weapons makes this especially justified and urgent. That step is likely to start a new surge in the arms race, and it is a matter of deep anxiety to the peoples of our continent.

60. The Hungarian Government considers it equally important that talks on the elaboration and conclusion of treaties prohibiting new types of weapons of mass destruction and radiological weapons should be speeded up. In the Committee on Disarmament, the Hungarian delegation has a long record of making great efforts towards that end. We are confident that our concrete initiatives will promote the success of negotiations.

61. Although the Hungarian Government believes that the limitation and prohibition of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction is a task of the greatest urgency, it considers it equally important and timely that steps be taken towards the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces, as well as towards a gradual reduction of military budgets. We favour effective measures to prevent the extension of the arms race into outer space, in line with the proposal put forward by the Soviet Union at the last session of the General Assembly.

62. Under the resolution adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, one of the main tasks of the present special session is to adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament providing a framework for consistent efforts aimed at elaborating concrete disarmament measures. It is a well-known fact that the socialist countries have always advocated general and complete disarmament with a view to strengthening peace and security. Since, however, it became evident that this goal could not be attained in a direct way owing to opposition by the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*], the socialist countries, later joined by many others, endeavoured to bring general and complete disarmament closer through partial disarmament measures.

63. That approach has already led to several important agreements when favourable external conditions existed and when the States concerned summoned up the necessary political will. We still consider that to be the most appropriate practical method of advancing the process of disarmament.

64. At the same time, we have accepted the idea that the measures required for general and complete disarmament should be incorporated as appropriate in a comprehensive programme of disarmament. For our part, we are fully in favour of adopting a realistic programme of concerted measures likely to be instrumental in halting the arms race, averting the danger of war, and giving impetus to a dynamic process of disarmament.

65. As regards suggestions and proposals on enhancing the effectiveness of disarmament machinery, I should like to emphasize that the existing system of disarmament forums is capable of meeting the requirements. We maintain, as does the great majority of Member States, that failure to achieve the desired results is due to the lack of political will on the part of certain influential States.

66. The Hungarian Government agrees that the United Nations should devote greater attention than it has in the past to mobilizing world public opinion for disarmament, as well as to information and education concerning disarmament. My Government supports the idea of launching a world disarmament campaign, and this view was set out in detail in our reply to the Secretary-General.

67. We think that the proposed world-wide action for the collection of signatures as a way of enlisting the support of the masses for urgent measures to prevent a nuclear war, curb the arms race and promote disarmament could be an important element of the world disarmament campaign. The Hungarian Government is ready to support such initiatives by way of further concrete steps and financial measures within our means.

68. At the tenth special session I had occasion to underscore the great importance of convening a world disarmament conference. We believe the General Assembly should definitely support that idea. The world conference would contribute to placing the cause of disarmament in the central focus of the attention of mankind.

69. It is no accident that we cannot report success in the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. Already in 1978, at the time of that session, the extremist imperialist circles had stepped up their subversive activities to undo the results of détente, the consequence being a deterioration of the international situation. It is characteristic that a 15-year programme for arms buildup was adopted by the summit conference of NATO precisely during that first special session on disarmament. One year later, the NATO Ministerial Council decided to deploy 572 American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe, posing yet another threat to the security of the Hungarian People's Republic. Bilateral relations between socialist and capitalist countries began to deteriorate, chiefly under the impact of the political measures taken and the propaganda campaigns launched against the Soviet Union and other socialist States.

70. It is a generally accepted fact that relations between countries with different social systems, especially those between the Soviet Union and the United States, have an important role to play in the develop-

ment of the international situation. This is clearly evidenced by events of the past decade.

71. It is precisely for this reason that the Hungarian Government welcomes and supports the efforts directed towards improving Soviet-American relations and renewing direct talks between the two countries. There is abundant proof that the success of such negotiations can bring a favourable influence to bear on the international situation in general and on disarmament forums as well. We sincerely hope that a favourable breakthrough will occur soon in Soviet-American relations, contributing substantially to the implementation of the measures adopted in 1978, the need for which is strongly urged at this session.

72. However, we can hope for results only if it is possible to create a favourable atmosphere for negotiations and thus to increase mutual trust. Today, the development of co-operation based on confidence is still hampered by various manoeuvres. Disarmament cannot be achieved if the American party continues to seek military superiority and if it insists on its plans for the development and deployment of new types of weapons of mass destruction. The United States administration must recognize the equality of the negotiating parties and must accept the fact that there is no way of reaching accords on disarmament other than by refraining from setting preconditions and by respecting the principle of equal security. Steps of a political or economic nature intended to narrow the scope of bilateral relations between States with different systems are detrimental to international co-operation.

73. We deem it essential that talks be started, parallel with measures for nuclear disarmament, about the strengthening of the security of States by international political and legal instruments. The conclusion of an international treaty definitively eliminating all forms of the use or threat of use of force from international relations would be of particular significance and relevance.

74. In the present international situation, it is encouraging that larger and larger masses of people are now raising their voices in defence of peace and against the arms race. Public opinion is ever more resolutely opposed to programmes and measures for arms buildup designed to serve the interests of monopoly capital and the military-industrial complex.

75. We support the decision to give the widest scope yet for direct participation in this session by representatives of mass social organizations. We are sure that their statements in support of peace and disarmament will be welcomed by the overwhelming majority of Member States and will have a beneficial effect on the direction of our work. My Government shares the view of the popular masses that effective disarmament measures, rather than an increase in armaments, are what is necessary.

76. It is gratifying to note that the popular masses are becoming increasingly aware of the close relationship existing between disarmament on the one hand and the security of their particular countries and international security on the other. That awareness is also becoming clear in the policies of more and more countries. We consider it necessary for the broad masses to become similarly aware of the harmful

effects of the arms race—instigated by the monopoly capitalist circles of the imperialist Powers—on economic and social progress, particularly in the developing countries. We, for our part, have repeatedly emphasized, and I should like to restate our position here, that it is a sin to squander the material and intellectual resources of mankind on senseless armaments and destruction. We are convinced that the means and resources released as the result of disarmament would help us to solve a number of economic and social problems at both the national and global levels.

77. Those forces that seek to impose ever-growing economic burdens on the socialist and developing countries by whipping up new wars and intensifying the arms race are imperilling the present and the future of mankind, and they will thereafter bear a heavy responsibility. We all know that the introduction of new weapons systems not only increases the danger of war but also absorbs immense and irretrievable resources that are necessary for the progress of peoples and their economic, social and cultural development. However, we also know, since contemporary history has shown us often enough, that the socialist countries and the peace-loving forces of the world will not tolerate the imperilling of peace by the disruption of military parity.

78. The people and Government of the Hungarian People's Republic are deeply convinced that a nuclear catastrophe can be avoided. That is why we are endeavouring to do all we can to work towards that end in close co-operation with all the progressive and peace-loving forces. This special session offers us an opportunity and provides a world forum for this uniting and co-operation.

79. The Hungarian Government, with the full support of the people of the country and all the forces available to it, will do its best to move towards that goal.

80. Mr. TALEB IBRAHIMI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): May I, Sir, begin by congratulating you on behalf of the Algerian delegation on your election to the presidency of this special session of the General Assembly and expressing our conviction that your great experience and your knowledge of disarmament problems will ensure the success of our proceedings.

81. At the very time when, in keeping with the aspiration of mankind to a world based on justice and law, we are discussing peace and disarmament, the terrorist nature of the Zionist entity, encouraged by all kinds of complicity, has once again been unleashed against the Palestinian, Lebanese and Syrian peoples. By launching another barbaric act of aggression on the very eve of the opening of this special session devoted to disarmament, the Zionist entity has demonstrated—for those who still had doubts—its bias fundamentally opposed to the ideals of the United Nations and its constant defiance of the most elementary norms of morality and law. Once again an infamous act is being committed under our very eyes. Once again the Security Council, paralysed by the same complacency, has failed in its primary responsibility.

82. How much longer will the Zionist entity be assured of impunity for its criminal delirium? How much longer does the international community have to be subjected to intolerable actions? How much

longer will the unanimous disapproval of the peoples remain without effect?

83. The savage use of the most sophisticated weapons against unarmed civilians and the ignoble murder of thousands of innocent persons are brutal reminders of the context in which we are meeting. It places each of us face to face with our responsibilities.

84. This session thus reflects a largely shared concern at the critical state of affairs in our world and indicates the constant aspiration of mankind to go beyond the horizon of war, which, after all, has been the dominant trait of history. These Assembly sessions devoted to disarmament undoubtedly represent an important juncture in the life of the United Nations and a special moment in the task of harmonizing the efforts of the international community to tackle one of the major challenges of our time.

85. These sessions are thus the profound expression of the determination of all the peoples to promote, by means of perseverance and collective effort, the advent of an international order of security founded on justice, liberty and progress. This wholesome demand has become urgent because of the continual deterioration of the international environment, which fosters and supports a system based on domination and exploitation.

86. Our present and future efforts must of necessity be based on the clear facts that that system suffers from grave deficiencies—deficiencies of a political nature, because it has been unable to dissipate dangerous and persistent sources of tension or to prevent the appearance of new conflicts; deficiencies of an economic nature, because it cannot even assure mere survival for so many human beings relegated to living in the conditions of another era; deficiencies, finally, because it conceives of security only in terms of relations of forces and the balance of power, which can only engender the quest for supremacy by means of the unbridled arms race and for spheres of influence and obedience. From the perception of this relation of forces, which by definition constantly changes, the result can only be a precarious balance. The potential disruption of that balance has become an obsession. But the obsession with preventing such a disruption leads inevitably to taking those very measures which bring about the much-feared disruption. This infernal logic has always characterized the approach to matters of disarmament.

87. In the circumstances, and despite the constant efforts of the international community, the true disarmament process, which all peoples yearn for, has not yet begun. On the contrary, the arms race, which clearly cannot be halted through measures of control, has of late become even more pronounced.

88. While the Charter of the United Nations proclaims the need to save mankind from the scourge of war, the spirit of confrontation has replaced the painstaking quest for peace. The creative genius of mankind has thus been called upon to improve military performance and to achieve mutual deterrence, which of necessity has resulted in the further spread of insecurity throughout the world.

89. Thus in the cold war as well as in détente, the concept of international relations based on the balance

of forces appears to be the most powerful agent in the arms race, and its logic seems to tolerate all the changes in the international political atmosphere.

90. Is it not a paradox that the disarmament undertaking, while supported by the demand of all mankind for the elimination of the deadly machinery of war, has but led to an incessant increase in expenditures on armaments, their further development and continued improvement? Thus our world continues to be what it has always been—the theatre of incessant conflicts which, with their own tragic events and untold suffering, show that in international life inevitable developments must of necessity come about through upheavals.

91. Given the structurally war-oriented course of international life, an alternative was bound to emerge, and the movement of non-aligned countries was quite naturally destined to propose it to the international community.

92. On its initiative, the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was convened. Through the action of its members, there was a consensus among the participating States on a renewed vision of the need for general and complete disarmament, a new approach combining the need for disarmament and security, a programme of action and a reform of the existing international machinery. The Final Document, in which all these concepts and measures were incorporated, was universally acclaimed as a platform which, if scrupulously followed, would make it possible at last to go beyond the ritual of rhetoric in the international community and begin a genuine disarmament process.

93. Meeting four years later, at a time when the profound crisis in international relations is continuing, this twelfth special session is duty-bound to take stock critically of past action and to elaborate, with renewed determination, effective measures in the context of a specific time-frame so that an order of peace and understanding among nations may finally be established.

94. It is reasonable to conclude that the disarmament undertaking has not yet begun. The balance-sheet of the last four years shows a result far below what could reasonably have been expected. Disarmament prospects have become fainter and we see a clear trend to question the very idea of real negotiations. This failure was only natural since discriminatory views, selective approaches and exclusive actions persisted. This is particularly true of the nuclear field, although it has been assigned the highest priority.

95. Moreover, the absence of concrete results is further aggravated by significant technological progress in miniaturization, accuracy and the optimal correspondence in the use of nuclear weapons with specific military objectives.

96. This evolution, apart from justifying greater concern, carries in itself the major danger of inducing the belief that recourse to nuclear weapons limited to a specific target would avoid the risk of escalation.

97. A similar danger has appeared in the last few years with the introduction of nuclear weapons in Africa and the Middle East. The Zionist entity and the *apartheid* régime have indeed been able to acquire

nuclear military capability, despite the restraints of the non-proliferation régime. This clearly proves the ineffectiveness of this régime as regards those against which it should above all have applied.

98. The situation thus created in these two regions of the world, which the General Assembly has solemnly declared should be nuclear-weapon-free zones, not only endangers international peace and security, but introduces a further obstacle to efforts to establish the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean as zones of peace. To be convinced of this, it is sufficient to recall that between the temptation and the attempt to resort to nuclear weapons there is only one step which by their very nature those two régimes might easily take. The arrogance of the Zionist entity in denying the States of the area the right to access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes demonstrates that likelihood.

99. In the light of these many elements, the desire to give security guarantees to non-nuclear weapon States only in a discriminatory and selective manner seems to indicate a lack of the political will to support the objective of security for all.

100. To the sophistication of the nuclear means of destruction is added the increase and improvement in the conventional military equipment of the great Powers, which seek to strengthen to the utmost their capacity for intervention in all parts of the world. For, nuclear confrontation seeming to be unthinkable although always possible, there has inevitably occurred a transfer of additional tension to the third world countries, which have thus become the arena of unceasing conflicts.

101. In fact, the growing recourse to the policy of force is increasingly characteristic of an international situation already seriously affected by the persistence of opposition to the completion of decolonization and to the right of all peoples freely to choose their own socio-political system and path to development.

102. Thus the stubborn desire to keep the third world systematically confined in a sort of cage is expressed in the reactivation of military bases, the deployment of forces for rapid intervention, the openly stated doctrine of vital interests and the pursuit of policies of aggression against peoples struggling to exercise their right to freedom, development and progress.

103. It is clear from this that while the arms race fomented all kinds of tensions, it feeds on those self-same tensions. This means that the problems of peace, security, disarmament and development arise as an indissoluble whole and call for an overall approach.

104. The plans which have prevailed so far have adhered stubbornly to considering in isolation the various aspects of the same reality. Any fragmented approach is bound to overlook the main point. The deadlock to which this approach has led means that we must now show the necessary lucidity and courage finally to tackle, directly and simultaneously, the primary causes of the arms race.

105. In the present state of affairs, of course, effective arms control measures could for a time reduce tensions and free resources which could more usefully be devoted to development. The basic problem, how-

ever, would remain intact, as history abundantly shows. Only removing the obstacles to development and substituting for confrontation a dialogue calling for the abandonment of all policies of force can, by consolidating national independence effectively, meet the security concerns of all and create conditions conducive to a true organization of international society which will make less inevitable the propensity vainly to seek an illusory security by means of the accumulation of armaments.

106. Disarmament measures can only benefit development efforts, while responding to the genuine needs of international security. The development efforts will bear fruit by eliminating one of the major sources of tension in our time and by bringing about relations based on equality without the values of domination. Thus we can see quite clearly the close relationship and mutual interaction between disarmament, development and security, and that it is absolutely necessary to carry out global economic negotiations and disarmament negotiations simultaneously.

107. It is precisely this view that received the endorsement of the international community in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, which prescribed a comprehensive programme of disarmament "encompassing all measures thought to be advisable in order to ensure that the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control becomes a reality in a world in which international peace and security prevail and in which the new international economic order is strengthened and consolidated." [*Resolution S-10/2, para. 109.*]

108. The establishment and solemn adoption of such a programme by the Assembly at this session would constitute the accomplishment of an urgent task which we had set for ourselves as well as the promise of a brighter future.

109. We have today a special opportunity to make the necessary break away from the narrow and fragmented approaches to a global problem which, because of its nature, requires a global solution.

110. In order to do this, we must resolutely commit ourselves to carrying out effective measures by identifying specific stages and deadlines in the context of an agreed time-frame. The achievement of general and complete disarmament cannot be viewed in terms of partial measures but must have the form and consistency of a genuine strategy.

111. Properly conceived as the coherent framework of an authentic disarmament process, the comprehensive programme must be as ambitious as is necessary and not resign itself to what is only possible. Thus, the consensus to be obtained on its content and nature should not be reduced to the lowest common denominator of the transient currents of opinion which are expressed in this Hall. This is why this exercise should not lead merely to a reformulation of principles and priorities which have been agreed to, nor, even less, should it lead back to questioning what has already been achieved.

112. In this connexion the relevant provisions of the Final Document of 1978, which have been approved by all, define the whole conceptual basis of the pro-

gramme and contain precious indications as to its function, substance and status.

113. Thus the comprehensive programme of disarmament is the natural extension of the Programme of Action adopted four years ago and an instrument indispensable for its implementation.

114. Certainly the implementation of the programme will be a long-term task and thus requires a timetable that will co-ordinate the actions to be undertaken in successive stages. In this spirit, the definition of deadlines should be the yardstick for measuring the progression and renewing the momentum in order to create and maintain a dynamic that will ensure that the process becomes irreversible.

115. Since, with regard to disarmament, professions of faith and textual declarations have proved unproductive, the time has come to meet the need for a commitment of higher quality. Acceptance by all States of multilateral obligations in the context of the deadlines agreed upon would be the best proof of their desire to act and of their will to ensure that the comprehensive programme becomes an effective instrument of disarmament.

116. The United Nations is naturally called upon to play an increasingly important role in this and to assume primary responsibility because it is the special forum which makes it possible for all to participate and to express their concerns. It is in this context also that all the required conditions must be created in order to facilitate the democratic functioning of the Committee on Disarmament, where we have noted a trend towards shifting it away from its role as a forum for negotiating specific agreements and towards limiting it to the role of a mere registration office.

117. In any event, the implementation of effective measures of disarmament largely depends on the improvement of the international environment. Therefore it is necessary to eliminate active or potential centres of crisis by means of speedy, just and lasting solutions, since those centres are perpetual impediments to development efforts and the establishment of genuine international peace and security. In view of the recognized links between disarmament, development and international security, joint actions are necessary in order to reverse the dangerous phenomenon of the acceleration of the arms race, the aggravation of international tension and widening development gaps.

118. Is the international community at present capable of the efforts and imagination required for adopting a new approach? This implies taking control, jointly and systematically, of the changes now developing in a world whose structures have broken down. We hope that the clarification of ideas which has brought to our attention the exigencies of genuine disarmament has already taken place. We must believe that mankind, confronted with the threat of its own extinction, will finally be able to show the clear thinking, courage and generosity necessary for ensuring the advent of a new world.

119. Mr. CHEYSSON (France) (*interpretation from French*): At the close of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, it was decided to convene this session four years later.

120. A good many people are astonished and indignant that so many prominent officials are speaking here about disarmament while weapons continue to build up and be perfected, war is raging, men, women and children are dying, and violence engenders further violence. You, yourself, Mr. President, to whose authority I pay tribute, are affected by this, as are many others in this Hall. And you, Mr. Secretary-General, whom I now greet for the first time in this distinguished forum, know that the efforts, intelligence and skill of the highest international authority are not sufficient; and each of us knows that you were recently called upon to exercise them. War seems to be stronger; to some it appears inevitable.

121. But we cannot submit to this fatality. And it is for precisely this reason that it is now more important than ever to hold the present debate. Any discussion about disarmament is a discussion about the survival of our civilizations. There is no subject more complex, but there is no subject more important, for it concerns all States and, beyond them, all peoples and all mankind. It concerns all States, including those with the fewest arms, for their fate depends at every moment on the conduct of those most heavily armed. It concerns all mankind, and therefore every person in the world has the right to understand and judge what is done and not done by Governments, including his own.

122. This is the fundamental meaning of the present debate. And from the threshold of this building to the furthest reaches of the earth it must raise questions and give millions of our contemporaries a sense of hope.

123. The General Assembly will not and cannot conclude disarmament agreements. These require specialized bodies and other negotiations. But the Assembly represents the universal expression of the aspirations of the States of the world. It must discuss the agonizing threat posed by armaments, provide a forum for debating different points of view, draw up the balance sheets, define the tasks and provide the impetus.

124. The purpose of our meeting here is first of all to assess the situation. Unfortunately, this is not difficult. Everyone knows that in the course of the past four years none of the hopes formulated in 1978 have been translated into concrete form. Moreover, it is clear that the arms race has been pursued at an accelerated pace, and confusion and obscurity—often deliberate—prevail to such an extent that no one can seriously advance precise data.

125. Attempts have been made and negotiations have been started; none of these has produced really meaningful agreements.

126. All of us must consider the causes of such a situation. The French delegation, for its part, intends to use the language of realism even if that is displeasing. It will tirelessly reaffirm the positions that France has been expressing for a year now.

127. A prime truth, which is a little hard to accept, is that the process of disarmament is not independent of the conditions of international security.

128. A dual relationship always exists between the level of arms and the conduct of States towards each other. Armaments contribute to tension but they are

not the principal cause of it; often they are only the consequence. The negative evaluation of disarmament must therefore begin with the finding that rules of international conduct are not respected.

129. To this I would add rules of political, social and economic conduct. Those who are virtuously astonished to see poor countries spending so much on armaments must admit that the worsening of economic inequalities and social injustices is an essential factor in insecurity and tension. As things stand the international situation is continuing to deteriorate both economically and politically and quite often socially as well. The elementary principles of the behaviour of nations, as set forth in the Charter, are cynically flouted. But a satisfactory system of international relations cannot be constructed on the basis of disregard for such principles. The profound interdependence among States, far from reducing insecurity by itself, only multiplies its causes. The growing number of acts of force are necessarily accompanied by a deterioration in international mechanisms for joint action. For two and a half years now the Soviet Union has had more than 100,000 men in Afghanistan; in the face of national resistance it conducts military operations that are causing much cruel suffering.

130. Other situations come to mind: the murderous conflict between Iraq and Iran, the invasion of Lebanon, the silencing—or should one say the crushing—of the Palestinian people, the repression in Central America, the destruction of freedom in Poland, *apartheid* in South Africa, the illegal occupation of Namibia, the war in the Falklands (Malvinas). There is a desperate need to seek a better international order. Each State has its responsibility in that regard, first and foremost, because of their power, the world's two most formidably armed States. Confidence among the partners seated at the same negotiating table must be built. The entire international community, and our Organization first of all, must devote itself to that task.

131. The discussion of disarmament should not be an occasion for propaganda, ending up in an exercise in semantics. It must not amount to a simple episode in the manoeuvres of world Powers, with each side first denouncing the other and then, once the lights in this Hall have been extinguished, agreeing to relegate the United Nations, its institutions and its mission, to the background.

132. The search for a more just and more secure global international order should be pursued with two principal objectives in mind. The preceding speaker has already referred to them: peace and development. France believes that in the case of disarmament those objectives can be met through balance between East and West at the lowest, safest and most stable level possible and through the defence and guaranteeing of the independence of each State by means of regional security.

133. To attain those objectives the international community must—and this is the third line of action we propose—strengthen the procedures and institutions relating to disarmament and ensure that public opinion is informed and mobilized.

134. In the past two years there has been a resurgence in public opinion in Western Europe and the United

States of the fear that had been dormant for the past 20 years, the fear of world war and therefore of nuclear war. Faced with such legitimate anxiety, there are two errors we must avoid: confusing pacifism and the unyielding determination to achieve peace, and fanning anxiety.

135. The cause of peace is not served by awakening or exploiting the psychosis of war or by multiplying unilateral proposals of a vague and spectacular nature with the aim of manipulating public opinion. The paths to disarmament can be taken by means of a realistic and objective analysis of the factors that increase or may increase the threat of a generalized military confrontation.

136. These factors are inseparably linked: the nuclear over-armament of the super-Powers, the risks of strategic destabilization resulting from the military use of new technology, the imbalance in conventional forces and the threat of surprise attack. To identify the threats to world peace we should simply recall what has kept the peace for 36 years: the certainty that any conflict in Europe, any crisis that fundamentally and profoundly opposes the vital interests of one or the other of the two super-Powers, would trigger a nuclear apocalypse. Yes, it must be said that nuclear deterrence has been the arm of peace wherever it comes into play between East and West. One need only think of what would otherwise have been the consequence of the terrifying imbalance in conventional arms that has persisted, in particular in Europe, since the end of the Second World War, at a time when the democratic countries were devoting their principal resources to reconstruction and to improvement of the economic and social conditions of their societies.

137. But in the last few years the qualitative and quantitative acceleration of the nuclear-arms race has created two threats of major conflict: the possibility of a nuclear first strike, generalized or, more probably, limited to Europe, by one super-Power hoping thereby to prevent such an attack by the other; and aggression by means of conventional or chemical weapons in Europe initiated by a Power convinced that the level of its nuclear means shelters it from the highest form of nuclear retaliation.

138. Confronted with such real dangers, Utopian or misleading solutions have too often been proposed: total nuclear disarmament, or a universal commitment to non-first use.

139. Such formulas would greatly compound the threat of war as long as the imbalance in conventional arms and political dissymmetry persists in Europe. Moreover, those who propose them seem to forget the essential provision of the Charter concerning the non-use of force. So what credibility could be given to proposals that would reduce the application of this basic clause to the nuclear threat alone?

140. These demagogic solutions aside, we are left with three priorities that derive from the strategic analysis of the threat of war: the reduction of nuclear over-armament, the elimination of technology-related destabilizing factors, and the reduction of imbalances in conventional weapons in Europe.

141. Clearly the highest priority must go to the process of de-escalating the nuclear-arms race of the

two super-Powers, even if that can be done only gradually. France therefore welcomes the resumption of strategic talks between the United States and the Soviet Union; this is an eminently positive factor.

142. Nevertheless, our concern over the dizzying increase in the arsenals of the two super-Powers persists, for several reasons.

143. The first is the accumulation by the super-Powers of excessive capacities for nuclear destruction. For a few years one of the great Powers had reduced its effort while the other none the less relentlessly went on strengthening its arms potential, particularly that aimed exclusively at Western Europe. Now the former is obliged to react, lest it find itself outclassed or feeling threatened. In this way, with the two parties moving from positions of inferiority to catching up and then to overtaking each other, the arms race destabilizes and terrifies each of the two camps in turn.

144. The arms race is even more disturbing qualitatively: the deployment or the prospect of the deployment of increasingly powerful ballistic weapons is now awakening the fear, often expressed in the past, that stability based on nuclear deterrence might be compromised by the reappearance of the first-strike capability.

145. In the face of these two dangers it is imperative that the balance between East and West be re-established at a lower and more stable level. Balance at a lower level means we expect the present negotiations at Geneva on intermediate-range nuclear forces and the negotiations that are to be resumed on strategic arms to lead to a significant reduction of the nuclear potential of the two super-Powers. We expect parity to be the rule and all levels of capability on both sides to be discussed in the strategic negotiations. A more stable balance means that priority must be given to the removal of the most destabilizing missiles.

146. It would clearly be illogical for the two sets of negotiations not to be closely linked. The talks on intermediate-range American and Soviet arms will inevitably bog down if they are not linked organically with an evaluation of other American and Soviet means which, although not based in Europe, are none the less capable of striking targets there.

147. In such a context, France cannot consider participating directly or indirectly in negotiations that must for the time being remain bilateral. It is only honest to say this as clearly as we always have. It is fair to point out the reason for this. It is a simple matter of common sense. France cannot, in full independence, escape the threat of vastly superior forces other than by nuclear deterrence. Our means of deterrence have been limited to the absolutely minimum level necessary to prevent anyone from being able to control our country, whereas the super-Powers' capabilities are characterized by an excess of super-armament. There is room for reduction of this excess. France cannot fall below the level of credibility without calling into question its security and independence.

148. It would certainly be otherwise if three conditions were met: first, the reduction of the arsenals of the super-Powers to such levels that the gap between capabilities could be considered to have changed in nature; secondly, the quantitative and qualitative

limitation of defensive strategic systems, which might one day neutralize nuclear deterrence; and thirdly, significant progress in the reduction of imbalances in conventional arms in Europe and the elimination of the threat of chemical warfare.

149. As for nuclear tests, frankly we can discern no real sign of a genuine readiness on the part of the two super-Powers to abandon them. First one and then the other protests its good intentions, and this has been going on for a quarter of a century. So far these good intentions have never coincided except for the decision that nuclear tests should be carried out under ground.

150. France also now carries out only underground testing. It could not at this time give that up without endangering an essential element of its independence in this area.

151. Technological progress can offer new opportunities for disarmament. Observation by satellite, in particular, will no doubt make decisive progress possible in the means of verification. These means should be at the disposal of all.

152. That was the purpose of the specific proposals made by France in 1978¹ regarding the creation of an international satellite monitoring agency. The Group of Governmental Experts on the Question of the Establishment of an International Satellite Monitoring Agency, a group mandated by the General Assembly, recently presented a remarkable report² to the Assembly describing the possibilities and the conditions of the attainment of that goal.

153. France will continue to work for the acceptance of a proposal that has already won widespread support. We regret all the more that the two super-Powers, which currently enjoy a monopoly in military observation from space, have not thought it necessary to inform the international community of the kind of contribution they would be ready to make in this area. In any event, that will not prevent my country from pursuing its aims in the context of technological changes and with the prospect of seeing more States join the "space club".

154. We cannot forget that technological progress can be used for military ends; the international community must guard against this before it is too late.

155. We are thinking, for example, of new weapons that might jeopardize deterrence, of military activities in space and, in particular, of anti-missile defence and anti-satellite systems.

156. France has already expressed its support at the Geneva negotiations for an international convention banning anti-satellite weapons. In our opinion, such a convention would fill a real gap in existing treaties. It would make it possible to prevent a qualitative leap in the arms race, stupendously costly for all of us, the long-term consequences of which for the stability of the strategic balance would be awesome.

157. Similarly, we believe that any challenge to the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, signed in Moscow on 26 May 1972, the principal success of more than 10 years of bilateral negotiations on strategic arms limitation, would be a far-reaching and lasting step backwards. France would be prepared to associate itself with a general treaty

in this area and in organizing the verification of such a treaty if such an approach could consolidate the ban on anti-ballistic missiles.

158. There are other horrifying weapons which make it possible to circumvent nuclear deterrence. I refer to chemical and biological arms. Research now under way in these fields makes this subject one of particular urgency. That is why France attaches special importance to the negotiation of a convention banning the manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons. Such a convention has been the subject of useful technical discussions within the Committee on Disarmament. It is unfortunate that it is still obstructed by the determination of the Soviet Union, which claims not to see the need for verification. Can there be disarmament and confidence without verification?

159. Of course, there is already a convention which prohibits the military use of chemical and biological means of warfare. That is the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, of which France is the depositary country. But that Protocol does not include specific provisions for verification. France proposes compensating for this deficiency by establishing procedures for the rapid identification of phenomena the symptoms of which call for recourse to specialized medical techniques. In this field WHO has both the experience and the international network to take the rapid action necessary to make the essential preliminary objective evaluation. Thus, in our opinion, that body should be assigned an important role in such arrangements.

160. These proposals are in no way a criticism of the inquiry which experts are now carrying out concerning certain alleged practices in South-East Asia and Afghanistan. We continue to support that inquiry.

161. I can confirm here that my Government has asked the French Parliament for authorization to accede to the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction. My Government intends to support and to propose itself various steps to meet the obvious inadequacies of the provisions of that Convention in the areas of consultations among the parties and of verification.

162. Lastly, the third potential threat to East-West equilibrium results from the tensions in Europe and from the buildup of conventional weapons in the Old World. This is why France proposed, at Madrid, in the context of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the convening of a conference on disarmament in Europe. First, confidence must be restored by reducing the risk of a surprise attack; then the present imbalance must be corrected by effective and verifiable reductions of offensive potential. This must be done within the only geographical framework that is meaningful in security terms—that is to say, the entire European continent, from the Atlantic to the Urals. These last subjects must be dealt with as soon as the work at Madrid is resumed; the French delegation will contribute to that end. We appeal to our partners in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to ensure that the public will at

last have the feeling that we are progressing in a way that is clear and comprehensible to all.

163. At the beginning of my remarks I spoke of the anxiety that the threat of war has awakened among peoples.

164. One painful fact stands out: in present times, war affects first and foremost the countries of the third world. The 130 or so armed conflicts since 1945 have all occurred in the South, and most of them have involved one or more developing States. Even as I speak now, everyone can hear, as I have already said, the cries of the victims in Lebanon, on the Iranian-Iraqi border, in Central America, in the Falklands (Malvinas). Each of us is thinking of the agony of the peoples of Afghanistan, Cambodia, Namibia and the Western Sahara. It should come as no surprise, then, to see the increase in the burden imposed on the developing countries in the total of world military expenditures: 4.5 per cent of the total in 1969, 7.2 per cent 10 years later and 16.1 per cent in 1980, according to the report³ by Mrs. Thorsson.

165. Does this mean that the third world should be disarmed? Such a proposal would be shocking and absurd. While every developing country is forced to overarm, we know full well that globally the third world is underarmed in comparison to the arsenals of the North. Some States in the South are actually critically underarmed in relation to their minimum security needs, and this could affect their independence. So the problem is not disarming the third world; it is, rather, building an international order that will enable each country in the South to ensure its development in security, in independence and in full command of its choices and lines of action.

166. From that basic observation arise the following objectives. The first is to avoid an aggravation or a change in the nature of existing tensions in many regions of the South. To that end, it is important to prevent East-West rivalry from being artificially grafted onto the quarrels, the disputes, and even the wars in the third world. Some of these are the result of centuries-old differences and conflicts. Others result from injustice, from the inequalities of incomes and land-holding systems, from oppression by certain forces too often a legacy of the colonial period. Be that as it may, France has said all along—and will continue to say for as long as necessary—that respect for the sovereignty of all States and the rejection of all interference in internal affairs are fundamental principles for any international order that is more just, more secure and more conducive to development. France is therefore resolutely in favour of non-alignment, genuine non-alignment. It is acting and will continue to act accordingly in its own policy. It asks that the international community do likewise.

167. The second objective is to encourage and support the efforts of the States of the South to eliminate tensions among themselves and to organize their collective security in a regional framework.

168. How can this be achieved? One possible line of action, as yet insufficiently explored, concerns regional security agreements. The Charter itself establishes a model for this in Chapter VIII, Article 52. May I remind the Assembly of paragraph 1:

“Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action.”

169. France maintains that the possibility of creating zones of independence and solidarity should be explored to the full. Who can fail to see the usefulness of paving the way to solutions that could not be reasonably envisaged at another level: controlling local crises, confidence-building measures, commitments to neutrality? A decisive step in that direction might be the establishment of regional structures making it possible either to move rapidly to set up local forces to monitor peace at the request of the States concerned or to maintain contingents on a permanent basis to verify and even guarantee commitments that have been freely entered into among neighbouring States.

170. Structures of this kind would make it possible for the States concerned in a region to come to an understanding on mutual respect for their differences, the abatement of tensions, confidence-building measures, arms limitations agreements and the means of monitoring and verifying commitments that have been entered into. At times it might even be necessary to establish networks of observers or even actual forces, on a temporary basis, to monitor peace. The regional nature of structures and arrangements such as these would remove the possibility of interference by external Powers. The transfer of each local dispute to the two super-Powers, which would otherwise be inevitable, would be avoided. Naturally, specific agreements would be called for among the interested parties outside the framework of any defence link external to the zone, so that the formulas would be established in conditions appropriate to the regions and the circumstances.

171. The international community should, in support of such positive and responsible actions, resolve to make available for such regional agreements the means of analysis and control deemed necessary by the interested parties themselves. If need be, these means might include those of the international satellite monitoring agency which has already been mentioned. France would, of course, be prepared to shoulder its part of the responsibility in accordance with conditions determined by the Security Council or another United Nations body at the request and in conformity with the wishes of the interested parties.

172. The establishment of so-called nuclear-free zones may constitute another application of the regional approach that has just been outlined. France is already on record as favouring this approach in places where the balance of power does not rest on nuclear deterrent forces. Naturally, such zones could be established only by the unanimous and express decision of the States concerned. There could be no question of imposing a decision from the outside, any more than in the case of any other regional agreement.

173. A commitment dealing with arms of whatever kind is, however, meaningful only if its application can be verified in conditions that are reliable and win the confidence of all the parties concerned. The international community should therefore study the possibility of making available to States forming part

of limited-arms or nuclear-free zones the technical means that provide such security and confidence. The already considerable accomplishments of IAEA—to which France would like to pay a tribute—allow us to think that these means will be continually adapted to the rapid progress of technology.

174. It is also important, of course, that regional agreements of this kind be recognized and respected by all outside Powers. States which decide among themselves to reduce their arsenals and which may agree among other things to renounce the production and stockpiling of nuclear weapons should receive every guarantee from the international community against any external nuclear aggression.

175. Furthermore, France believes that these guarantees should be applied in general to all non-nuclear States. For its part, it states that it will not use nuclear arms against a State that does not have them and that has pledged not to seek them, except if an act of aggression is carried out in association or alliance with a nuclear-weapon State against France or against a State with which France has a security commitment. In thus moving closer to the kind of guarantee already made by others, France hopes to facilitate the drafting of a Security Council resolution.

176. Moreover, the international community should support the establishment of zones of peaceful nuclear co-operation by reconciling the necessary guarantees of non-proliferation with the dissemination without discrimination of all non-military nuclear technology. To that end, the countries with this technology should provide the means to set up regional centres for the enrichment or reprocessing of nuclear fuels. These centres should furnish groups of States that have freely decided to form nuclear-free zones or nuclear-co-operation zones with privileged access to all the technology relating to the nuclear fuel cycle. The establishment of such zones would thus bring into play elements exceptionally favourable to development. This would be a form of transfer from armament to development.

177. As is known, France has decided to co-operate in the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America. Unfortunately, the implementation of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)⁴ has been delayed because several countries of the region have not adhered to it.

178. My country would take the same favourable attitude if in Africa a decision were taken by the countries concerned to make that continent or part of it a nuclear-free zone. Here, too, it is for the interested parties to discuss the matter and take a decision—and not for an outside Power, however strong its ties of friendship with Africa.

179. Every year the General Assembly mentions the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. Whatever difficulties might be involved, the Secretary-General might usefully make contacts in order to consider the best procedure for moving forward. At a time when war is unleashed in the Middle East it may seem strange to recall this idea, but we should be in no doubt that peace will one day return and that the prospect of co-operation would reinforce the will for peace.

180. I shall conclude this portion of my statement by mentioning the Indian Ocean. France supports the principle of a conference if thorough preparation should indicate that it would be of value.

181. Can one speak of the third world and its independence without also speaking of development? To speak of development is to speak of disarmament, not only because death must be pushed aside before life can be improved, but also because it is the same men and the same resources that will be used, in the South, either for arms or for development. Yes, it is time to begin the transfer to development of the human and financial resources now fuelling the arms race. As many United Nations documents have emphasized, a huge part of the immense resources swallowed up by arms could, and should, be devoted to development. Among the many inequalities to which the third world is condemned by the present international disorder, its inequality in security is one of the most appalling. To provide for their security, too many third-world countries must draw on the minimum necessary for life, while the super-Powers finance their over-armament by skimming the top off of their higher standard of living. This is illustrated by the fact that, in the long term, military spending is representing a decreasing share of the gross national product in most industrialized countries, but an increasing share of the gross national product in the least advantaged developing countries.

182. In 1978, France proposed a plan⁵ that caught the attention of the international community: the creation of an international disarmament fund for development. The group of experts headed by Mrs. Thorsson discussed this at length. Why not continue this endeavour by stepping up studies on a voluntary basis, until they become universal?

183. Given the overriding necessity of limiting arms and starting on the path of disarmament, the most heavily armed States have special duties. But all peoples, without exception, have equal rights and equal duties: the right to information and expression, and the duty to enable all men and women to participate in the same movement.

184. It is important for this universal Organization—the only one, our Organization—to provide all its Members, and through them all the inhabitants of this planet, with objective information, clear documentation and the possibility of consideration and the means of negotiation.

185. This special session gives the Assembly, which has sovereign control over its own decisions, an opportunity to accomplish the disarmament tasks that the present state of the world requires be accomplished. The first special session devoted to disarmament did a great deal of work in this respect, work from which France shall not detract. In particular, it was agreed in 1978 to review the composition of the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation believes that expanding its membership by a reasonable number could strengthen its authority without detriment to its function as the principal organ for multi-lateral negotiations.

186. France, as is known, would like the General Assembly to decide on the final status of UNIDIR, which has the capacity for considerable expansion

both in the field of research and in the services it provides to negotiators.

187. In that connexion, one important aspect of the efforts to adapt the machinery concerns the status, role and means to be granted to the Centre for Disarmament, as well as direct access for its Director to the Secretary-General. The present situation does not reflect what the Assembly should expect of the Secretariat. I wish to state clearly that the present situation is unsatisfactory both on the level of organization and on the level of political arrangements. This is even more clear in that it is becoming very difficult to co-ordinate the disarmament activities of the United Nations with those of other international specialized agencies.

188. The activities of the future satellite monitoring agency, whose establishment we call for, should also be considered in the context of a restructured Centre for Disarmament.

189. Other countries have suggested giving the United Nations a larger role in all international verification techniques. France is ready to study these proposals. It is interested especially because the question of management arrangements will be raised sooner or later; a thorough analysis should be made. Such an analysis might deal in particular with the possibility of setting up a United Nations disarmament programme which, modelled after UNDP, would group together the various activities undertaken by the United Nations family.

190. France has high ambitions for disarmament; it has high ambitions for the United Nations. I repeat that for those ambitions to be fulfilled they must be entrusted to our peoples—to all our peoples. We are in favour of everything that can contribute to knowledgeable information about what is at stake in current or future negotiations.

191. In this context, the international community should be able to benefit from the independent reflections of outstanding men of great authority, religious, scientific and moral leaders chosen by the Secretary-General from among the various currents of thought. Some would describe this group by the felicitous name of the "Council of Consciences". This would serve alongside the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, whose mandate and composition must be reviewed. It could group the winners of Nobel Prizes in peace and the sciences, representatives of the great religions, thinkers and experts—the latter in small numbers. It hardly needs to be repeated that disarmament will be accepted by the major political and economic forces holding sway in the world only if there is a deep need for it felt within each conscience.

192. The call for peace must not be a battle-cry, a pretense that barely disguises attempts to spread false information or to mislead people. The beautiful blue flag of the United Nations or of UNESCO must not cover goods destined for one camp alone. International dialogue requires reciprocal exchange of information and the free movement of people and ideas.

193. Agreement must be reached on concrete terms that would allow widespread information and study efforts to be undertaken on the problems of international security, the balance of forces and arms limitation. And public opinion in all our countries

must be allowed to benefit from these efforts through free access to the information media and through the unimpeded flow of ideas. Some are proposing campaigns for disarmament and peace, while they deny their own citizens all objective information on the positions of the others, forbid all free discussion and ban all demonstrations.

194. I ask the United Nations information centres in the various States to make generally available to the public, in their national languages, the highlights of remarks made from this rostrum by the representatives of all countries. This information should be reported regularly in the main periodicals. In addition, the questions we take up in this way should be debated by elected representatives in the world's parliaments; they should be taken up in public forums, on television, and, indeed, on all the every-day occasions that bring people together regularly: at school, in the barracks, and in youth movements. Debates could take place in public, before the widest possible audience, on the subjects we discuss here in a closed, even sterile, environment. Why should we not have discussions of contradictory viewpoints between French and Soviet citizens, between Vietnamese and Japanese, between Bulgarians and British, on the television networks of the countries concerned? Just imagine the effect such discussions would have. I can assure the Assembly that French authorities would co-operate in urging our television networks to participate if it became possible to organize such programmes.

195. Disarmament is not an end in itself. Peace and security are our goals, and assuring them must be the overwhelming concern of all the world's leaders, the shared passion of all our peoples. As we have seen, it means a balance in the forces of the great Powers at the lowest possible level, and it means the limitation of conflicts between the smaller Powers. It requires mutual confidence, which in turn depends on developing the collective conscience. The United Nations and the Secretary-General himself stand at the centre of the evolution that must free mankind from fear.

196. Mr. RAO (India): May I, on this occasion, greet you now as the President of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, which is also the second special session on disarmament. May I also take this opportunity to offer the felicitations of my delegation to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, as this is the first time since the commencement of his stewardship of the Organization that I take the floor.

197. The General Assembly met four years ago in its first special session on disarmament. Between then and now, the global strategic environment has deteriorated visibly and palpably. The chill of a new cold war affects us all. Détente is being eroded as all of us watch helplessly. Armament budgets of the leading industrialized nations spiral upwards, unchecked, inducing effects elsewhere. New generations of nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons are being developed and deployed; they are more lethal and accurate, with shorter flight time. Even as a convention to prohibit chemical weapons is being negotiated, we are told that deadlier gas weapons are to be produced and deployed. Sophisticated arms are flowing into certain countries and regions, their types

and quantities bearing no relation to the legitimate defence needs of the nations concerned. New facilities and forces are being created within the developing world which are calculated to enable ever more rapid intervention by the mighty.

198. An enormous sense of insecurity and uncertainty oppresses the people of the world in both the industrialized and the developing countries. The question today is, shall we allow the nuclear weapon to be the destroyer of the world? This is not an academic question. The number of false alarms that have resulted in nuclear forces being placed on stepped-up alert clearly indicates the risks involved and warns mankind that, whatever the degree of sophistication attained in safeguard systems, the man-machine combination will not remain fail-safe for all time to come.

199. It is beyond dispute that existing nuclear arsenals can destroy the world many times over. There is now a wider awareness of the high probability of any use of nuclear weapons getting totally out of hand, and military strategists are almost unanimous in conceding that it will become impossible to maintain any effective command and control over a nuclear-weapons exchange within minutes of its commencement. Outstanding military commanders, scientists and policy makers, including many who had earlier propounded these concepts, have now challenged the very notion that a nuclear war can be fought and won. Theories dealing with nuclear war, such as those concerning limited nuclear war and war in outer space, are fantasies, but they are capable of leading to the reality of all-out nuclear war.

200. Nuclear weapons are not like other weapons, the use of which could be related to a definable or achievable objective, however much one may detest or disagree with that objective, for it is obvious that no objective or interest on our earth could possibly be secured if, in the process, the destruction of the globe itself were involved. For three decades now, the world has been beguiled and conditioned to believe that nuclear weapons have helped preserve peace through deterrence and were not meant to be used. This has produced a strange paradox. If everyone comes to believe that nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction are not meant for use, these weapons will at once lose their deterrent power as the currency of terror. Perhaps realizing this, nuclear theology has had to come up with doctrines of counterforce, limited nuclear war and the linkage thesis. History teaches us that military and political strategies of so-called deterrence are often overtaken by weapon technologies and their actual use in war. Given that the time needed for complete nuclear annihilation of the globe would be barely an hour or two, most of these doctrines fall into the category of esoteric and grim scenarios of a nuclear cult totally unrelated to the real world.

201. It is unfortunate that a number of States have sought to promote what they consider their own security, and the security of their allies and friends, by trying to invest nuclear weapons with special virtues or a new respectability, while paying lip service to the objective of nuclear disarmament. Theories of nuclear deterrence block the way of the essential priority objective of nuclear disarmament. It has been claimed that nuclear weapons have helped to maintain world

peace since 1945 and that the European continent has remained peaceful owing to the presence of nuclear weapons on both sides of the divide in such numbers and types that an approximate balance, parity or rough equivalence has been established. This logic, in addition to being basically flawed, is also macabre. It implies that peace should forever remain hostage to nuclear weapons and that the perceived security of some nations is to be equated with peace in the whole world. The United Nations study on nuclear weapons⁶ emphasizes, and rightly, the unacceptability of establishing a world system consisting of the two distinct categories of nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States. Such a system, it says, would always carry within itself the possibility of proliferation, both of nuclear weapons and nuclear-weapon States and, in the long run, the seeds of its own destruction.

202. Nuclear war doctrines are in essence doctrines of terrorism practiced by nation-States. They are based on subjecting the populations of entire countries to the terror of obliteration. If nation-States practice terrorism in their international dealings, can this fail to have a deep and unwholesome impact on individuals and societies? If the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, is, in effect, thrown overboard in the context of nuclear-war doctrine, would not other solemn international treaties and conventions in the field of disarmament also suffer the same fate?

203. The basic fact is that the struggle for disarmament in the nuclear age cannot be waged on the basis of concepts belonging to a pre-nuclear age. Before the advent of nuclear weapons, disarmament was a question hinging on a balanced limitation or reduction of arms. In the nuclear age, this is obviously no longer valid, since what is at stake here is the very survival of mankind.

204. It is pertinent to remind ourselves that the Charter of the United Nations was drawn up when the world was not yet aware of the real potential and significance of nuclear weapons. Hiroshima and Nagasaki showed the catastrophic effects of the use of nuclear weapons, and the first resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its very first session drew attention to the grave danger of nuclear weapons and the imperative need for nuclear disarmament. For years, the international community groped for a new concept of disarmament which would make sense in the nuclear age. Such thinking eventually crystallized in the historic resolution 1378 (XIV) of 20 November 1959, when the General Assembly unanimously declared that the goal of disarmament efforts in this nuclear age could be none other than the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. This means that disarmament has to be general—that is, to cover all countries; that it has to be complete—that is, to apply to all weapons systems and, lastly, that this general and complete disarmament has to be implemented under strict and effective international control.

Mr. Martynenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Vice-President, took the Chair.

205. In spite of this most significant, unequivocal and unanimous affirmation by the international community,

the arms race has only gathered greater momentum, and the sense of insecurity of the world has grown enormously. The preponderant number of armed conflicts waged in the 37 years since the Second World War have taken place in the developing world and have generally been the result of great-Power involvement, direct or indirect. We are deeply distressed that even as we meet here now wars are raging in Lebanon, in the South Atlantic and between Iraq and Iran. Insecurity today oppresses more and more non-aligned countries as local conflicts in the developing world become increasingly structured into great-Power designs.

206. This sense of insecurity is not restricted to the developing world alone. In the developed countries too, no Government or individual can now feel free of great anxiety and fear because of the possible outbreak of a nuclear war, since such a war would engulf all States. The recent spontaneous and mammoth demonstrations and the increasingly popular movements, most of them free from political or party motivation, opposing all nuclear weapons *per se* bear testimony to the newly awakened realization in those countries that the so-called stability of deterrence cannot be depended upon. This realization represents a crucial change in old beliefs and is by itself becoming a powerful force in the struggle for disarmament.

207. The first and most urgent step in the efforts to root out the menace of nuclear weapons is to agree immediately upon the total prohibition of their use. While there is the Geneva Protocol of 1925 prohibiting the use of both chemical and biological weapons, and while there are ongoing negotiations to prohibit, *inter alia*, the use of radiological weapons, it is strange that banning the use of nuclear weapons has not been seriously considered so far. However, at the initiative of the non-aligned countries, including India, the General Assembly has repeatedly declared the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons a violation of the Charter and a crime against humanity. It is gratifying that this proposition has already been accepted by two of the five nuclear-weapon States. What is now required is an internationally binding treaty or convention which would give concrete form to this commitment on the model of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, which prohibits the use in war of biological and chemical weapons and which has indeed been adhered to by all the great Powers and the overwhelming majority of other States. Convinced that the opportunity provided by the second special session on disarmament should be utilized for proposing similar concrete measures in the field of disarmament, India is separately proposing a draft convention seeking to prohibit the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We commend it for urgent and serious consideration by all States.

208. The prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons will provide an indispensable basis for further concrete measures towards nuclear disarmament. In the pursuit of nuclear disarmament it would be unrealistic to look for absolute parity or total agreement on the existence of parity in the destructive capabilities of the two major nuclear arsenals. Various declaratory statements and proposals for cuts, freezes and control measures have been put forward. These have been met by counter-proposals, at least partly

meant to neutralize one another and retain the propaganda advantage. This has by now become a continuing dialogue and is changing so rapidly in substance that it is impossible to make any value judgements. Thus, while the dialogue may continue, it is evident that the first step should be to freeze the present nuclear arsenals and not to add to them. Any attempt by one side to redress a perceived imbalance would generate a corresponding reaction from the other side, thus initiating a further upward spiral in the nuclear arms race. The logic of a freeze, therefore, is unassailable as an earnest of subsequent cuts.

209. Early this year, in its communication to the Secretary-General, India proposed the concept of a freeze on nuclear weapons. This proposal provided for a complete stoppage of any further production of such weapons, combined with a complete cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. These combined measures would mean that no more nuclear weapons would then be produced anywhere in the world and that nuclear facilities everywhere, whether in nuclear-weapon States or non-nuclear-weapon States, would become peaceful and stay peaceful for all time. An identical system of international safeguards—be they called full-scope safeguards or complete fuel-cycle safeguards—could thereafter be accepted by the nuclear-weapon States themselves for the simple reason that there would no longer be any pretext, excuse or ground for them to refuse international safeguards on their own facilities. The freeze would need to be immediately followed by a reduction in existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons and would thus constitute the first concrete step in an integrated approach to nuclear disarmament.

210. It is also our strong belief that in addition to such a freeze, steps should be taken for an immediate suspension of all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments by all nuclear-weapon States pending a comprehensive test ban. The demand for a comprehensive test-ban treaty dates back over two decades and springs from two underlying objectives—first, to prevent the radioactive pollution of the human environment, and secondly, to slow down the nuclear-arms race, since testing would not be available for developing new designs or for the regeneration of existing weapon stocks. For the comprehensive test-ban treaty to be truly comprehensive it would also have to take into account the effect of newer isotope separation technologies on weapons production and development.

211. In the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly references are made to nuclear-weapon-free zones and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The Government of India believes that the nuclear-weapon-free-zone idea has become unrealistic. Even in Latin America it has not been accepted without reservations by some countries of the region and by the nuclear-weapon States. With Israel and South Africa generally believed to be in possession of nuclear weapons, it is equally unrealistic to envisage nuclear-weapon-free zones in West Asia and Africa. For how can the existence of clandestine nuclear arsenals be reconciled with the nuclear-weapon-free-zone concept? In any event, the movement and deployment of nuclear weapons in various regions of the world by the nuclear-weapon States are fundamentally irreconcilable with the very

idea of nuclear-weapon-free zones. These are the concrete and practical aspects to be borne in mind. But even more important is the question of principle. We cannot subscribe to the legitimization of the possession of nuclear weapons by a few Powers by agreeing to live under their professedly benign protection in the guise of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Peace is indivisible; so is nuclear disarmament. It cannot be piecemeal in terms of geographical extent. India therefore believes that the whole world should be free of nuclear weapons.

212. The General Assembly, as the conscience of the international community, has laid down that the highest priority in the field of disarmament should be accorded to nuclear disarmament and to the elimination of all kinds of weapons of mass destruction, be they biological, chemical, radiological or of any other kind. Despite this, efforts have been made and are still being made in certain quarters to distort these priorities and to shift the focus from nuclear weapons to conventional weapons. The spurious reasoning advanced in this connexion is that it does not matter to a man whether he is killed by a nuclear weapon or a conventional weapon since he is dead in either case.

213. This basically flawed approach has been used, first, to suggest that nuclear and conventional disarmament be given the same importance and, secondly, to suggest that instead of a global approach, which alone is relevant to the fundamental objectives of the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, there should be a regional approach. There is also an attempt to create further confusion by over-emphasizing questions such as confidence-building measures, studies in verification techniques and new institutional arrangements in disarmament. I would like to state categorically that, while every item could be assigned its legitimate place, any attempt to tamper with accepted priorities, on any pretext or argument, should be promptly rejected. It is absurd to suggest that while nuclear stockpiles keep on mounting mankind has first to think of banning rifles and machine-guns on the plea that these also cause death. The accepted priority and emphasis on nuclear disarmament must, therefore, never be allowed to be diluted, eroded or whittled away.

214. It is India's conviction, therefore, that the focus of disarmament must be clearly directed on nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. This is not to say that an ever-spiralling arms race in so-called conventional weapons and the increasing sophistication of these weapons systems are not matters for concern. General and complete disarmament encompasses the eventual elimination of all weapons of war. This is our goal. However, as the Final Document recognizes, the priorities must be nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction, conventional weapons and reduction of armed forces.

215. It is a bizarre game which the world is witnessing today in the name of disarmament. The effort is, in fact, to move towards more armaments rather than less. The expression "arms control", which is current usage in certain quarters, carries the unacceptable implications of control without disarmament and the concept of a giver group of countries gaining

the permanent capacity, or *locus standi*, to control all other countries in the matter of possessing arms. This is further illustrated by the exclusive use of the expression "arms limitation" in the context of the great Powers, which obviously differs from arms control. This is not merely a matter of semantics, but quite clearly a matter of substance. One wonders, then, whether the game of disarmament in the nuclear age is, *inter alia*, an effort by the great Powers to control smaller countries—shall we say one of the modern versions of colonialism and imperialism?

216. In the same manner, all too often the focus has been on horizontal proliferation, as if to suggest that nuclear weapons in the possession of certain chosen States are somehow permissible or safe but that they should not be allowed to fall into the hands of others. Ever since 1964 India has stressed that all proliferation of nuclear weapons, be it horizontal or vertical, must be stopped simultaneously within the framework of the same international instrument. Everyone accepts that ever since 1945 the continuing proliferation of nuclear weapons has been primarily due to the fact that vertical proliferation by the then-existing nuclear-weapon States has not yet been stopped, checked or inhibited. The concept of non-proliferation is rooted in the history of disarmament. This history has demonstrated that efforts to restrain the emergence of a larger number of nuclear-weapon Powers will succeed only if the existing nuclear-weapon Powers themselves accept the same discipline as they demand of others. To us this is a matter of principle. Unfortunately, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, as it emerged, was based on the faulty notion of checking horizontal proliferation alone, without placing simultaneous and equal curbs on the existing nuclear-weapon States. Under article VI of the Treaty the nuclear-weapon States had an obligation to reduce their nuclear arsenals. This obligation has been treated by the nuclear-weapon States as non-binding and merely a hortatory or good-faith declaration. In fact, their arsenals have more than doubled and now threaten to proliferate at a still faster pace. This has been the main reason why the Non-Proliferation Treaty has proved to be such a fragile instrument. The disillusionment among the signatories is all too evident.

217. Then there is the spatial dimension. As the nuclear-weapon States deploy more and more weapons around larger areas of the world, the sense of insecurity of non-nuclear nations correspondingly increases. Deployment of nuclear-weapon carriers in bases and areas such as the Indian Ocean cannot but have grave implications for the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States of the region.

218. The recently announced resumption of strategic arms limitation and reduction talks between the Soviet Union and the United States is a welcome development. However, it is essential that the scope of these talks be enlarged to cover all nuclear-weapons systems. Moreover, a commitment by the United States and the Soviet Union to abide by the treaties already entered into could open up prospects for more comprehensive efforts leading to nuclear disarmament and the relaxation of international tensions.

219. Let me now turn to another major issue: the relationship between disarmament and development. Much has already been said about this, and I do not

want to repeat the statistics already available and known regarding the extent to which development and welfare activities can be supported by channelling resources away from armaments. The hard facts, telling as they are, have been reiterated time and again; yet the impact, I am afraid, has regrettably been negligible. The vested interests, whose purpose it is to produce weapons of mass destruction, as it is also of some of the Governments which help to sustain them, evidently could not care less about the immense cost of what they are engaged in.

220. The study by the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development reiterates the basic fact that the arms race and development are in a competitive relationship, particularly in terms of scarce resources and in the vital dimension of correct attitudes and perceptions. The arms race has complicated the process of stabilizing the international monetary system, aggravated the balance-of-payments problems and distorted the desired evolution of healthy international exchange in a period of growing economic interdependence. On the other hand, the catalytic effects of arms limitation and disarmament are bound to broaden the base of détente and lead to the channelling of some of the released resources for the benefit of the developing countries.

221. The study highlights the negative impact of military expenditure on capital formation and employment. In regard to inflation, the study finds that expanded military production leading to increased demand for various inputs tends to create shortages, particularly in situations of inelastic supply, and exerts an upward pressure on the general price level by pushing up costs of production. This is corroborated by historical experience. Since the military sector is highly capital intensive, it is estimated that, on an average, two working places could be created in the civil sector of the economy in lieu of each one in the military sector.

222. Discussing global interdependence, the study urges that it is in the overall self-interest of all the major groups in the world to bridge the existing economic and political divisions. Conversely, if each of the major groups, either by choice or through lack of choice, endeavours to pursue growth and development with minimum interaction with the others, the outcome will be distinctly second best for all. The attitudes and perceptions underlying the arms race emanate from North-South as well as East-West interactions; hence they stand in the way of global economic development. We in the developing world are fully convinced that our own continuing development is symbiotically related to the sustained development of the industrialized part of the world, hence our interests and our stake in policies pursued in the industrialized world which would sustain its growth and increase international trade, transfer of technology and financial flows.

223. The industrialized world is apprehensive about the withholding of scarce raw materials and sources of energy. If only they would divert their research and development efforts from defence even partially, some of these problems would not remain as intractable as they appear today. Sustained development of the North has to be tied to the accelerated development of the South. International relations must not be

pursued in terms of conflict and competition or of gaining supremacy in nuclear strategic arsenals or conventional capability. The co-operative approach alone, as envisaged in the new international economic order, more particularly by the non-aligned movement, can provide long-term answers and solutions. It certainly merits serious consideration by all States.

224. The Final Document makes a reference to the need for reducing military budgets, strengthening peace and security at a lower level of forces and limiting the flow of conventional weapons. These are desirable objectives to which nobody can take exception. We support all of them. However, if the arms race is to be stopped and reversed, it must be addressed on a global basis and from that end of the spectrum where it is most intense and sophisticated, and a beginning must be made with the nuclear-arms race.

225. Common people everywhere have grasped this simple but fundamental truth. It is the Governments which have been unwilling or unable to face it. Mobilization of world public opinion in this context has been an important factor in disarmament efforts. We commend, therefore, the idea of the World Disarmament Campaign. As a token of our support for it and in response to the statement made by the President of the General Assembly, I am pleased to announce that India will contribute 1 million rupees to the Campaign.

226. My Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, was keenly looking forward to participating personally in this special session. Since she has been unable to do so, she has asked me to convey a personal message from her to this gathering. With your permission, I shall now read out Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's message:

"I wanted to participate in this second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, for I have long held strong views on this vital subject. My voice is raised in the cause of peace.

"Men and women have put up with inequality and injustice, submitted to exploitation and tolerated the disintegration of their environment. They have even gone to war, displaying courage, fortitude and gallantry of a high order. All this and more they have endured. There has been protest, resistance, even revolution in one part or another. But never has a feeling so deeply affected people, across divisions of class, political ideology and even of international frontiers. It may not yet encompass the whole of the human race, but its numbers are increasing. Those who pause to think cannot but be acutely aware that inhumanity is the result of decisions and actions of humans themselves. Never before has humankind as a whole faced the possibility of its destruction by the weapons that some States claim to need for their security. The danger of nuclear war is inherent in the very dynamics of the arms race and what is known as deterrence. It is said that cities are targeted for nuclear attack because that is regarded as the ultimate form of deterrence. The total accumulation of destructive radioactive power is more than enough to eliminate all forms of life several times over. This new barbarism—nuclear war—entails the destruction not only of warring countries, but also of the peoples of the non-aligned and neutral ones.

“The situation today is far more critical and the need for action more compelling than in 1978. How can this session follow up the declaration of the first session? I venture to propose the following concrete programmes of action: first, the session should negotiate a binding convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons; secondly, as a first step towards the eventual cutting of existing stockpiles, there must be a freeze on nuclear weapons, providing for the total stoppage of any further production of nuclear weapons, combined with a cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes; thirdly, there must be immediate suspension of all nuclear-weapon tests; fourthly, towards this objective, disarmament negotiations must once again revert to the task of achieving a treaty on general and complete disarmament within an agreed time-frame, as was discussed between the United States and the Soviet Union in the agreed principles and draft treaties of the early 1960s, for although the problems involved have become far more complex, the basic approach and the principles then formulated could still provide a basis for meaningful negotiations; and fifthly, the United Nations and its specialized agencies should take the lead in educating the public on the dangers of nuclear war and the harmful effects of the arms race on the world economy, as well as the positive aspects of disarmament and its link with development.

“This conference might also consider issuing a call to devise legally binding restrictions on various types of scientific and technological research for purposes that are inconsistent with humanitarian laws and principles. The Secretary-General might be requested to undertake an independent expert study to that end.

“We urge the great Powers to start negotiations with determination to reach agreement. The prospects of an early accord may seem discouraging from the particular point of view of one side or the other. But the path to peace and security cannot and does not lie through an arms race or theories of deterrence. Intricate calculations of security and insecurity merely generate irrational fear and suspicion in policy-makers and in the public at large. On behalf of the growing world community which is calling for peace, I appeal to leaders of all nuclear-weapon Powers and their allies to help pull the world back from the precipice. Let us all co-operate to save humanity. In a war, the dominant thought is to win. Can we do less for peace?”

227. Mr. NZE (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): If there is any subject which encompasses the full drama of the human condition, it is the possible destruction of our species in what individuals conceive of as a nuclear holocaust.

228. To reverse the present direction of the arms race and bring about a situation in which the security of every nation is guaranteed with minimal military equipment is the ultimate goal of properly understood and implemented disarmament, in the name of the best of political morality and with the greatest respect for human life.

229. But what a vast programme that is. It would be absurd, however, to be rendered immobile by the dimensions of this Utopia that goes by the name of “general and complete disarmament”. For there is no alternative, and it will be too late if we wait to see the shimmering fires of the apocalypse on the horizon before we come to our senses.

230. The very convening of the second special session on disarmament proves that the moral and political resources of men and women today are not lacking and that they must be mobilized to fulfil the necessary, indeed imperative, task of disarmament, or at least to get things started.

231. The negative balance sheet drawn up by the Preparatory Committee, of which the Congo was a member, established that practically nothing that had been laid down in the Programme of Action at the first special session on disarmament had been accomplished. That is certainly a cause for bitterness. But we must draw on that bitterness and pessimism and find the indispensable energy and will to translate into concrete acts what international public opinion so ardently and unanimously desires: peace through disarmament and not through over-armament.

232. We appreciate that the President's responsibilities in this connexion are heavy, since he is presiding over the adoption of important decisions that will determine the survival and the credibility not only of all our institutions and our work, but also of the whole of civilization, all civilizations. We have seen him assume very important duties since the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly. We know therefore that he is capable of living up to our expectations at the second special session on disarmament. He is a statesman and a great servant of the ideals of the international community; he is also a great-hearted man who knows the price of peace. He is the best man to guide the work of the present session.

233. We also take this opportunity to extend to the Secretary-General, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, our congratulations and appreciation for the abilities he has already demonstrated during the short time since he took up his duties last January. In a world in a state of upheaval such as that in which we live the qualities of a man of his ability will be of great benefit to the United Nations and its various activities in the interest of peace.

234. The plight of the present generation, a generation of science and progress if ever there was one, is reflected in a few self-explanatory figures. From \$300 billion in 1978, arms expenditures have doubled, reaching \$600 billion in 1981. Consequently, every human being now has three tonnes of explosives for his involuntary suicide.

235. What are we to make of the activities of more than 500,000 scholars or scientists throughout the world who are working not for peace, progress and development, but simply in arms research activities?

236. This is a cruel irony for the 1980s, which was proclaimed the Second Disarmament Decade by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/46 and which already shows all the signs of an unprecedented frenzy of activity in the field of armaments.

237. As we mentioned at the beginning of this statement, the Declaration and the Programme of Action of the tenth special session have remained hopelessly ineffective. Indeed, more than 200 nuclear-weapon tests have been carried out since 1978, whereas we might have expected that they would be banned or at least decreased in number.

238. As the arsenals of all kinds of nuclear and conventional weapons have grown, the sophistication and development of new lethal weapons have been publicly encouraged and have been pushed to ever higher degrees of refinement. Thus it was that a programme was launched to manufacture the neutron bomb, the so-called N bomb, which is now at the summit of the deadly hierarchy which formerly consisted of the A and H bombs.

239. We are deeply dismayed too by the prospect of another chemical weapons race. With regard to conventional weapons, the hope that might have been raised by the adoption in 1980 of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects has been undermined by two obvious facts. On the one hand conventional weapons have been used repeatedly since the end of the Second World War in more than 100 conflicts, causing growing numbers of victims; on the other hand those weapons unfortunately account to a very large extent for the increase in the military budgets of the developing countries, to which ever-increasing amounts of all kinds of equipment, from planes and missiles to ships and other delivery vehicles, not to mention munitions, are sold.

240. As a developing country we deplore these facts for at least two reasons. The first is that this perpetuates and even increases tensions and situations of insecurity throughout the world. The second is the criminal waste arising from the diversion of \$600 billion each year from financial and other resources that could have been devoted to activities in the interest of peace and development.

241. With regard to situations of tension, of which there have been so many over the last few years, there has been an unprecedented increase in the factors which give rise to them. Thus we have seen the search for zones of influence which affect what some call their "vital interests", even when those so-called interests are in sovereign countries or demilitarized zones. The consequence is, for example, an accelerated militarization of certain parts of the world that until that time had been spared the presence of nuclear weapons. This is true of the Indian Ocean, where such imposing bases and forces have been installed that they are even preventing the holding of the international conference that has been so long planned and so constantly postponed.

242. The war in the Malvinas Islands has also led to the presence of British submarines carrying nuclear warheads, in contravention of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).

243. The danger of increased militarization of the South Atlantic is particularly acute because the racist régime of South Africa has for a long time represented a nuclear threat to the African continent, although

this nuclear threat violates the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at Cairo in 1964. That Declaration was approved by the United Nations, but it has not been respected. Thus we see the great violence that an oppressive régime such as that of racist South Africa can unleash. In the same way, all situations characterized by colonialism and contempt for the right of peoples to self-determination, all interference in the internal affairs of other States and all aggression against and violation of the territorial integrity of other States constitute the root cause of a war or conflict psychosis which certainly does not help the cause of peace and of disarmament.

244. Unfortunately the world has witnessed and continues to witness all these anomalies, which have led to over-armament by some and desperate efforts by others not to be left behind.

245. As for the major Powers, distrust has become antagonism, which has eclipsed the notion of détente as an objective of international strategy and transformed dialogue and negotiation into confrontation. It now seems that negotiations can be considered only if the protagonists are in a strong position. Deterrence and the possibility of a limited nuclear war are finding more than a few supporters.

246. As a result such very important negotiations as SALT have been suspended, important agreements such as the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, signed at Helsinki in 1975, have not been followed up and other bilateral or multilateral negotiations have remained hopelessly ineffective.

247. It is hardly possible, at a special session such as this, not to recall the impact, of which we are all so well aware, of the arms race on economic and social development. To repeat a statement made by the Congolese delegation at the most recent regular session of the General Assembly, a little more than \$20 billion taken from the \$600 billion spent annually on preparations for war would suffice to resolve a whole host of problems in the fields of health, education, nutrition and agricultural development throughout the world.

248. Need I recall how difficult it is nowadays to arrange financing for the transfer of technology or for the exploitation of the resources of the sea, in spite of the recently adopted United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.⁷

249. Scientific research solely for peace, and not for military purposes, is now considered almost a Utopian dream.

250. Yet it must be stressed that all peoples of the world have a right to enjoy the benefits of science, the applications of which should be devoted first and foremost to their elementary needs. Nor should the peaceful uses of nuclear energy itself for the benefit of the greatest number of people be excluded.

251. In this context it is frightening to contemplate the growing militarization of outer space. Satellites should be considered primarily and exclusively as being among the most effective instruments for exploring the resources of our planet.

252. The peoples of the entire world are profoundly devoted to peace; they all want to live in a world in which they can develop and enjoy well-being. Never has this hunger for peace reached such proportions as it has in the past two years. The pacifist and anti-militarist demonstrations which take place throughout the world are the most striking testimony to this, and they convey a serious message which we cannot ignore.

253. Yet it is a regrettable fact that this desire for peace has been accompanied by an unbridled escalation in the arms buildup and in an evil desire to dominate others. Some among the most industrialized countries still think the world belongs to them, and they have assumed the right to control what happens in other countries and what those countries may possess. This attitude of intolerance, scorn and denial of the rights of other peoples bears within it the seeds of tension and widespread violence; it creates conflict; it feeds on war and confrontation.

254. It is our conviction that it should be possible for the international community to put an end to such a flagrant contradiction and to lead mankind to peaceful coexistence of systems, races and philosophies.

255. Peace is universal and comprehensive. It either exists or it does not exist. It must not be for some and not for others. Peace must benefit all the peoples of the world and must permeate all aspects of their daily lives—economic, social and cultural.

256. The advent of a new international economic order which we all so ardently desire is largely dependent on disarmament efforts and therefore on peace. We know to what extent economic questions concern the United Nations and we are familiar with the praiseworthy efforts of the world Organization to find solutions to the many problems facing our world today. We wish simply to reaffirm the devotion of the People's Republic of the Congo to the United Nations system. This Organization is still an indispensable forum in which the nations can come together and engage in dialogue—an ideal framework for efforts and actions to turn our unbalanced world into a world of peace, security and development for nations and of well-being and progress for peoples.

257. We should also like to express confidence in deliberative organs such as, on the subject that has brought us together today, the enlarged Committee on Disarmament, which has done useful work, and the Security Council, which must have greater capacity for action, throw off the burden of perpetual vetoes and impose decisions in keeping with the spirit of the Charter.

258. We are convinced that a strong Organization, in the service of all the peoples and all the nations on earth, remains, in this world that seems to be rushing headlong towards the apocalypse, an undeniable guarantee of peace, security and peaceful coexistence.

259. Mr. KAMANDA WA KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, I should like to extend to Mr. Kittani of Iraq sincere and cordial congratulations on his unanimous election to the presidency of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly, the second special session devoted to disarmament. The competence, experience and outstanding

diplomatic and human qualities which he has already shown in leading the work of the General Assembly assure us that the present deliberations will respond appropriately to the anguished desire of all the peoples of the world for progress towards disarmament.

260. May I also convey our appreciation to the Secretary-General for the penetrating analysis of the issue of disarmament which he made at the opening of our work.

261. This second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which takes place only 18 years before the advent of the twenty-first century and at a time of international upheaval, is an event of special significance for all mankind. Unless specific and constructive steps are taken, and unless the paths of the future are mapped out in a spirit of peace and mutual confidence, the very future of civilization may be compromised. Indeed, at the very time when we are gathered to speak about disarmament, in the Middle East, the South Atlantic, Africa and elsewhere we hear the noise of weapons and destruction of all kinds. We may well wonder whether the atmosphere, the context or the present international environment is really propitious for disarmament efforts.

262. Two days ago I was talking to a friend about the importance of this special General Assembly session on disarmament. He said that, in his view, this twelfth special session should have adopted the Venus de Milo as its symbol. When I asked why, he replied, "Because the Venus de Milo is superb without arms". While I presume this anecdote can be understood only in English, the fact remains that it also expresses the opinion of those who continue to believe that disarmament is designed to mutilate or handicap States.

263. What, then, is disarmament? Where and when does it begin, and when does it end? The peoples of the world should know this because, although the arms race and its opposite, the halting and reversal of that race—in other words, disarmament—are essentially the responsibility of those who are over-armed, those who manufacture a surplus of death-dealing weapons and those who profit from their sales, and the responsibility as well of those regions in which there is heavy concentration of nuclear and conventional weapons and an alarming number of troops and military arsenals—it is of concern to all peoples and to all the inhabitants of this earth, whose well-being, future and survival are threatened by the very existence of such weapons.

264. Strictly speaking, therefore, we must draw a distinction between essential responsibility for disarmament and the basic concern about disarmament. To give expression to all aspects of mankind's concern about the arms race is for the countries which do not have arms, that do not manufacture them and that are not military Powers, and all the sectors of life that are affected, a way of helping those countries which have weapons or which are engaged in the arms race to understand better the full dimensions of their disarmament responsibilities. If we fail to do this, we shall be contributing, no doubt involuntarily, to the arms race. That is why, in our

view, this debate at the second special session devoted to disarmament is a crucial one.

265. We live in a world that cultivates paradox and fosters rational, political, economic, cultural and moral ambiguity—something which surely threatens peace and promotes the arms race.

266. In the rational, political and moral spheres we are living in a world where people are arming themselves to assure their security, at the very time that they feel that general and complete disarmament under effective international control is indispensable to assure their security, to guarantee progress and development, to restore peace and re-establish mutual confidence in international relations.

267. At a time when everyone seems to agree that armaments possessed by States have assumed alarming proportions and a disturbing sophistication and that this over-arming threatens the security and survival of mankind—that is, of each and every one of us—we continue to arm to assure our security.

268. Theories of deterrence, of the balance of forces and of limited and preventive nuclear war, hegemonistic expansionism, the desire for power and supremacy, insecurity, the defence of others and of oneself—all the pretexts, all the overt and covert reasons are used to justify the arms race and the difficulty of halting or reversing that race.

269. The paradox also lies in the fact that we are so bogged down that we can no longer even usefully discuss useful ideas or essential matters, because of the struggle between closed and imperial ideologies and the machinery of rejection which we cultivate and develop with regard to the positions and arguments of others. And this goes on even here within the United Nations, which was set up precisely to help towards co-operation on a basis of confidence among nations and peoples and the dawning of a world of peace, harmony and understanding.

270. We tend during debates on essential matters to practise evasion and diversion and to talk around the subject and to reject any fact or idea, however inoffensive it might be in itself, which comes from others, as if it were illegally transmitting some enemy virus, for fear of contamination. The inability of one to acknowledge the same facts as the other, above all if we do not belong to the same political movement, seems to have become dominant in our deliberations and in international relations, something which certainly is not propitious for successful disarmament efforts.

271. Disarmament, then, has become, despite the concern of the majority of the States of the world, the ideal theatre of confrontation, speculation and propaganda for the great Powers and the military Powers.

272. Two nuclear weapons were used for the first time by one of the nations of the world in the Second World War, killing and wounding hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians in the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and their outskirts. It is estimated that at present there exist more than 50,000 nuclear weapons of that type, several times more powerful and more dangerous than those used during the Second World War. Furthermore, between then and now we

have seen the creation of the United Nations, which developed a system to maintain international peace and security based on the idea that nations would trust each other and would rely essentially on the Security Council of the United Nations to guarantee their security and maintain international peace, a system conceived bearing in mind the lessons of the most devastating war in history.

273. Today, turning their backs on the system of the maintenance of international peace and security provided for in the Charter at the end of the Second World War, certain Governments are actively engaged in the escalation of the race for arms of all kinds, which vie with each other in their sophistication and their common capacity to cause massive and indiscriminate destruction.

274. Now, when it is a matter of the survival of mankind, can we fail to conclude that those Governments pose a serious and grave threat to all humanity, particularly when they support such things as the idea of a "limited nuclear war" or "limited nuclear exchange", first-strike capability, mutual assured destruction, preventive attack, deployment of forces and warning systems?

275. Many countries of the world—developed and industrialized countries more than developing countries, but including the latter—have spent over the last 20 years and continue to spend billions of dollars on the development, testing and production of weapons, especially nuclear weapons, new and sophisticated weapons systems and launching systems.

276. It is vitally important that all the nations of the world remember the inscription in the peace park at Hiroshima, a tribute to the victims of the first nuclear weapon which says: "Rest in peace, for we will not repeat this sin". Peoples of all nations the world over, on this beautiful planet Earth which they share with other beings, are pleading for all possible action to put an end to the accumulation of armaments, especially nuclear armaments.

277. The inhibition of reason is another factor which facilitates or encourages the arms race.

278. Increasingly widespread mistrust among peoples and countries and the lack of confidence in international relations are most assuredly encouraging the arms race, to the detriment of disarmament efforts.

279. The national television, radio and press—the mass media, in a word—purvey propaganda and tendentious information. The image of a strong or powerful enemy which is presented serves to create feelings of fear and hatred and, finally, prevent rational debate. In this atmosphere fraught with brainwashing, it becomes easy to put forward or give credence to a series of outrageous concepts, such as mutual assured destruction, first-strike capability, the theory of deterrence, the indispensable balance of forces, the inevitability of the armed peace, limited and preventive nuclear war, and many others, even if we know that once war has broken out no one will be able to stop what threatens to become, for lack of combatants, a war to end all wars, as Pastor Philip Potter has said. We have cause for concern.

280. Fertile ground for a warlike mentality and the arms race is the psychopathology of mistrust, of fear,

if not of hatred, which possesses us and which inhibits our ability to make use of all our spirit and determination to promote a climate of confidence through willingness to recognize our common human condition despite our differences of race, culture and ideology and the desire to prove more open and more honest as regards the issues which divide us and the problems which compromise our security and our future.

281. Fertile ground for a warlike mentality and for the arms race is also provided by conviction, whether or not intentionally introduced into our minds, that when it comes to armaments, and above all nuclear armaments, we are powerless in the face of the arms race and as regards disarmament, especially if we do not produce arms.

282. Fertile ground for a warlike mentality and the arms race is the spirit of greed which animates arms merchants. Whereas in the northern hemisphere crowds are protesting violently, and without doubt rightly, against the constant improvement and sophistication of nuclear weapons and against the possibility of their use, it is too often forgotten in that part of the world that it is the countries of the North in particular that sell and provide weapons of destruction and death throughout the world.

283. Fertile ground for a warlike mentality and the arms race is the desire for domination, power and supremacy, through which a minority of countries wish to subjugate the overwhelming majority of the States and peoples of the world with the sole aim of protecting and consolidating the economic, political and cultural interests which they have or intend in those countries.

284. Today armed conflicts rend asunder many regions of the world, destroying the essential values of civilization. We must therefore consider during this session a comprehensive approach to disarmament and help the people of the world, men and women, children and the elderly, better to understand the essential place of the arms race in the present world crisis. There will be no disarmament without the genuine determination, reaffirmed here, to establish a more just economic order, to share material and human resources in an equitable way and to facilitate the participation of all in the life of the society.

285. Someone has rightly said that the North-South conflict is as serious as, and perhaps even more serious than, the East-West conflict, for the East-West conflict, which is a conflict of economic and political interests, will be settled, with or without weapons, mainly in the developing countries of the southern hemisphere.

286. The action of the great Powers seems to be based on the idea that the mutual fear which the State behemoths and imperial ambitions inspire in one another has in fact become the true controlling factor postponing the third world war. And if we want to attack the root of the evil in order to ensure disarmament, we should aim at eliminating that belief. For the idea underlying the efforts of the international community and the very concept of general and complete disarmament under effective international control is that States can achieve their legitimate political, economic, social and cultural objectives without war, without war-mindedness and without con-

frontation, and that it is therefore not necessary to mortgage the future of nations, peoples, generations, even of humanity itself, through excessive accumulation of sophisticated weapons. There is an even greater risk of control over those weapons escaping mankind, for mankind is going through a moral crisis.

287. The action of the imperialists seems also to be based on the notion that the potential annihilation of mankind, because it implies our own end, prevents acts of partial destruction from becoming general and that, because it generates in mankind, through the manufacture and stockpiling of ever more sophisticated weapons capable of destroying our planet several times over, the fear of total annihilation, States will refrain from any action which could lead to the employment of those weapons and will refrain from obtaining or trying to obtain such dangerous and pernicious weapons. In that way small-scale wars will not become widespread and the possibility of another world war will continue to be postponed indefinitely.

288. But States which are truly fearful and which do not want to acquire these weapons place themselves under the protection of those which do possess them, and do so because of all sorts of affinities, to ward off the possibility that a State possessing such weapons may one day use them against them, for one cannot predict nowadays with what weapons one will be attacked or the consequences of the strategic intention of the great Powers in the face of a given new or unexpected situation. This impels the military Powers increasingly to arm themselves. Thus, arming oneself for the defence of another becomes another motive, another justification for the arms race.

289. We should note that this way of thinking gives comfort to the great Powers in the arms race, which becomes almost an act of generosity in the service of mankind, a humane act aimed at protecting others, protecting the world, our planet and the human race from annihilation!

290. War has thus become a crisis when the development and proliferation of annihilation techniques have made it utterly meaningless. With the weapons we have today, it is possible that after a war there will be neither victor nor vanquished, for the world itself will have been destroyed. Everyone will lose above all the planet Earth itself. I therefore ask, over whom and over what will nuclear war triumph?

291. War will certainly not triumph, but that is not to say that human folly will not triumph—for there are suicides of peoples. Hitler would no doubt have brought the whole world down with him if he had had the weapons we have today or those which we witnessed for the first time on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. When imperial ambitions risk everything, will they or will they not hesitate to involve mankind in their ruin? Will thermonuclear annihilation, then, be the ultimate aim or the ultimate recourse?

292. Can the Hitlerite dream of world domination be pursued today through means other than those of Hitler? Can that mad dream be fulfilled without destruction? Such disturbing questions justify the recommendations in the Programme of Action adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, on disarmament, recommendations in whose implementation we placed great hopes.

293. The delegation of Zaire attaches very special importance to paragraphs 20 and 47 of the Final Document of that first special session devoted to disarmament, which state that "measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority" and that "nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization. It is essential to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons. The ultimate goal in this context is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons."

294. Today we consider it an achievement that the third world war has been postponed since 1945. But will we not have lost everything in the few years we have gained? We are thus in favour of a complete ban on nuclear-weapons testing, and we consider that States which do not possess nuclear weapons or which have solemnly undertaken not to acquire them are entitled to solemn, clear, unequivocal and effective negative guarantees from the nuclear Powers.

295. At the very moment I am speaking, there are at least eight wars in progress, making use of conventional weapons. In 1980 we noted that since 1945 there had been nearly 125 localized wars using conventional weapons which had resulted in more than 80 million deaths. Today in 1982—when the countries of the North have settled into a cold war and are vying for supremacy in weaponry, above all in nuclear weaponry—we can count more than 140 wars since 1945, all of which broke out in the third world, claiming millions of victims. This shows, if there were any need to do so, the great importance which must also be given to conventional armaments in the overall context of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

296. In the economic sphere, the efforts aimed at finding world-wide economic solutions adapted to present-day realities have shown no progress, while vast sectors of the world's population are threatened by poverty and economic disaster. The arms race and other forms of violence have levied a mounting toll on the world's resources. The international situation has not fostered the efforts of the developing countries to accelerate their growth and to restore their balance of payments in particular.

297. Paradoxically, at a time when we have all become more than ever aware of the need for the development and improvement of the world economy, present trends, if they continue, will have the effect that in 1990 more than 800 million people will be living in a state of absolute poverty. International co-operative efforts are losing ground as the system of multilateral co-operation crumbles. At a time when military expenditures are swallowing up ever-vaster resources—without, in the final analysis, strengthening international security—countries have greater and greater difficulty in allocating the needed resources to meet urgent economic and social needs; they are facing slow growth, growing inflation, unstable monetary values, agonizing unemployment and an overall weakening of their economies.

298. Development assistance, an important contribution to international stability, is marking time. For lack of consistent international dialogue and the

necessary impetus, the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade is marking time. Voluntary resources, the need for which is nevertheless felt by all in order to encourage the vital role of international organizations so as to achieve the objectives of the International Development Strategy, are woefully insufficient.

299. Global negotiations, the principle of which was adopted by the General Assembly in 1979 [*resolution 34/138*] as a major contribution to the restructuring of international economic relations and to the establishment of a new international economic order, have still not been launched for lack of the necessary political will on the part of the developed countries. Half of the world's population is suffering from malnutrition, poverty, immense economic and social difficulties and other miseries which are not justified by the existence of enormous resources in the world which might have been used to avoid those scourges.

300. Extravagant expenditures on nuclear weapons have thus caused serious delays in carrying out programmes of economic, social, educational, health, hygiene and environmental development designed to achieve and consolidate the general well-being of peoples.

301. The environment which supports and nurtures us and future generations is deteriorating from day to day, to the point where it no longer sustains human and other forms of life, because of the use of and experimentation with arms of all types and, above all, nuclear weapons.

302. In 1980, expenditures for armaments rose to \$500 billion, that is 10 per cent more than in 1979. Today, as we have heard many times, those expenditures have risen to \$600 billion for all the countries of the world, that is, almost double the amount spent in 1970.

303. Arms expenditures by the militarily important States have today reached sums which are at least 30 to 50 times as great as those they allocate for aid to the developing countries. And at the same time, UNICEF is drawing our attention to the suffering of 17 million children who are going to die from malnutrition and avoidable diseases in 1982, and the ILO is drawing our attention to 115 million young people who are unemployed the world over, three quarters of whom are in the third world, while enormous resources are wasted on armaments.

304. The arms race is directly linked to relationships of power between the rich and the poor, both nationally and internationally, as well as to the violation of major stipulations of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States [*resolution 3281 (XXIX)*], that is, the violation of economic and social rights.

305. It has thus become obvious that the arms race is widening the gap which separates the developed nations from the developing countries.

306. The question which arises here is whether all States of the world, and particularly the great Powers and the nuclear Powers, which proclaim and reaffirm here their will to disarm, are really devoted to the idea of disarmament, if the countries which are prospering from the arms industry and those upon whom the

possession of the most sophisticated arms of destruction confers a pre-eminent position in international relations as well as extremely important privileges in the relationships which they have with other States, especially the developing countries, are really inclined to deprive themselves of these sources of revenue and means of growth, on the one hand, and of the enormous privileges which they enjoy, on the other hand.

307. Today, the new international economic order is still hardly more than an abstraction, while the economic future of the great majority of countries and peoples continues to suffer from widespread disorder and difficulty.

308. The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly laid the foundations for an effective approach to disarmament which cannot be considered in the absolute. Although the overwhelming majority of military expenditures is still that of the two great Power blocs, expenditures on national defence in many other countries have more than doubled in real terms during the past decade, and everything indicates that this trend will continue. All countries, whatever their size, refer to needs of legitimate security to justify their participation in the acceleration of the arms race.

309. It is thus quite clear that the arms race is the focal point of the present world crisis—a human crisis, in that it implies attacks on the physical integrity and survival of mankind and with regard to the gratuitous suffering it engenders; a moral crisis, in that it infringes a rule professed by moral codes the world over, that is, “Thou shalt not kill”; a crisis as regards the values of civilization and culture, in that it challenges the norms of conduct acknowledged by all civilized societies; a political crisis, in that it refuses change and the establishment of an order of international relations devoid of terror and governed by the force of law rather than the law of force; a legal crisis, in that it refuses to take into account the positive changes and modifications which might enrich international law—changes and modifications expressed and embodied in all the new law-making work of the United Nations since the emergence of the third world nations and which militate in favour of the restructuring and democratization of international relations; and finally, an economic and social crisis, which is manifested in evasions, hesitations and obstacles concerning the establishment of a new international economic order and the launching of global negotiations.

310. That is why the Republic of Zaire, a developing country, has always broached the question of general and complete disarmament from the standpoint of the development and progress of peoples who have yet to experience a better quality of life; from the standpoint of security which is indispensable to the organization of progress and development; and finally, from the standpoint of the necessary restoration of confidence in international relations, for a world of peace.

311. That is why we continue to believe that the twelfth special session of the General Assembly should accord special attention to studies which have been drawn up on the relationship between disarmament and development, disarmament and security, and disar-

mament and confidence-building measures in international relations.

312. We believe that those studies should enable us to bridge the gap which separates the developed and industrialized countries from the developing countries concerning the definition of development, of security, of confidence-building measures in international relations and of détente.

313. In my statement to the 20th meeting of the First Committee during the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, I spoke in detail of that difference in definition which separates the developing countries from the developed and industrialized countries in those areas.

314. It should be sufficient for me to recall here that for the countries of the northern hemisphere the problem of development seems to present itself in terms of maintaining and protecting the quality of life which they have achieved. As a result, the accumulation of military arsenals, the increase in personnel and ever more sophisticated weapons of destruction, seem not to be objectives or actions inconsistent with their concept of development. Quite the contrary, it seems that the possession of such power is likely to increase the advantages they have on the international check-board and may enable them to retain the enormous privileges they have. Blackmail here, intimidation there—who can fail to understand that the possession of such powerful means gives rise to the temptation for their possessors to use them to make the attitude of others conform to their interests?

315. For the developed and industrialized countries and, particularly, for the great Powers and the nuclear Powers, it seems that the problem of international security is seen in terms of the balance of power, the equivalence of power relationships, of the division of the world into spheres of influence so that one party does not arrogate to itself more votes than the other, for it does indeed seem that the question may be that of splitting the votes of the world! The result of this is the feverish energy they apply to knowing at every moment, in as precise a fashion as possible, the volume, quality and level of armaments, of personnel and of arsenals of the other. If it appears that one party has an additional nuclear delivery vehicle, a new type of fighter or transport aircraft, an additional aircraft carrier or new submarine, a new type of radiological, bacteriological or chemical weapon or one more nuclear bomb, the other side immediately feels that its security is threatened and, in the name of the balance of power, it launches into a new arms race, and so the process continues.

316. On the one hand, these countries are shadowed by a spirit of competition and military or nuclear confrontation which is incompatible with the spirit of disarmament; on the other hand, they identify their own security too easily with international security.

317. For the industrialized countries, and above all for the great Powers and the nuclear Powers, measures that might build or increase confidence in the world are solely if not essentially military in nature. And in this context, détente as it applies to these countries appears increasingly to be a *modus vivendi* which enables the great countries of the world to pursue their objectives of supremacy and hegemony the world over

without worrying each other. But it is this idea of détente that in fact constitutes the true threat to international peace and security and maintains the climate of mistrust and the threat to international peace and security, for it is sufficient proof that the great Powers have not abandoned their plans for world supremacy.

318. The return to the cold war has had the effect of escalating the arms race, even though the protagonists are careful, as I have already said, to restore balance in the relationships or to re-establish the balance of power in the world.

319. The implementation of the recommendations and decisions contained in the Final Document has been slow, just as the countries most concerned have shown real hesitation to disarm.

320. The idea that we should like to see developed among all the States of the world in order to maintain our efforts at general and complete disarmament is that States can achieve all their political, economic, social and cultural objectives outside of or without an arms race and the spirit of military or nuclear competition. Unfortunately it seems that some States Members of the United Nations are not sufficiently aware of that idea.

321. So here as elsewhere we fear that nothing concrete or substantial will come about as long as the great Powers and the countries that produce armaments, and above all nuclear arms, are not really politically determined to contribute to the halting and reversing of the arms race.

322. At this session the General Assembly should deal constructively with the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in the world and advocate concrete and effective measures to deal with South Africa's nuclear capability and its nuclear installations, which it refuses to submit to the control of IAEA or any international control. South Africa's nuclear capability and the support it enjoys in this regard completely negate the determination of the peoples of our continent to make Africa a zone free of nuclear armaments. It is high time to proclaim our determination to see to it that the air, the earth, water and outer space, which we are duty-bound to protect and care for, are not used for developing, experimenting on, producing, transporting, stockpiling or deploying nuclear weapons or other weapons of destruction.

323. Indeed, the ideal thing would be to declare nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace not for a particular nation or a particular region but for the whole world, the whole planet. That, we feel, is the message of the concept of disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, and all the disarmament decades proclaimed by the United Nations. We should, then, not help other nations to take part in an exercise that gravely compromises the interests of all mankind.

324. As long ago as towards the end of the last century, international conventions were adopted asserting that the rights of belligerents in choosing means of harming the enemy are not unlimited. Experience has proven, especially during the course of the two world wars, that those rights have been exercised in an absolutely unlimited and indiscriminate fashion because of the progress of science and technology in perfecting means of destruction.

325. In convening at Geneva the first international conference on disarmament, the League of Nations more than 50 years ago pursued two basic ideas: first, that armed peace is not a guarantee against war; and secondly, that the arms race, as a source of fear, mistrust and mutual suspicion, paralyses the will for peace.

326. It can be stated that it was the failure of that first international conference on disarmament that enabled Hitler to arm Germany and unleash a war of revenge for the German defeat in 1918. It has also been proven that often an armed peace lasts only long enough for the party that has lost to catch its breath, rearm and resume war.

327. What is in store for us if the efforts of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament fail? In its Preamble and its Article 55 the Charter of the United Nations speaks of saving "succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind" and creating "conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations".

328. The philosophy of the Final Document revolves around the idea that: first, the accumulation of armaments is not a guarantee of the security of mankind but is a threat to its future and to the survival of civilization; secondly, instead of serving the objectives for which they are supposed to have been conceived, armaments create new dangers for those objectives; thirdly, a new war could open up into nuclear conflict, and a nuclear war could put an end to human civilization and the very survival of mankind.

329. Thus we should undertake general and complete disarmament and halt and reverse the arms race—that is, we should undertake to reduce troops and armaments until we reach a point at which no State has more than is necessary to maintain order in its own territory and, if need be, to contribute to United Nations forces for the maintenance of peace and security; we should remove the resources necessary to wage war and devote them to well-being and development and to the struggle against poverty and misery the world over.

330. To desire disarmament—and we all desire it—and to speak of disarmament—and we all do speak of it—is to desire a world of peace free of war, insecurity, mistrust and poverty, and to deal consistently with the causes and factors which encourage if not facilitate the arms race.

331. We have stated repeatedly that international conflicts can be resolved by peaceful means through the co-operation of sovereign States, through exchanges of their assessments and experience, through communication and negotiation. We have stated repeatedly that States and peoples the world over can achieve all their legitimate political, economic, social and cultural objectives without an arms race.

332. That is why this twelfth special session of the General Assembly should be able to stress the need for educating mankind in the spirit of peace and to emphasize disarmament education in order to develop the perception of the existing relations among disarmament, peace, security, development and social progress; to promote education permeated with con-

cepts of international peace, understanding and co-operation; to promote the diffusion of the ideals of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other relevant documents on which international co-operation is founded; to eradicate the war propaganda, the idea of a possible enemy, militarism and all hostility towards other nations and to disclose and denounce the causes of the tension, crises and problems which characterize the present international situation; to promote understanding of the origins of the arms race, the manufacture and acquisition of arms, the reasons for the profits which are behind the growth of military budgets and their consequences for societies, and set out the possibilities for development and social progress.

333. It is for the same reasons that this special session should give priority attention to the adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament based on the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the work done by the Committee on Disarmament and the material prepared by the Disarmament Commission.

334. We feel that the correlation between the new international economic order and the comprehensive programme of disarmament should be emphasized. Thus, "to disarm" will no longer be a verb which is conjugated only in the second and third persons but which will be conjugated in the first person as well.

335. In conclusion, I should like to recall General Assembly resolution 290 (IV), concerning essentials of peace, which declares that

"the Charter of the United Nations, the most solemn pact of peace in history, lays down basic principles necessary for an enduring peace; that disregard of these principles is primarily responsible for the continuance of international tension; and that it is urgently necessary for all Members to act in accordance with these principles in the spirit of co-operation on which the United Nations was founded".

336. That the arms race is incompatible with this principle is beyond the shadow of a doubt.

337. Ms. GONTHIER (Seychelles): Four years ago, at the end of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Assembly adopted by consensus a Declaration which opened with the following sentence: "Mankind today is confronted with an unprecedented threat of self-extinction arising from the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced." [*Resolution 5-10/2, para. 11.*]

338. Since then, this threat may not have increased fourfold, but it has definitely not decreased and, indeed, the arms build-up has continued unimpeded by the Programme of Action adopted by the first special session on disarmament with a view to halting and reversing the arms race and to giving the necessary impetus to efforts designed to achieve genuine disarmament leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Since the adoption of this Programme of Action, the First Disarmament Decade, solemnly declared in 1969 by the Organization, has come to an end, and we are currently in the Second Disarmament Decade, declared

in 1980. How many more such decades will be required before the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control is attained? At the current pace, prospects for the attainment of such a goal do seem bleak indeed.

339. It is a sad plight for mankind that today, despite all efforts to curb spending on armaments, world military expenditure is at present well over \$600 billion a year and is still increasing. Official development aid, we know, accounts for less than 5 per cent of this figure. Undeniably, arms mean violence. However, the greatest violence in the world, as President René pointed out to the Seychellois nation recently, is hunger, poverty, sickness, ignorance and injustice. All these ills of two thirds of mankind are perpetuated through the indifference of those who squander the world's wealth in the arms race. It makes no difference whether a human being is killed in war or is condemned to starve to death. One cannot refrain from reflecting on the short-sightedness of those who readily stock up their nuclear arsenals with bombs comparable to three tons of TNT for every child, woman and man on earth and yet do not heed the excruciating cry of the third world for more economic aid. The threats of a nuclear war are ever increasing. Certain parties are even advocating the possibility of waging limited, restricted nuclear war and are endeavouring to persuade their citizens to accept such an eventuality. All this propaganda is aimed, no doubt, at lowering civic awareness of the harmfulness of nuclear weapons. It is well known that the existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth.

340. To the Republic of Seychelles, a developing archipelagic State of the Indian Ocean, the foreign military buildup in that region is most preoccupying. We appeal for the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) and for the extension of the concept of a zone of peace to other regions as a plausible approach to alleviating undue tensions in various regions of the world. Were this concept put into practice, it would surely be a major factor in creating the circumstances conducive to achieving the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The Assembly called upon the great Powers, in conformity with the Declaration, to enter into consultations with the littoral States of the Indian Ocean with a view to halting the further expansion of their military presence in the Indian Ocean and eliminating from the area all bases, military installations and logistical supply facilities, nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

341. What is happening is that they are pushing the spectre of nuclear war as far away as possible from their own countries and territories. It is very clever on their part, because, if there is a confrontation, then it would be as far away as possible from their own area. Why do they not confront each other on their own front lines? If they want a competition to see who has superior nuclear weapons, why can they not choose a battleground in their own back yard? Why should they bring their tensions to the Indian Ocean? One can expect anything with all these marines hovering around. We certainly do not believe that they are on holiday or picnicking on Diego Garcia.

Mr. President, do you believe that they are there for a picnic? We welcome people in our area for holidays, not for military destruction. Let those who manufacture nuclear weapons deploy and use them in their own back yards, and if their citizens object, then let them destroy the weapons, but do not victimize other countries with them.

342. We have said that talks on the Indian Ocean under the umbrella of the United Nations could reach a consensus that would be reasonable for all sides so as to ensure that those routes which some claim to be threatened are protected. As far as the countries of the region are concerned, we know that the majority are prepared to come to any conference in order to reach any agreement guaranteeing the right of free passage on the high seas, but whenever we talk of getting together, especially in the context of the Colombo Conference and the conference proposed by President Ratsiraka of Madagascar;⁸ it seems that some Powers respond by sending more marines into the region, creating rapid deployment forces, increasing the number of warships and intensifying militarization to include nuclear weapons.

343. The Disarmament Commission, the General Assembly and the United Nations should take a strong position on the Indian Ocean. It is said that prevention is better than cure. Let us resolve this problem before small countries and peoples disappear forever from the world. Otherwise the conscience of you and me, and not only our Governments, will forever be stained with blood, horrible death and destruction—not to mention the guilt of our generations to come. We are painfully aware of problems raging right now that were not solved then owing to frivolous mentalities and the desire of some to play games with the lives and development of others. For once let the United Nations prove its worthiness in the case of the Indian Ocean—an ocean dotted with many small islands with small populations who feel terribly vulnerable.

344. We call upon the Disarmament Commission, which has thus far skirted the Indian Ocean issue, to deal with it head on and solve this dangerous problem. It is hoped that in the World Disarmament Campaign, the international public will be made aware of the dangerous situation in the Indian Ocean. This plea must not be allowed to be a mere cry in the wilderness.

345. We know we are small. There will be no write-ups of Seychelles' disarmament stand in the newspapers tomorrow. There are no reporters here. Victims and potential victims do not get publicity, but we do matter. We matter because we are here. We matter because we have a right to exist. If we are to perish, we will not do so without first having kicked, yelled, screamed and cried out for this madness to stop. As for the nuclear-arms scientists and arms manufacturers: we ask you to turn your skills to areas from which mankind can benefit.

346. Let me turn briefly to South Africa, a country that, despite an arms embargo against it, continues to receive arms from all sources in the world, a country that continues with impunity and perhaps with blessings from some in its wide design of destabilizing several independent African States, unleashing its own armed forces and mercenaries in its pay to punish those States for their independent and principled stands. My own country, having recently been a victim of this type of aggression from South Africa, shares with so many other African countries the untold sorrow and misery that that kind of aggression inflicts upon our people and infrastructure.

347. In whose interest is it to continue to encourage wars which give rise to massive redundancies from the armed forces that produce a pool of potential mercenaries in some countries whom other countries use without fear in order to further their foreign policy goals while blocking attempts to produce a convention on mercenaries?

348. At this special session the General Assembly should take a decisive step towards genuine disarmament. In view of the fact that real progress in the field of nuclear disarmament could create an atmosphere conducive to progress in conventional disarmament on a world-wide basis, the Government of the Republic of Seychelles wishes to appeal to all Member States participating in this session to decide, as a first step, to halt the production of all types of nuclear weapons. Arrangements should be made for negotiations to take place on a programme for the denuclearization of the world. If the Assembly were to take this decision, mankind would indeed have taken a great step forward towards preventing its self-destruction.

349. As people, we should like to live our lives quietly, free from want or fear.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.

NOTES

¹ A/S-10/AC.1/7, annex.

² The report was subsequently issued with the title *The Implications of Establishing an International Satellite Monitoring Agency* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.IX.3).

³ *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1).

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

⁵ A/S-10/AC.1/28, annex.

⁶ *Comprehensive Study on Nuclear Weapons* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.81.I.11).

⁷ *Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea*, vol. XVII, document A/CONF.62/122. This volume was subsequently issued as a United Nations publication, Sales No. E.84.V.2.

⁸ A/AC.159/L.32, annex.