



Friday, 18 June 1982,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. Ismat KITTANI (Iraq)

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. PAZ BARNICA (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The noteworthy coincidence between the topics to be discussed at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the basic lines of the foreign policy of the constitutional and democratic Government of the Republic of Honduras, led by Mr. Roberto Suazo Córdova, makes it a particularly signal honour for me to address this world body on their behalf.

2. I should like first to state how pleased we are that Mr. Kittani is presiding over the work of the General Assembly, since we are familiar with his years of experience in disarmament matters and nuclear questions and since we remember the masterly way in which he conducted the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

3. I should also like to extend a respectful and cordial greeting to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar. The preparations made by the Secretariat under his leadership, and, in particular, by the Centre for Disarmament, to enable us to conduct our discussions effectively, are extremely satisfactory and we wish here publicly to thank him most sincerely.

4. In the four years between the closing of the tenth special session, the first devoted to disarmament, in 1978, and this special session of the General Assembly, the world situation, in our view, has been characterized by the fruitless and, indeed, dangerous persistence of conflicts based on a balance of power supported by an arms buildup that is excessive in terms of both quality and quantity.

5. The quest for national security through the possession of sophisticated weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, together with the policy of military blocs and alliances of the great Powers, has merely served to increase the possibilities of a confrontation with the most serious consequences for all mankind. The danger of nuclear war is stronger today than ever, and the probability that, in order to avoid those risks, ideological and strategic conflicts can be switched to small and medium-sized countries in geographical areas outside the industrial regions is a source of well-founded and serious concern to our developing countries.

6. The possession of the atomic bomb has radically changed the nature and meaning of modern interna-

tional relations. Apart from the immeasurable destructive power involved in the use of such weapons, a foreign policy based on their possession creates deep feelings of insecurity for other countries, which in turn may induce in them not only a desire to strengthen their own defences with atomic weapons or with those accessible through alliances, but also to identify regions where such countries can check such a threat, thus increasing the areas of tension or conflict.

7. Consequently, there is a great deal to be gained from having full guarantees given to non-nuclear-weapon States and from those States being legitimately concerned as much by the risk of a nuclear conflagration as by the possibility of seeing their legitimate rights curtailed, and from their being fully involved in the planning, analysis and negotiation of broad disarmament policies and measures, beginning with those for nuclear disarmament.

8. The enormous cost of the arms race and the very close relationship between disarmament and development, the reduction of military budgets in order to speed up the transfer of economic resources to development requirements, together with the importance of respect for the peaceful use of nuclear technology for those same ends of economic and social development, deepen our interest in achieving forthwith a reconciliation of positions among the great Powers and the adoption during this session of the General Assembly of a genuine and realistic comprehensive programme of disarmament.

9. In view of the relationship between disarmament and international security, it is necessary to establish measures that would serve to lessen the mistrust and hostility which exist between many nations in various regions of the world. It is essential to promote renewed allegiance to the principles of the Charter of the world Organization and to the development and improvement of peaceful means of settling disputes.

10. The authority of the Security Council has been disregarded too often for the Council to continue to be sufficiently effective, and the guidelines periodically adopted by the General Assembly, the body which is the true expression of the feelings of the immense majority of the international community in various situations, not only have been set aside but have been objected to because of petty national interests, which are completely indifferent to the interests of mankind as a whole.

11. This situation is obvious in conflicts such as those between the Arab countries and the Israeli nation in the Middle East; in the African countries, with the oppressive régime of *apartheid* in Namibia; in the struggle of the Afghan and Kampuchean peoples against foreign occupation forces—situations in which the lack of proper machinery for the peaceful

settlement of disputes brings dangerously close to the abyss of large-scale confrontation not only the nations most directly involved but also the whole international community. This could bring us to the brink of a nuclear holocaust.

12. In the same line of thinking, the maintenance of colonial situations by military power merely serves to create or widen differences among countries which otherwise, for many reasons, are more likely because of their traditional links of friendship and culture to achieve greater levels of economic and political co-operation.

13. This is the situation at the moment on the American continent, with the armed conflict over the Malvinas Islands between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Argentine Republic, a conflict which has kept our region in a state of alarm and tension, heightened by the tragedy of recent events. An additional factor in this crisis, which has been of deep concern to us, has been the imposition of economic sanctions against Argentina by several countries.

14. The Government of Honduras wishes to state again that it supports the just claim of Argentina to see its sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands recognized, and to associate itself with those countries which have asked that the Secretary-General be granted effective assistance in order to help the parties find a final and just solution to this delicate situation, pursuant to the mandate handed down by the Security Council, which should now take its proper place in dealing with the impact of this dominance of force.

15. The conflict over the Malvinas Islands has put to the most difficult test the American regional system and the very meaning or force of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance¹ of 1947. This unfortunate event has been very carefully considered by the Government of Honduras, which essentially wishes to see that the machinery of collective security and the links of continental solidarity are maintained and not weakened.

16. The Government of Honduras has made the internationalization of peace the keystone of its foreign policy, particularly in the Central American region. With the confidence it has in being the product of democratic elections with the broadest participation of the Honduran electorate, and thus endeavouring to consolidate a realistic social and economic policy for the benefit of the masses of our people, the Government of Honduras is making great efforts to ensure that the postulates of peace, justice, progress and democracy are set forth in the Central American area as the basic pillars of a society which is undergoing pressing and peaceful change.

17. Last March I had occasion to put before the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States the peace proposal for Central America from the Government of Honduras and Mr. Roberto Suazo Córdova. The substantive part of the document was made available to the Security Council and to Member States of the United Nations.²

18. The six-point proposal of the Government of Honduras was based on the Government's desire to spare Central America the danger of confrontation and

war, to strengthen the pluralist, democratic system of government, to promote economic and social development and to reduce the high cost of armament. This was a proposal for the adoption of disarmament measures including the conclusion of agreements on the reduction of armaments and military strength, the cessation of the arms race, a reduction in the number of foreign military advisers, the control of the illegal traffic in arms, which causes violence, the establishment of international mechanisms to monitor and supervise sensitive areas and zones, so that commitments entered into might be made effective.

19. Similarly, the Honduran peace proposal declared that there should be absolute respect for demarcated frontiers and traditional lines of jurisdiction and envisaged the holding of a permanent multilateral dialogue which, besides serving as a framework for the conclusion of the agreements I have mentioned, would make it possible to promote, within the internal order of each country, the political arrangements which would strengthen the pluralist and democratic system and enforce respect for human rights and the freedoms of peoples.

20. The Government of Honduras has been holding talks with the Government of Nicaragua concerning our peace initiative. We hope that this dialogue will produce positive results in various fields and consolidate peaceful coexistence in dignity, as an expression of friendly relations based on mutual respect and co-operation with interdependence.

21. Those who, indulging in some sort of scandal-mongering, seek to misrepresent the attitude of the democratic Government of Honduras, which is not to allow destabilizing actions to be launched from its territories against other régimes of the region, are not telling the truth. We reaffirm our decision, with the frankness which is incumbent on a government freely elected by the people.

22. We feel that openness and objectivity must underlie any dialogue leading to understanding among States, if through such dialogue permanent solutions are sought which would not be constrained by the transitory desires for supremacy or dangerous ideological confrontations which are foreign to the spirit of our future or the reality of our history.

23. Our attitude toward the existing tensions in other Central American countries is, like our attitude regarding Nicaragua, that our conduct should conform to the principles of non-interference, the right of peoples to self-determination, respect for the territorial integrity of each State and adherence to the unswerving application of peaceful means of resolving international disputes.

24. Hence we hope to see the internal situation in El Salvador return completely to normal, with the cessation of violence and agreement by the Salvadorian people to internal reconciliation through measures which will make it possible to channel their aspirations within an institutional framework which would allow for renewed and constructive change.

25. The situation which Central America is experiencing has unfortunately caused the massive displacement of people seeking security, refuge, peace and employment.

26. Honduras, which is at the moment, despite our own economic difficulties, receiving more than 30,000 refugees from neighbouring countries, here appeals again to the international community, to the countries and international organizations, that in a spirit of open solidarity they increase their contributions to the assistance programmes for refugees who, forced by circumstances, have come to live in my country.

27. Our Government and people have shown and will continue to show a highly humanitarian attitude to this problem of refugees, and through me they thank those who have given assistance in dealing with this problem, especially the United Nations, through its various institutions, in particular the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

28. The Government of Honduras considers this the proper occasion to make known its opinions on those parts of the comprehensive programme of disarmament which deserve priority attention. The criteria are, in our judgement, the following.

29. First, we feel that the General Assembly should arrive at this session at an agreement in principle on the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing, which would lead to the early holding of negotiations on a treaty that would be universally endorsed to prohibit such testing. The damage to the environment and the dangers to peace involved in continued indiscriminate testing are sufficient reasons to support this measure that has been backed by international public opinion for more than a decade.

30. Secondly, the régime of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] must be strengthened, particularly through improvement of the methods of monitoring and controlling the transfer of nuclear material for peaceful purposes, and also through the commitment of the nuclear Powers to undertake and conclude serious and wide-ranging negotiations on the cessation of the arms race and of the development of technology for new weapons of mass destruction.

31. Thirdly, the United States of America and the Soviet Union should be urged to maintain and comply with the measures negotiated in the agreements on the limitation of offensive strategic arms. While we are gratified by the announcement by both nations that on 29 June this year they will begin a new round of negotiations, they should be asked to bring their important talks on the reduction of strategic weapons to a satisfactory conclusion.

32. Fourthly, similarly, universal accession to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction [*resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex*] should be promoted.

33. Fifthly, in view of the long-hoped-for possibility that disarmament agreements and measures can be carried out in a climate of growing confidence, the Government of Honduras feels that proper verification measures should be included in this context and therefore urges that proper facilities for effective negotiation and implementation should be made available.

34. Sixthly, we reiterate our full support for the promotion of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle

East, Africa and South Asia, through proper negotiation among the parties directly concerned and bearing in mind, as a frame of reference yielding some experience, the machinery set forth in the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco).³

35. Seventh, on matters of regional disarmament we maintain our support for continued negotiation on the reduction of weaponry and of military personnel and the deployment of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe.

36. Eighth, the need to link disarmament closely to development entitles us to draw attention to the appropriateness of a recommendation by the General Assembly of a programme for the reduction of arms expenditures by the most militarily advanced countries, for the conversion of the corresponding industries and for the transfer of the resources and technology thus released to international programmes of economic and social co-operation.

37. Ninth, the objective of promoting the reduction of conventional weapons to levels that are strictly necessary for the defence of sovereignty and territorial integrity and for the maintenance of public order is a fundamental part of our foreign policy. On this basis we consider that the quest for such an objective must be concurrent with the strengthening of the means for the peaceful settlement of disputes and with effective action by the international community against illegal trafficking in arms. In this regard and with reference to Central America and in conformity with the joint declaration adopted by several heads of State at San José, Costa Rica, on the occasion of the swearing-in of President Luis Alberto Monge on 8 May this year, we consider that a meeting of the foreign ministers of that region of conflict should be held in order to promote the achievement of this worthy and necessary objective.

38. Finally, I wish to state that the Government of Honduras is examining those elements that could contribute to the establishment in Central America and the Caribbean of a zone of peace, where tensions would give way to co-operation, claims would give way to the sovereign equality of States and the productive efforts of peoples would not be geared to arming but, on the contrary, to the full attainment of the aspirations of our societies, which rightly call for a more just, united and humane future. Honduras is aware of the role it can play in furthering this objective and declares itself resolutely prepared to contribute to the resumption of talks and to the drawing up of a specific calendar for this encouraging purpose.

39. Faced with the choice between armed peace, dependent upon the fear inspired by claims that war can ensure peace, and peaceful coexistence based on respect for the rights of every State and for the norms and principles of international law, the democratic Government of Honduras has no hesitation in opting for the second alternative, which is the only one in keeping with the cultural and historical unity of Central America. This is the alternative of which we are convinced because it is the one that makes faith in human dignity and the hope for a better world flourish.

40. Mr. OUKO (Kenya): I should like first of all to convey the greetings of the President of the Republic of Kenya, current Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, Mr. Daniel Arap Moi, to this second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

41. We are meeting at a time when the international political climate is fraught with danger and increasingly serious outbreaks of conflict in various parts of the planet are common events. It is a regrettable political climate. The sense of insecurity has given an unfortunate boost to the arms race, and international relations have steadily deteriorated. Very little progress has been achieved despite the fact that disarmament has been a subject of international deliberation since 1932, a very long time indeed for one item to be on the agenda of the international community. This morning, in his brilliant intervention, the Prime Minister of Canada gave us some of the reasons why there has been so little progress. It should be recalled that the first Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade in 1961, called for the convening of a special session of the United Nations General Assembly to discuss disarmament. The first special session of the General Assembly devoted solely to disarmament took place in 1978, that is, 17 years later, and very important decisions were taken.

42. The twelfth special session of the General Assembly is thus taking place within a relatively short time after the tenth special session. It underscores not only the duty of the international community to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, but also the grave consequences that could result from the continued escalation of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race. This sentiment found sufficient expression in paragraph 18 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly [*resolution S-10/2*], which reads as follows:

“Removing the threat of a world war—a nuclear war—is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation.”

43. That statement envisaged an international disarmament strategy the end result of which must be general and complete disarmament under effective and verifiable international control. What prompted it was the realization that all peoples of the world and their countries have a stake in the avoidance of war, nuclear or otherwise. We expected a systematic and early translation of those consensus recommendations and decisions into concrete and practical solutions to the disarmament problem.

44. Most regrettably, no progress has been made since 1978 in the implementation of those decisions. On the contrary, the dangerous spiral in the arms race has been intensified, refined and sharpened, especially in the most dangerous field of nuclear arms. The fundamental objectives, priorities and principles set forth in the Final Document still remain only on paper. Military expenditures have grown from \$400 billion in 1978 to \$500 billion in 1981. Similarly, nothing has been done to ensure the implementation

of the provisions of paragraph 13 of the Final Document, which declares 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, by international agreement and mutual example”.

Our hopes and aspirations have thus been frustrated. The international agenda for disarmament is still as full today as it was before the tenth special session.

45. Thus the problems of nuclear weapons; of conventional weapons, including those weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects; chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; radiological weapons; the reduction of military expenditures and armed forces; the relationship between disarmament, on the one hand, and socio-economic development on the other, as well as disarmament and international peace and security; peaceful applications of nuclear energy and achieving a comprehensive programme of disarmament under effective international control—to mention only a few of them—are still unresolved. As I said earlier, this special session is an occasion for us to map out another concerted strategy for addressing all these fundamental problems of disarmament with a view to achieving some progress—and soon.

46. Of paramount importance is the question of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. This issue has always been inscribed on the disarmament agenda as an item of the highest priority, and rightly so. By signing the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water⁴—better known as the partial test-ban Treaty—on 5 August 1963 and depositing their instruments of ratification on 10 October of the same year, when the Treaty came into force, each of the original parties to that Treaty agreed to undertake a firm political commitment to pursue a comprehensive test ban and, in article 1, paragraph 1, “to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion [covered by the Treaty], at any place under its jurisdiction or control” and, in article 1, paragraph 2, “to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear-weapon test explosion anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described” in the Treaty. Even though initially believed to be an occurrence of historic significance, the emergence of that partial test-ban Treaty did not—and, most unfortunately, has not to this day—slowed down the nuclear-arms race among the major nuclear Powers. On the contrary, and tragically, that Treaty seems to have served only as a licence for accelerating nuclear testing, despite the existence of numerous General Assembly resolutions against such testing. In fact, the original parties to that Treaty alone account for more than 90 per cent of all nuclear explosions conducted between 5 August 1963 and 31 December 1979. Moreover, the so-called firm commitment of the parties to pursue a comprehensive test ban was shelved for more than 10 long years.

47. Similarly, the political will and firm commitment necessary for the effective implementation of agreements and decisions among nations have also been eroding with respect to the implementation of the decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly adopted annually over the past quarter century on the question of cessation of nuclear-weapon tests.

48. The Government of President Daniel Arap Moi continues to endorse the two central messages reflected in all the actions taken so far by the international community on this fundamental issue. One is the conviction that, whatever the differences on the issue of verification, there are no insurmountable obstacles necessitating a delay in the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban. The other is the need to recognize the highest priority attached to the question of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban. All the disarmament deliberations, including the single, multilateral disarmament negotiating forum—that is, the Committee on Disarmament—must pay particular attention to these crucial issues in the process of disarmament.

49. It is the firm view of the current Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, President Daniel Arap Moi, that the first step in halting nuclear-weapons proliferation is to halt the nuclear-arms race and to reverse it from its present stage. This is why my delegation has all along supported the call to establish *ad hoc* working groups on a nuclear-test ban and also on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and on nuclear disarmament within the Committee on Disarmament, with unlimited mandates, as stipulated by the General Assembly in numerous resolutions. We support the establishment of subsidiary negotiating bodies within the Committee on Disarmament because we are convinced that such bodies can serve as vehicles by means of which key issues of disarmament can be tackled effectively and efficiently. We reject the endless theory of deterrence because it only promotes the arms race between the super-Powers and increases opportunities for military confrontation between their respective military alliances.

50. My delegation also attaches great importance to the question of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

51. I have pointed out already that nuclear weapons constitute the greatest and gravest threat to humanity and, as in the case of a nuclear-weapon test ban, the question of security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States has been the subject of various resolutions of the General Assembly. The question of assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should be seen as a step towards the elimination of these weapons and not as an end in itself. I therefore reiterate the call of my Government to the nuclear Powers to re-examine their unilaterally declared policies and positions relating to arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We consider that nuclear-weapon States should provide concrete and legally binding assurances to all non-nuclear-weapon States. At the same time, we urge accelerated progress towards complete nuclear disarmament. My delegation also calls

for full adherence by all non-nuclear-weapon States to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

52. The question of elaborating a comprehensive programme of disarmament is also another priority area for action by the international community. According to General Assembly resolution 36/92 F of 9 December 1981, this session of the Assembly has a duty to elaborate and adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Unfortunately, the Committee on Disarmament could not agree at its last session on a clean text of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. We therefore have a document on a comprehensive programme of disarmament which still has many unresolved issues. It is the hope of my delegation that a negotiated text of a comprehensive programme of disarmament will emerge and be adopted before the closure of this session. My delegation attaches considerable significance to this comprehensive programme of disarmament. In the view of my delegation, a comprehensive programme of disarmament will be an instrument through which progress in general and complete disarmament can be attained. We welcome the agreement which seems to have emerged on the division of disarmament measures into three stages. At the same time, we regret the fundamental differences which still exist on the key issues of the relationship between time-frames, stages and review and implementation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. This relationship should be recognized, since the programme must be truly comprehensive and global in character. My delegation continues to subscribe to the proposal for a 20-year time-span within which a comprehensive programme of disarmament should be implemented—that is, up to the year 2000—with a five-year period of review and appraisal of the implementation of each stage of the programme. Furthermore, we believe that measures for the implementation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament should be identified both in the context of the objectives, priorities and principles of the programme and in the context of their short-term, medium-term and long-term perspectives.

53. One area which my delegation considers to be of highest priority is the close relationship that exists between disarmament, on the one hand, and social and economic development, on the other. Competent studies published on this very issue, including the report of the Secretary-General to which is annexed the study by the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development,⁵ present some shocking revelations about the colossal amounts of resources, currently estimated at more than \$500 billion, spent annually for military purposes. All this represents a pitiful waste of resources desperately needed for economic and social development, particularly by the developing countries. There can be no justification for continued squandering of already scarce resources on ever-increasing military expenditure. This second special session on disarmament should find a solution to this problem. My delegation will continue to call, as it always has, for the rapid elimination of the economic imbalances existing in the present international economic relations among nations of the world. We believe that the

establishment of a new international economic order would contribute to the attainment of the ultimate objective of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. We therefore call on those concerned to release real resources now being unwisely squandered on the arms race for reallocation to socio-economic development for the benefit of all people, but particularly the poor people of the Earth.

54. A comprehensive programme of disarmament will thus be an important instrument in the disarmament process, the success of which will also depend on many other supportive measures. Effective mechanisms are essential for disarmament, and this was one of the preoccupations of the tenth special session. Strengthening the capacity of the United Nations to deal with disarmament issues essentially means finding better ways and means through which both the deliberative forums for disarmament, namely, the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission, can play increased roles in the field of disarmament. The Committee on Disarmament, which is the single multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament, must never be deprived of its negotiating character. All the 40 member States of the Committee on Disarmament, including my own, and all other members of the international community have a duty to facilitate the exercise by the Committee of its negotiating mandate.

55. Disarmament negotiations conducted outside the Committee, including strategic arms reduction talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, the trilateral negotiations on the nuclear test-ban between the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States, and any other similar disarmament negotiations should support and be supplementary to negotiations in the Committee. It is because of this single multilateral negotiating characteristic of the Committee that my delegation is a staunch supporter of the creation of *ad hoc* working groups in sufficient numbers within it, with a view to elaborating conventions in the various fields of disarmament.

56. In summary, my delegation believes that at the current special session the Assembly should consider the following issues, come up with positive results, and make, as appropriate, specific recommendations for future action on them: first, review and appraisal of recommendations and decisions of the tenth special session in the light of documentation submitted on the issue, including the special report of the Committee on Disarmament [A/S-12/2] submitted in accordance with various General Assembly resolutions; secondly, strengthening of the negotiating capacity of the Committee on Disarmament, review of its membership and creation of working groups of the Committee in sufficient numbers to deal with issues before it for negotiation; thirdly, elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament; and fourthly, elaboration of draft provisions for multilateral conventions on chemical weapons, radiological weapons, and security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States.

57. The first special session devoted to disarmament succeeded in laying a sound foundation for an international strategy for disarmament. The present special session should succeed in establishing a firm political will in all nations and in extracting an undertaking

from all nations, especially the nuclear Powers and their military alliances, to relax tensions in international relations, to implement promptly the provisions of the Final Document, to promote international détente and peaceful co-existence, to halt and reverse the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race, to prevent vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons, never to use nuclear weapons or start a nuclear war, to develop co-operation and consultation among nations and thereby promote confidence among themselves, to halt all nuclear tests and subsequently conclude a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty, and to adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament as a legally binding instrument, to be initiated in New York during this special session and to be signed at a place and time to be designated.

58. My country will continue to exert every effort to make a valuable contribution to the cause of disarmament. As President Moi has repeatedly stated, our efforts have been, and will continue to be, for peace. We shall continue to oppose the use of force in international relations, military intervention, aggression and occupation of territories by force. We shall also continue to support people subjected to colonial and alien domination.

59. Finally, my delegation endorses the formal launching of the World Disarmament Campaign and to that effect suggests the convening, at the earliest appropriate time, of a world conference on disarmament. It is also necessary, in our view, to initiate and intensify studies on important aspects of the arms race and embark on programmes of public information on disarmament. Mobilization of public opinion in favour of disarmament is necessary in order to educate not only the masses but also policy-makers in all countries about the grave dangers of the arms race. I hope that this undertaking can start now, during this special session, which we should like to look upon as an important milestone on the road to general and complete disarmament under effective, verifiable international control.

60. Mr. FADZILLAH (Malaysia): Like other representatives who have addressed this session before me, I should like at the outset to congratulate Mr. Kittani on his election as President of the second special session devoted to disarmament. I am confident that under his able guidance we shall be able to conclude our work by reaching positive and constructive conclusions. My delegation extends its full support and co-operation to him in carrying out his difficult task.

61. In 1978, the first special session devoted to disarmament adopted the Final Document by consensus. The Document, which contained a Declaration and Programme of Action on disarmament, aroused high hopes and great expectations among the international community that a formula had at last been found that could guide negotiations towards the attainment of the desired goal of general and complete disarmament, enhancing the chances for global peace and security.

62. As we meet again today during the twelfth special session, four years have elapsed, and yet there has been little progress. On the contrary, the world is today fraught with ever greater instability arising from acts of aggression, occupation and interference.

It is therefore obvious that the strategy that we adopted at the tenth special session to reduce the arms race and to secure peace and stability has not been successful. One of the reasons for this failure is the apparent lack of political will of some Member States to make a reality of the strategy adopted during that session.

63. My delegation shares the views expressed by many previous speakers that we are today nearer neither the goal of general and complete disarmament nor the attainment of durable international peace and security. Instead, we are today engaged in an intense, increasingly explosive and highly dangerous arms race. Total world military spending in 1981 soared to a record level of over \$600 billion. That figure illustrates the distortion of priorities in a world where two thirds of the population live in hunger and poverty. Studies by the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development have indicated that if only a mere fraction of those expenditures were channelled to social and economic betterment, it would enhance the elimination of global poverty and deprivation.

64. The massive arms buildup we witness today is closely related to the tension and instability resulting from heightened rivalries between the super-Powers in competing for spheres of influence. This trend by the super-Powers has not been lost on other nations, which often resort to the use of force in the settlement of disputes, in violation of the principles of the Charter. The Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea, the Soviet aggression in Afghanistan, the countless Israeli violations of Lebanon's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and its complete disregard of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, and the recent war in the South Atlantic, to name just a few, have contributed immensely to aggravating world tension. It is therefore clear that the arms race will continue, given this atmosphere of political instability and distrust among States.

65. Malaysia is situated in a region that historically has been open to external influences. Exposure to power play has perhaps become a natural state of affairs in South-East Asia, which has experienced successive rivalries between Western colonial Powers, between the major Powers during the cold war and increasingly between the Soviet Union and China in the post-Viet Nam period. Coming from a region which is all too familiar with big-Power rivalry and involvement, my delegation would like to urge the major Powers to heed the call of the international community and take appropriate measures to restrain the arms race and embark on alternative means of ensuring peace and security. In this regard Malaysia welcomes the announcement of forthcoming talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear weapons scheduled to commence later this month at Geneva. We strongly believe that the two super-Powers should intensify their efforts to halt and reverse the arms race and continue with their dialogue to complement efforts undertaken within the framework of the United Nations with regard to disarmament.

66. My delegation views with concern the failure to resume the multilateral negotiations on a nuclear test-ban treaty which were abandoned in 1980. The

successful conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty at this juncture would undoubtedly have a positive influence in our endeavours to curb the nuclear race by halting qualitative improvements and the development of new types of nuclear and other destructive weapons.

67. The tenth special session also envisaged that the comprehensive programme of disarmament should be the centrepiece of an international instrument which could create legal obligations binding upon States to implement the measures necessary for disarmament. Unfortunately, the efforts by the Committee to finalize a text of the comprehensive programme of disarmament for consideration at the twelfth special session were not successful. It is our earnest hope that greater political will and flexibility will prevail during this session, thus making it possible for us to adopt and implement at the earliest possible time a programme that would provide for specific measures to achieve the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament in clearly defined stages.

68. Another area of concern to my delegation is the prevention of horizontal nuclear proliferation. It is of paramount importance that there be universal adherence to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Its effectiveness would further enhance the rights of States to develop, through international co-operation, research on and production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes under the recognized IAEA safeguards régime. While we expect Members to submit fully to those safeguards, we viewed with concern the unprecedented attack last year by Israel on the nuclear installation in Baghdad, which indirectly undermined that safeguard régime.

69. The indication that South Africa and Israel may be in possession of nuclear armaments outside any international control is also cause for concern. While this provides an extra sinister dimension to an already uncertain climate, it also damages the credibility of the Treaty, as well as germinating dangerous tendencies towards even greater proliferation.

70. My delegation also views with concern the alleged reports of the use of chemical toxins in Afghanistan, Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea. As delegations are aware, my delegation supported the establishment in 1980 of a Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons, in order to ascertain the veracity of the allegations. We hope that, following the renewal of its mandate last year, the Expert Group will be able to continue its investigation and finally come up with a more definitive conclusion. We urge the Committee on Disarmament to continue its negotiations on chemical weapons as a matter of priority with a view to achieving general disarmament in the field of chemical weapons. This would include measures to curb attempts to produce new types of chemical weapons and for the destruction of existing stock-piles.

71. While giving priority to nuclear disarmament, it is not the intention of my delegation to relegate conventional weapons to a lower level of importance. The accumulation of conventional weapons could create similar conditions of instability in various parts of the world and lead to the spiralling of the con-

ventional arms race beyond the level necessary for self-defence. The urgent need for disarmament in conventional weapons is evidenced by the widespread use of those weapons in present-day warfare. Equally compelling is the trend for developing countries to themselves embark on massive conventional armament. Measures to curb the level of conventional weapons require mutual agreement on the need for an acceptable level of military strength. This effort has to be complemented by confidence-building measures and other initiatives, such as the establishment of zones of peace.

72. Malaysia has always supported the idea of establishing zones of peace in various regions of the world. Such zones of peace would create conditions conducive to peace and stability and eliminate super-Power rivalries for spheres of influence, thus preventing potential regional conflicts. Moreover, such a move would certainly pave the way for regional co-operation in the fields of economic and social development. Work on this regional concept of disarmament would certainly complement the efforts to achieve the goal of disarmament undertaken in various bodies. Mindful of this fact, Malaysia and other partners in the Association of South-East Asian Nations will continue to pursue efforts to achieve a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia, which would provide a basic framework for ensuring peace and stability in our region.

73. The goal of establishing a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean also offers countries in the region the prospect of increased stability and security. My delegation fully supports all efforts to bring about an early realization of this proposal. In this connexion, we regret that the Conference on the Indian Ocean was not held last year. Although there is still divergence of views on the concept, we believe that this divergence could be narrowed through a spirit of compromise. At the same time, the littoral and hinterland States themselves must exercise the necessary restraint and responsibility so as not to act in a manner inconsistent with the spirit of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [resolution 2832 (XXVI)]. We hope that the rescheduled Conference on the Indian Ocean will produce positive and constructive results in 1983.

74. The immense explosive power of nuclear weapons, their great numbers and the accuracy with which they can be targeted guarantee that nuclear war, if it comes, will produce destruction on an unprecedented scale. In the event of such an occurrence all nations big and small will find themselves affected. There are today well in excess of 40,000 nuclear warheads, and they have a capacity about one million times as great as that of the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima. Unfortunately, despite the realization of their destructive potential, the production of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction has taken on new momentum.

75. Mindful of the catastrophic consequences of such a conflict, and in consonance with the pacific objectives of this session, my delegation would like to call on all nations to contribute to halting this dangerous trend, which could bring about a revival of the cold war of the 1950s.

76. Some argue that the bonds formed between States as a result of bilateral and multilateral co-operation in economic, social and political affairs are, or may soon become, sufficiently strong to overcome those tendencies towards confrontation which are a consequence of unrestrained military technology. But, given the speed with which military technology advances and the frailty and uneven progress of international détente, it is reasonable to doubt this. Those who do have an obvious choice, and that is to work for disarmament.

77. Mr. JACOBS (Antigua and Barbuda): This is the first occasion on which my country, the newest Member of the United Nations, has spoken on a major issue before the Assembly. It is a matter of particular pleasure that we do so under the presidency of Mr. Kittani, for it was he who presided over the General Assembly when we were admitted to the Organization. We have every confidence that his known skill and ability will contribute to the success of this important convocation.

Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

78. Four years ago, as the General Assembly convened its first special session on disarmament, my country, then not independent, held out great hope for its work. Sitting on the sidelines of international debate, we reposed enormous faith in the ability of the United Nations to develop and implement a programme of action which would not only halt but reverse the spiral of the arms race and reduce the risk of conventional and nuclear war.

79. Alas, although a Programme of Action was developed and adopted, its implementation has fallen badly short of the expectations even of those who are most cynical about the Organization's work.

80. Therefore it is hardly surprising that in many parts of the world, including here in New York, the seat of the United Nations, large groups of people are openly demonstrating for disarmament and in the course of these demonstrations are indicting the United Nations itself. Many of these groups associate the failure to halt the arms race with the ineffectiveness of this body. For where can they look but to the United Nations to exercise a sobering control on nations intent on stockpiling weapons of destruction? In creating the United Nations and enshrining in its Charter a role for collective security, did we not promise mankind to make the world a safer place in which to live? Did we not extend the hope of an enduring respite from the horrors of war?

81. When a generation has come to maturity with that role still to be played and that promise unfulfilled, surely they have a right seriously to question whether Governments place any value on the Organization beyond that of scoring debating points.

82. The protests of this generation against the continuous, unrelenting stockpiling of weapons have broken out across the globe like a rash. It is a rash of resistance, an epidemic of health in an otherwise unhealthy world. They are saying to all of us—to Governments and to those who represent Governments in the Organization—that they expect action to ensure their survival. They are not content to trust their lives

to the sanity of a few whose fingers are poised on the triggers of a holocaust.

83. They want a broader and more comprehensive response from us, and it is obvious that such a response must consist of practical steps to arrest the arms race and to devise a system of collective security which demands of each nation a commitment to the protection of mankind as a whole.

84. Mine is but a small country. We are one of 62 of the world's States having a population of less than a million. We wish to be secure within our borders, free from the fact and threat of aggression, unencumbered by the expenditure of scarce financial resources on weapons of war. We wish to spend our money on development, not defence; on farmers, not soldiers; on food, not guns.

85. It is a matter of regret to us that newly independent States are becoming as guilty of contributing to the arms race as the larger Powers. It is unfortunate that developing countries have been forced to accept the culture of militarism as a response to the question of security.

86. In 1978 developing countries imported nearly \$16 billion worth of arms—more than a third going to non-oil-producing nations. The mind marvels at the qualitative improvement in the conditions of life of poor States that could have been achieved had that \$16 billion been spent on health, education, housing and agriculture.

87. Yet those developing countries will argue that they had no choice but to spend money on defence, for their failure to do so would have opened their borders to military adventurism by larger and more powerful States.

88. In making such an assertion they would be right, for there can be no doubt that fear of external threat is a major reason for arms purchases by developing countries. But such threats only exist because the Organization has not lived up to the commitment in the Charter to provide collective security. In this context my Government finds compelling arguments for this problem having been addressed in the report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, which is being called the Palme report⁶ after its Chairman, the former Prime Minister of Sweden, Olof Palme.

89. Recalling with a chilling reality that between 1945 and 1971 alone there have been 120 wars in 71 third world countries involving the active participation of the armed forces of 84 countries, the Palme report has called on the United Nations to act in the interest of poor States. To quote from page 127 of the report:

“The international community, fulfilling its duties under the United Nations Charter, has in many ways helped to bring Third World States to nationhood. It has a further duty, within the spirit and expectation of the Charter, to foster an environment of material and psychological security.”

90. Specifically, the Palme report has recommended a modification of the concept of collective security set out in the Charter of the United Nations. Its basis is a political agreement and partnership between the permanent members of the Security Council and third

world countries. Its purpose would be to prevent conflicts from being settled by armed force. Under the scheme, the members of the Security Council would not veto collective security action in respect of disputes between third world States. Given this political concordat among Security Council members, three phases of United Nations action would be necessary.

91. First, on being alerted by at least one of the disputing parties to the danger of possible conflict, the Secretary-General would constitute a fact-finding mission to advise him on the situation.

92. Secondly, if circumstances warranted, and with the consent of at least one of the disputing parties, the Secretary-General would seek the authorization of the Security Council to send a military observer team to the requesting State to assess the situation in military terms and to demonstrate the Council's serious concern.

93. Thirdly, in the light of the report of the military observers the Security Council would authorize the induction of an appropriate United Nations military force at the request of one of the disputing States with a view to preventing conflict.

94. The Charter of the United Nations already provides for these roles. The modification recommended in the Palme report seeks merely to give a realistic and operational framework to a task which the original concept of the Charter set for the Organization.

95. The adoption and implementation of this recommendation by the Security Council and the General Assembly could save many hundreds of lives and create the conditions for redirecting scarce financial resources in third world countries to the crucial task of development. Surely this is a role worthy of the United Nations; surely this is a role which we should unhesitatingly pursue.

96. Countries such as my own have no hope, no salvation, no prospect of security beyond the protective umbrella of the United Nations, unless we, too, join the race to stockpile arms as a deterrent to potential predators.

97. It would be a further indictment of the Organization if small countries were forced to join the arms race, despite their reluctance to do so, because this body lacked the will to assume the political responsibility for which it was created.

98. I have drawn particular attention to the third world dimension in the problem of the arms race because I firmly believe that it is an area in which the United Nations can play an immediate and effective role. As I speak, I am very conscious of the potential conflict in at least two sectors of the Latin American community, of which my country is a part. There is no need for those conflicts to occur, no need for the blood of young people to be spilled, no need for the economic havoc which would descend upon an already economically deprived area.

99. But to avert such needless waste and hardship we must all recognize that the time has come for the United Nations to act positively and promptly in advance of such situations, to prevent conflicts instead of arbitrating on the righteousness of one side or the other in the aftermath of carnage and chaos.

100. We would urge the Assembly at its second special session on disarmament to take account of the Palme report and particularly of its recommendations on the security of developing States.

101. Although developing countries are not without fault as contributors to the risk of war, we are not immune to the consequences of East-West conflict, where the arms race, and particularly nuclear warfare, presents its greatest danger.

102. We recognize that the instinct of this current generation of young people is unquestionably for survival. They rightly give the well-being of humanity a higher priority than the assertion of an ideological or political position. They do not consider that mankind is so base that the final resolution of ideological and political differences should be the annihilation of large populations.

103. They believe that man has the capability of negotiating practical solutions to political problems without having to resort to the military option. Who would say they are wrong? And if they are wrong, then the world faces only the prospect of large-scale destruction and human suffering such as it has never known and cannot comprehend. That would be a world that we, the current leaders, had moulded, and the young would be justified in seeking to overturn our actions before the world ran out of time.

104. The super-Powers bear a great responsibility for our present condition. They have an equal responsibility to change it, to create those conditions in which the world is not threatened by nuclear disaster and in which resources are focused on development and not destruction. Total military spending will amount to over \$650 billion this year. This is more than the entire income of 1.5 billion people living in the 50 poorest countries.

105. The price of a single modern fighter plane would be sufficient to inoculate 3 million children against major childhood diseases. The price of one nuclear submarine with its missiles would provide 100,000 working years of nursing care for the aged.

106. The super-Powers should consider what those funds would mean to the quality of life in developing countries if a portion were released for development assistance. Moreover, they should consider what effect releasing such funds would have on the productive sectors of their own economies, on jobs for their own young people, on advancing research into cancer, on eliminating slums and on implementing programmes to stop drug addiction.

107. Halting the arms race has become a matter for urgent global action in the cause of mankind's survival. Already we have seen expressions of political will to end that race by people in many parts of the world. This body would fail to satisfy the noble ideals for which it was established if it turned a deaf ear to the eloquent calls for peace and an end to the arms race that have echoed so profoundly across so many continents. The time for us to act has come. It is here and it is now.

108. This twelfth special session must bring to reality a programme of action which not only limits the production of arms but also prepares a framework for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, for a

comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty and for a more discriminate system in the transfer of arms. Concurrently we must devise the means for collective security, and equally we must devise sanctions against those who would jeopardize the principle of such collective security through acts of aggression.

109. In this way, despite past misgivings and continued scepticism about the United Nations, we may be able to restore its authenticity and value in the eyes of the global community while creating a world which is secure and which is peaceful.

110. The PRESIDENT: Under the decision taken by the Assembly at its seventh plenary meeting [*para.* 68], I now call on the Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Mr. Zehdi Labib Terzi.

111. Mr. TERZI (Palestine Liberation Organization): This is a crucial moment. Let me at the outset place on record our deep gratitude and appreciation to the General Assembly for the concrete expression of its position of principle in reflecting and condemning the policies and acts of aggression and State terrorism committed by a Member of the Organization.

112. The walk-out this morning of almost two thirds of the Members speaks much louder than any other form of expression—the walk-out when a criminal terrorist came to this rostrum to speak of hypocrisy and teach us something about the Bible. Israel and the Zionist movement and their supporters should learn by this act of solidarity with the Palestinian people and the Lebanese people and other Arab peoples, and with all peoples who are fighting for their dignity and their rights.

113. On 4 December 1948 *The New York Times* carried a letter in which the signatories expressed their alarm at

“... the emergence in the newly created State of Israel of the Freedom Party (Herut), a political party clearly akin in its organization, methods, political philosophy and social appeal to the Nazi and Fascist parties. It was formed out of the membership and following of the former Irgun Zvei Leumi, a terrorist, right-wing chauvinist organization in Palestine.”

114. The letter appeared in *The New York Times* on the occasion of the visit of Menachem Begin to the United States. The letter went on, “It is inconceivable that those who oppose fascism throughout the world, if correctly informed of Mr. Begin's political record and perspective, could add their names and support to the movement he represents.” Those who joined in making public this letter added, “It is in its action that the terrorist Herut Party betrays its real character; from its past actions we can judge what it may be expected to do in the future.” The letter adds that, together with the Stern Gang, Herut “inaugurated a reign of terror in Palestine. Jewish community teachers were beaten up for speaking against them, adults were shot for not letting their children join them. By gangster methods, beatings, window smashing, and widespread robberies, the terrorists intimidated the population and exacted a heavy tribute.”

115. The distinguished American citizens who signed the letter concluded by stressing that the performance

of the Herut Party bears the "unmistakable stamp of a Fascist party for whom terrorism (against Jews, Arabs and British alike) and misrepresentation are means, and a 'leader state' is their goal".

116. Among the names that appeared under that letter in *The New York Times* are Hannah Arendt, Rabbi Jessurum Cardozo, Albert Einstein, Irma L. Lindheim, Irma and Stefan Wolfe, Myer D. Mendelson.

117. The General Assembly this morning was further desecrated by the presence at this rostrum of the terrorist Menachem Begin, leader of the so-called Freedom Party, Herut, just as it was desecrated by the presence here a few months ago of his fellow criminal, Shamir, leader of the Stern Gang, who, in more than one way was responsible for the cold-blooded murder of the first United Nations peace envoy, Count Folke Bernadotte.

118. Those wise American citizens had clear understanding and foresight. They could foretell what the future would bring if those fascists ever succeeded. This is no history class or analysis of events, but the two parties did succeed and in fact are in power. Judgement can now be passed, and as a matter of fact has been passed. The current actions of the coalition of the Irgun and the Stern terrorists—actions committed to implement a policy, a policy to put into practice an ideology, a fascist ideology; actions that can best be labelled as acts of State terrorism, as acts of aggression by Israel against a peaceful country, Lebanon—have been strongly condemned.

119. Israel's latest in the series of acts of aggression had an unashamedly declared aim: to eradicate the Palestinians—genocide. The aim of the latest act of aggression is put into force: a "final solution". That expression has rung in our ears. We have still in our memories a similar "final solution". Albert Einstein and his colleagues were right when they warned the world in 1948. The Herut—Begin's gang—and the Stern—Shamir's gang—are parties akin to the Nazi and Fascist parties.

120. They are not only akin to the Nazis in their philosophy; they are very much akin in their behaviour and method of operation. Under the misnomer "security", the neo-Fascists carry out their aggression and military expansionism, they violate the territorial integrity of the States around them, they occupy and annex, and they reap the fruits of their aggression; and, what is more, and this is really saddening, they are even rewarded.

121. Here let us reflect for a moment. Were the neo-Fascists rewarded after the fact, after committing the crime, after invading the sovereign territory of other countries? Were they encouraged, maybe pushed, to commit those acts of aggression and State terrorism?

122. The Department of State in Washington tells us and makes no secret of its knowledge that Israel had such a plan for more than a year, but instead of deterring or discouraging—I would have wished to say prohibiting or stopping—the carrying out of the plan, the Government of the United States proceeded lavishly to donate to Tel Aviv billions of dollars worth of weapons, most advanced and sophisticated weapons. The Government of the United States, as

a sign of encouragement, even signed an agreement—something called an agreement of mutual understanding.

123. Yesterday we were reminded of the plea of His Holiness Pope Paul VI in this Hall 17 years ago. We were reminded that His Holiness had said, during the twentieth session, "If you wish to be brothers, let the weapons fall from your hands." [1347th meeting, para. 37.]

124. His Holiness never meant that those arms should be donated to others so that they could drop cluster bombs and fragmentation bombs on innocent civilians, resulting in the cold-blooded murder of women and children; thousands of them. Let those hands be clean before you speak about the cleanliness of hands.

125. The Government of the United States asserted that Israel was more than a friend; it was an ally, a strategic ally. All this encouragement came at a time when the Administration knew about the Israeli plan and the preparations for the invasion and for the massacres. Yet the Assembly was told that the Administration in Washington was opposed to aggression and that the Administration in Washington was faithful to its commitment to the Charter of the United Nations. How unbelievable, when one of the first aims and principles of the Charter is to suppress aggression and one of the first principles of the policy of the United States is to foment and finance aggression.

126. Israel has made its view clear to America's special envoy—a certain poor Mr. Philip Habib—so it has been reported in the press; and Israel envisages an Israeli presence in Lebanon "for several months". This, again has been reported in the press.

127. Tel Aviv, as supported by the Administration in Washington, wants to prevent the return of the territory now in Israeli hands—in Lebanon—to the *status quo ante bellum*. Israel wants to dominate a clearly defined territory, a part of the sovereign territory of Lebanon. The pretext is security of the State. Do we have to recall Hitler's claims on Poland and the myth of the Polish threat to the security of the Reich? Another declared aim or demand of Israel *vis-à-vis* the Lebanese is an agreement calling for the withdrawal of all foreign armies from the soil of Lebanon. There is only one foreign army on the soil of Lebanon and that is the occupation army of Menachem Begin, the almost 100,000 Israeli troops that have invaded Lebanon. That is the army that should immediately, unconditionally and totally withdraw from Lebanese territory. This was stated in a resolution unanimously passed by the Security Council.

128. Here it is clear that Israel will not be satisfied with forcing an agreement akin to other agreements; it is also interfering in the internal affairs of the sovereign State of Lebanon. Whatever armies are in Lebanon, apart from the occupation army of Tel Aviv, are not foreign occupation forces; they are friendly brotherly forces invited by Lebanon, by the legitimate and constitutional Government of Lebanon. This action was even agreed to by the League of Arab States.

129. A third demand, as reported, was the establishment of a new order in Lebanon as part of any final

settlement, a new order. This expression reminds those of my age of the new order of the Third Reich, of the final solution. Now where are we heading? This is the epitome of arrogance, and the attainment of what Albert Einstein described as a "Leader State" is the goal of the neo-fascists in Tel Aviv.

130. The United States has encouraged Israel to the extent that Tel Aviv is the spoilt brat or the spoilt child of the United States.

131. Shamir, who now assumes the role of a foreign minister, in no ambiguous terms says that Israel will not leave the area it has conquered in Lebanon before a decision by the sides on the principles of the settlement. He said, "Israel's position is strong enough to resist having to accept any ideas—and that the USA knows: that it cannot get anything from Israel by applying pressure".

132. For all of us who watch television sometimes this statement, that the United States cannot tell Israel what to do—of course, not at this late stage, maybe—was reaffirmed.

133. This is a special session on disarmament, and when one speaks of disarmament, one does not speak about the tools of death and the instruments of destruction, but about the men and women who manipulate innocent lives and promote their own aims. A pistol or a dagger, a cluster bomb or a home-made Molotov cocktail are lethal, but such tools can and must be judged by the purpose for which they are utilized. A cluster or fragmentation bomb dropped on a refugee camp and killing innocent children should be condemned and banned. A dagger, a small machine-gun or even a heavier gun in the hands of a people fighting for its liberation, for its survival, for regaining its rights should be made accessible and should be guaranteed.

134. The Zionist policy, since its inception, has been built on the principle of force and therefore of arms. Jabotinsky, one of the founding fathers, talks of the iron-fist policy which would characterize the nature of the envisaged State. We have discussed at length in this body and other international bodies the effects on human life that the iron-fist policy has had, but let us be reminded now of the character of Israel, an entity which has 30 per cent of its prime-age population in uniform full time and the remainder capable of being mobilized rapidly from the reserves. Perhaps this is not impressive to you. But if we were to apply those same percentage figures to the population of the United States, we would reach the figures of 13 million United States citizens continuously under arms and 60 million more as reservists. I think that would alarm most of the world. The Zionist State—that little State that they talk of—must be committed to the use of force since it has at least 3,500 tanks, 8,000 armoured vehicles, 622 combat aircraft, 1,900 pieces of artillery, three submarines, two corvettes and over 25 rocket-firing patrol boats. In the year 1982, it expects to raise military expenditure by at least 40 per cent and possibly more to accelerate its campaign of extermination against the Palestinian people. Let us be reminded now that there is not one country in the world today which spends a greater percentage of its gross national product on the military than Israel, which spends something like 40 or 45 per cent. Its per capita

expenditure is the second highest in the world. Its external debt—a country with almost four million people—due to military expenditure alone exceeds \$16 billion.

135. Israel has very little to offer a peace-loving world. These past few years have seen numerous wars, both international and civil, and the consolidation of military States. During this time the Zionist entity has found it important to increase taxation on its population and to exploit the Palestinians under occupation. To man their garrison they have had to maintain economic policies which result not only in extraordinary high unemployment rates but also inflation rates of up to 200 per cent per year. Despite massive emigration from Israel, the unemployment rose from 1,500 per day in 1979 to almost 11,500 in 1981. Understandably, however, an estimated 300,000 Israeli citizens work in war-related industries—300,000 in a country of almost four million. To contend with this Israel has to face two options, and both have to be pursued simultaneously. The first is to increase the repression and exploitation of the people and lands occupied by force in 1967—and those people are my brothers, the Palestinians under occupation. The other option is to escalate arms sales abroad. Israel began this policy in a small way in 1973, and by 1977 it was exporting \$200 million worth of arms per year and by 1981 over \$1,250 million worth. They estimate that next year's figure will be \$2 billion. And they still speak about the ploughshare and the sword. I do not know where to draw the line of difference here. Israel has become the seventh largest arms exporter in the world.

136. Mr. Avraham Asheri, who is the Director General of the Ministry of Industry and Commerce, said on 13 April that a new industrial plan for consolidating control over the West Bank and Gaza is under way. There is already a garrison full of Zionist fanatics who, as armed civilians, indiscriminately murder large numbers of Palestinians, take the lands belonging to the Palestinians and continue to confiscate such lands in ever-increasing areas in order to provide space for factories which will be used for the production of sophisticated electronics for export. The surveillance device used to capture the black freedom fighter in South Africa is being produced in the Holy Land of Palestine under occupation. We ask how this can promote a peaceful world? We ask how it is that in the Negev, in occupied Palestinian territory, the nuclear experiments are carried out and, once those little missiles and those little bombs are produced, the experimentation station is in the Kalahari Desert, in occupied Namibia? Cannot one see how these are connected, how these are linked?

137. With regard to the second option—suppression, repression and confiscation—let me remind you that more acts of genocide in recent years are attributable to conventional, even primitive, arms than to nuclear arms, and so it is with this aspect that disarmament activity must first be concerned.

138. The Palestinian people knows what it means to be repressed, to be murdered, to be exiled, to be tortured. The Israelis are the masters of repression, murder, expulsion and torture. The world has rarely seen the like of such a horrifying State, which more

and more resembles Nazi Germany. The Zionist State aims not only to violate human rights, but actually to eliminate in its entirety one of the world's peoples, the Palestinian people.

139. Who can fail to see the hypocrisy in Israeli Defence Minister Ariel Sharon's radio announcement on IDF Radio on 7 March 1982, when he declared that Israel had "reached a state of affairs where . . . [it would] stop and check the arms race. We have no intention to add, in the 80s, even a single tank, even a single gun, or even a single aircraft." That statement came two months before the Reagan administration awarded its Zionist protégé 75 additional advanced F-16 fighter bombers. Now we can understand why Sharon said he would not produce them: he is getting them free, with American taxpayers' money.

140. Now, how can any human being remain passive to this, thus supporting such a deranged country? How can anyone be fooled into thinking that the Zionist entity is acting in self-defence when it is spreading its murderous methods to other parts of an already unstable third world? This military might which it uses against the Palestinian people under occupation and in exile will be used to eliminate absolutely the existence of at least one and possibly many nations in the world. And the Israelis will try to do it with conventional arms. That is why it is necessary to promote conventional disarmament globally. These arms threaten the third world in a much more visible way than nuclear arms do.

141. On 17 June 1982 the Deputy Director of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO] office in Rome was murdered; a Lebanese student in Rome was also assassinated. According to the *New York Post*, a splinter group of an organization called the JDL claimed responsibility for both terrorist crimes, and the claim emanated from New York. We have not heard of a denial; we have not heard of a disavowal; we have not heard of a condemnation of these crimes. But we do not hold responsible the citizens of Rome or the ethnic group to which these murderers belong. We trust that the authorities in Italy will apprehend the criminals and take legal action in accordance with Italian criminal procedure. At this I think it important to inform the General Assembly that the Palestine National Council, at its meeting on 19 April 1981, adopted the following decision:

"The Council strongly condemns terrorism and international terrorism, particularly organized official Zionist terrorism against the Palestinian people and the Palestine Liberation Organization and against the Lebanese people. The Council condemns American imperialist acts of terrorism against liberation movements in the world."

If I may, I should like to read out this decision in Arabic.

[The speaker read the decision again in Arabic.]

142. The junta in Tel Aviv tells us clearly that the aim is to eradicate the PLO. And here let me make it clear that, in order to eradicate the PLO, Israel will have to eliminate or exterminate the Palestinian people, because the PLO is the Palestinian people, and what the international community has to deal with is the future of the Palestinian people. The core of the conflict,

as the Assembly has repeatedly asserted, is the question of Palestine and the future of the Palestinian people. The presence of us Palestinians in Lebanon is not by our choice; it is a result of the brutalities and atrocities that forced us to seek refuge in the brotherly State of Lebanon.

143. Our presence and our activities in Lebanon are regulated by treaties ratified by the Lebanese Parliament. We are committed to honour those treaties, and only the legitimate constitutional authorities in Lebanon can address this issue with the Palestine Liberation Organization—and no one else.

144. In addition to the bilateral treaties, the Palestine Liberation Organization honours its commitments to the decisions of the Arab summit meetings, and particularly those decisions relevant to our temporary presence in Lebanon—temporary, I say, because we are there temporarily until we return to our homes and property in Palestine.

145. To eradicate the PLO is the declared aim of the Zionist junta in Tel Aviv, but I declare here that the Palestinian people will not consent to an accommodation; we shall resist any and all attempts to eradicate our people; we shall fight by all means to guarantee our survival. The rights of self-defence and survival are inalienable and sacred and apply to all peoples—not only States, but peoples—without selectivity or discrimination.

146. A preliminary assessment of damages resulting from the Israeli holocaust in the year 1982—more than 40 years after the Nazi holocaust—were reported to the Secretary-General in a letter dated 16 June from Chairman Arafat. With your permission, Mr. President, I shall read out parts of that letter.

[The speaker continued in Arabic (interpretation from Arabic).]

"Thirty thousand Lebanese have been killed or wounded, 10,000 have been lost, 800,000 have become refugees, 14 refugee camps have been completely destroyed, three major Lebanese cities have been levelled: Tyre, Sidon and Nabatiyeh. Apart from the destruction of scores of other Lebanese villages and towns, we would cite the disruption of the lives, and interference with the vital needs, of the citizens; the destruction of hospitals, schools, water outlets and electricity supply.

"We appeal to the United Nations to call a halt to this fascist criminal invasion, and for a complete, immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces in accordance with Security Council resolution 509 (1982).

"I call on the United Nations to send, as a matter of urgency, a high-level international mission to investigate the crimes committed by the fascist forces of the Israeli invaders, who are continuing to commit these crimes. The world should know the horrors of the crimes that have been and still are being committed in Lebanon against the Lebanese and the Palestinians. This enemy, despite the declaration twice of a cease-fire, continues to carry out military operations daily, and its forces continue to make incursions into Lebanese territory. Beirut and even the Presidential Palace have been besieged by them."

[*The speaker continued in English.*]

147. Despite all the news we hear about a cease-fire, fighting, shelling, including shelling by warships, and bombing are still continuing in Beirut and areas of south Lebanon. The siege of Beirut is becoming more and more severe and the battle more and more fierce. This is an omen that this might lead to a massacre. I appeal to the Assembly for immediate action to be taken to stop this onslaught. However, on our side we are determined to survive and to defend our rights and our children. We shall never allow the aggressors to reap the fruits of their aggression.

148. The Palestine Liberation Organization, which has been invited here as the representative of the Palestinian people, has accepted and agreed to implement the resolutions of the United Nations relating to the question of Palestine. To our mind, this is the only road to peace. On 20 March 1977 our National Council affirmed

“The right of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in all international conferences, forums and efforts concerned with the Palestine question and with the Arab-Zionist conflict, on an independent and equal footing, with the aim of

achieving our inalienable national rights as recognized by the United Nations General Assembly in 1974, particularly in resolution 3236 (XXIX).”

149. This is an appeal to the international community and, at the same time, a challenge to those who obstruct sincere endeavours for peace.

150. If it is peace the Assembly is after, then this is the time to take a stand.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.

NOTES

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 21, No. 324 (a), p. 93.

² *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1982*, document S/14919, annex.

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 326.

⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43.

⁵ *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1).

⁶ “Common Security: a programme for disarmament” (A/CN.10/38. See also A/CN.10/51).