



President: Mr. Lazar MOJSOV (Yugoslavia).

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. BOYA (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, my delegation once again extends its warm congratulations to you—and also to the other officers—on your election to guide the work of this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Your great qualities as an able and experienced diplomat, which we have been able to appreciate during recent sessions, are a sure guarantee of the success which, the delegation of Benin hopes, will crown the work of this session.

2. I take this opportunity also to express to Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, my delegation's appreciation of the skill, mastery and tact of which he gave proof throughout the work of that Committee. I wish to pay a special tribute to the Preparatory Committee for the efforts it made; the results of its work at the meetings in February and March were decisive for the holding of the present session. The special role played by the non-aligned countries in the convening of this special session and their open and active co-operation in the Committee are proof of the vital importance they attach to the problem of disarmament.

3. This is the first time since the founding of this Organization that an opportunity has been given to the entire international community to participate in a special debate on disarmament. The number of eminent and illustrious statesmen participating in this session proves it to be a very important historical event which goes beyond the normal routines of the First Committee or the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

4. That is why, in our opinion, the objective of the present session is not to adopt texts which will never be applied, but to examine and place in perspective honestly the principal problems relating to the unbridled arms race. The establishment and understanding of those problems will increase awareness of the danger to international peace and security represented by the stockpiling of arms, and the need for everybody to start on the road to general and complete disarmament.

5. The international situation is very tense at present. The region most affected by that tension is our continent, Africa. The principal cause of that ever-increasing tension

is the firm determination of the imperialist Powers to endanger, in their own purely selfish interests, international peace and the security of States, in particular the smallest States which have almost no means of defence.

6. Those among these States which are determined to follow a policy of national independence in order to rid themselves of foreign domination and economic exploitation are daily at the mercy of imperialist threats and aggression.

7. Thus, on 16 January 1977, a horde of mercenaries equipped with very sophisticated weapons savagely attacked the town of Cotonou, the capital of my country. The objective was clear: to carry out the colonial reconquest of our country, the People's Republic of Benin. The people of Benin, who love freedom and independence, attacked the army of mercenaries, although our people were armed only with staves and machetes. Our patriotic armed forces broke through, forged ahead and forced the mercenaries to retreat after hard fighting lasting three hours.

8. Just suppose for a single minute that we had not had this minimum means of defence to repulse the mercenary aggressors, our people would have been massacred, our country reconquered, our independence and our freedom confiscated for the benefit of sordid imperialist interests.

9. Our victory over the mercenary army, of course, was not complete. We suffered half a defeat, since the routed army was able to escape in the aircraft which had transported it. We could only repulse the aggression of the mercenaries using very rudimentary weapons. We had no anti-aircraft defence to bring down that plane, which before leaving had flown over the town of Cotonou, which was terrorized. Nor did we have fighter planes to chase and bring down the plane in flight; the plane of the mercenaries therefore disappeared with impunity from the place where it had landed. If at the time of that barbarous aggression we had had a minimum of proper equipment, the mercenary army would have been totally captured or wiped out.

10. That aggression of Sunday, 16 January 1977, and the new threats of aggression against our security have forced us to engage in an arms race and compelled us to seek more effective means to ensure the protection of our peoples. Since that time we have diverted to security and civilian protection a large part of the scant resources we had earlier set aside for economic and social development projects.

11. Thus, international imperialism has imposed on our country, the People's Republic of Benin, as it has done on

the Socialist countries of Europe and other progressive and anti-imperialist countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa, an arms race, involving us in costly research into military techniques for self-defence and protection.

12. Many previous speakers here have already stressed that the world today is over-armed. This is no isolated phenomenon, when we consider that in 1977 \$400 thousand million were swallowed up by arms. The present state of over-arming is connected with all the manipulations of international imperialism, which is perfecting its means of political domination and economic exploitation. The racist régimes installed in Africa and elsewhere in the world, together with the conservative pro-imperialist régimes, are overarmed and have highly sophisticated weapons for mass destruction.

13. In the face of this situation the only possible alternative for the progressive countries, which are the targets of imperialist Powers, is to do everything possible to survive by acquiring arms. The arms race derives directly from the threats and aggression of international imperialism. That is the truth and we must have the courage to say it aloud.

14. Among the areas of tension which are most dangerous for the peace and security of States today we must mention those existing in Africa, our dear and beautiful continent. The designs of imperialism on our continent are no longer a secret to anyone. It is a matter of trying to keep for themselves, through terror of arms, the enormous mineral resources which lie hidden within the continent, together with effective control of strategic points to ensure that our raw materials can get safely to Europe and North America.

15. Some North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Powers are all the more active in this systematic plundering policy because they are cynical enough to pose as defenders of Africa. They try to impose on Africa an unnatural military alliance under NATO control. The creation of this alliance, and military intervention designed to protect corrupt régimes condemned to disappear, can only worsen the present situation. For our part, we are convinced that these neo-colonial Powers chosen by NATO to play the rôle of conductor for the new adventures of colonial reconquest in Africa will inevitably fail. Their policy calls into question the principles of peaceful coexistence, of living side by side with respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of countries with different socio-economic systems.

16. International imperialism has created the psychological conditions which have caused the present state of over-arming. This death industry is a flourishing one, and the capitalist West has brought it to such a high degree of perfection that reconversion could not be carried out without some gnashing of teeth.

17. Similarly, international imperialism and the NATO forces are responsible for the degree of sophistication existing in the means of mass destruction throughout the world. Following the atomic bomb used at Hiroshima and all its tragic consequences, there is a new scientific

achievement of imperialism, the so-called "clean bomb", the neutron bomb. Why then should we be surprised if the other side, feeling directly threatened in the long term, should look now for the appropriate means to take up the challenge of the neutron bomb in order to maintain the balance of terror? It is a vicious circle.

18. For 30 years no concrete result has been obtained in the field of disarmament, the main objective of the Charter of the Organization after a very bloody war, and that is because no one has wanted to face facts and accept the responsibilities deriving from them. This is a unique occasion to look at problems as they are.

19. My delegation, like many others which have spoken before it, feels that this special session must be the point of departure for real and significant progress towards disarmament. This session must break with the practice of honeyed words, which have no aim other than to lull to sleep the conscience of the peoples of the world, and must proceed to specific measures with a view to disarmament. To achieve that, every delegation has the obligation henceforward to see that its actions do not belie its words.

20. Those who proclaim from the housetops that they have helped Africa to emerge from the black night of colonialism, and that it was only their great-grandfathers who were colonialists and were responsible for all the atrocities and sufferings imposed on Africans, have an obligation to future generations to keep faith by respecting, absolutely unconditionally, the individual security of small defenceless States such as my own. "Daddy's" Africa has gone forever. The African peoples are fully aware of the misdeeds of colonialism and those among them who have thrown out colonialism and neo-colonialism know very well that the fundamental characteristic and the prime source of their backwardness lies in foreign domination, whatever its source. They do not want to fall between Scylla and Charybdis; that is why the only sure way to real disarmament is for the imperialist Powers first and foremost to give up their paternalistic and feudal outlook.

21. The principle of unconditional respect for the individual security of States, particularly of the smallest and most disadvantaged States, will allow for no compromise. This principle implies the following corollaries: the non-use of force against these States; no political interference in their internal affairs; respect for their territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence and for their political orientation; and respect for their non-aligned status.

22. We know perfectly well that the imperialist States recognize those principles only to the extent that they pay lip service to them and have no hesitation in infringing them for their own selfish interests, which have nothing to do with the true interests of these States. Such infringement can only result in a hardening of positions, making disarmament impossible.

23. Henceforth, what we want is a solemn commitment from the imperialist States that they are prepared to respect all of these principles so closely linked to the internal security of each State. As long as imperialism persists in its re-

fusal to respect those principles, general and complete disarmament will remain empty words.

24. The second principle that I should like to stress is that of respect for the collective security of States in any given geo-political grouping. That principle implies that there will be no attempt to establish zones of influence or to divide the world into spheres of influence. It may be of use to stress here the dangerous consequences of the selfish policy which has already had a very detrimental effect upon peace and justice-loving peoples, especially in Africa, where arbitrary colonial demarcation of boundaries has been imposed.

25. The true instigator and persistent advocate of the political dividing up of the world is international imperialism with its terrifying machine, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Its policy is at present threatening our continent, and we condemn it utterly, because in the name of this policy of sharing, so dear to imperialist Powers, armed interventions have been made in support of unpopular and corrupt régimes.

26. By scrupulous respect for the principles which we have just mentioned, the Western Powers would prove their sincere desire to help in building a new world free from war. They could relieve the developing countries of a heavy burden, enabling them to divert their meagre resources devoted to military ends to the prior objectives of the welfare of their people.

27. In our view, the convening of this special session, devoted to disarmament, represents a positive step in so far as it is a stage in redefining the strategy of development, therefore the principle of disarmament will be beneficial to the development of the third world and will improve living conditions for all mankind throughout the world. The dual aspect of disarmament and development is essential and this special session must emphasize that point.

28. The struggle to end the arms race would be useless and would be a waste of time and energy unless there were positive results in better living conditions for three quarters of the people in the world who are still suffering. In the present socio-economic context, with the existing evils clouding the horizon, there is no hope for a better future.

29. When we consider that States Members of the Organization swallow up approximately \$400 thousand million annually in inventing, manufacturing and perfecting sophisticated military equipment, one may well ask where this world of animals supposedly endowed with reason is leading to. In the meanwhile, it is a tragedy that the aims of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade [*resolution 2626 (XXV)*], which were certainly not ambitious, are far from being attained. During the first half of the Decade, from 1971 to 1975, official aid for development from the developed market-economy countries amounted to only 0.32 per cent of their gross national product, which did not even achieve 60 per cent of the objective of 0.70 per cent which was laid down in the International Development Strategy. To attain that objective, it would have sufficed to have

given the equivalent of only 5 per cent of military expenditure to development assistance. What substance can be given to a programme of action to establish a new international economic order and to the spirit of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States if disarmament which, since the end of the Second World War, has become the alpha and omega of development, is not approached honestly? Disarmament is not a matter for the super-Powers, or for certain arms salesmen. It concerns the whole of the international community, which is afloat the same drifting vessel, a vessel which threatens ruin; and if we are not careful, the human odyssey will be cut short, because its course will have been charted through dangerous waters infested with devices supposedly designed for its protection. Certainly we have the means to avoid this holocaust; it is simply a matter of having the courage and the will to do so.

30. My country, the People's Republic of Benin, has a deep-rooted desire for peace. Here I should like to declare the readiness of my country to struggle to bring about total and comprehensive disarmament which is essential for peace, international security and co-operation. Clearly, it would be vain to expect the military Powers simply to renounce their prerogatives. In their rivalry for zones of influence and their struggle to safeguard their sordid interests lie the only reasons for perpetuating this vicious circle. Nevertheless, I think that co-operation and dialogue must be pursued and that the existing negotiating bodies should be restructured. This session should be the place to make it possible to go beyond statements and recommendations adopted by the General Assembly, to the stage of practical action and the adoption of effective decisions and specific measures on disarmament.

31. Finally, I should like to express the hope that the historic importance of this session will be properly assessed. We must believe that it will engender a new attitude free of the spirit of intransigence and selfishness, which unfortunately has always pervaded the preceding negotiations between the military and nuclear Powers. It is our bounden duty to ensure through our efforts that a more just world will emerge, one in which confidence will replace mistrust, individualism will give way to co-operation and international solidarity, and a true haven of peace and security will come about, otherwise we shall have to answer for our failure to future generations and to history. It is a wager, but we have no right to lose it.

32. Mr. KHALATBARY (Iran): Sir, it is a source of great pleasure for me to extend our greetings to you upon your election as President of this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We already had occasion, during the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, to appreciate your remarkable talents and profound understanding of the issues before us. With your dedication to the goals of disarmament and with your experienced guidance, we can hope to achieve constructive and positive results. I should like to take this opportunity also to convey my delegation's gratitude to the Secretary-General for his inspiring address at the opening meeting of this session.

33. This special session is by far the most important and representative gathering ever held on disarmament. But by no means is this a new subject. History bears witness to the underlying phenomenon that, along with man's drive towards a life more meaningful in both style and substance, violence and destruction have existed with the positive features of man's society. To alleviate this condition man has resorted to measures that have allowed him the necessary security, and in instances where this security has appeared endangered, man has resorted to force. Yet in every case humanity has had another opportunity to return to a somewhat pacific and human manner of life.

34. I submit to this world assembly that, given the new dimensions and sophistication of armaments, modern man no longer has a guarantee that he will be able to return to a normal life after heightened conflict and warfare. The effectiveness of the ultimate and advanced tools of destruction against a background of growing insecurity and conflict potentialities may very well render, in the case of total warfare, victor and vanquished indistinguishable. It is in such circumstances of danger and hazard, then, that we whole-heartedly welcome the opportunity presented by this special session to seek practical solutions to this risky state of affairs. The moment being ripe for a special session, we look to this Assembly to provide new avenues towards the solution of problems of disarmament. We sincerely hope that after 30 years of dragging negotiations, which apparently have been accepted as inevitable, it will be possible to renew and accelerate our efforts.

35. I should like to stress from the very outset that in the consideration of any meaningful disarmament efforts, two cardinal elements must constantly be borne in mind. The first relates to the unique roles and responsibilities of the largest Powers, particularly the United States and the Soviet Union, in any viable disarmament endeavour aimed at halting the spiralling nuclear and conventional arms race. Although these two super-Powers have in fact acknowledged their responsibility by engaging in the bilateral negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms, their stockpiles have remained untouched. The absence of a meaningful agreement for the reduction of the level of nuclear weapons cannot justify the production of as many nuclear weapons as possible. For it is, as preceding speakers have repeatedly stressed, the arms race between the largest Powers which is the principal driving force behind the world-wide arms build-up. This also represents the largest diversion of resources and the most devastating danger. It should be recalled that nearly a third of all the scientific and technological manpower and research expenditures of the industrial Powers is geared to military purposes and that a very few industrial countries account for three fourths of the total world military spending. Concurrently, in the more than three decades of the nuclear age, the accumulation and modernization of nuclear weaponry has progressed at an alarming pace and at an even more alarming human and material cost. At the other end of the spectrum, the spread of conventional weapons continues both in quality and in quantity. Therefore, when the realities of the arms race picture are combined, it becomes clear that any meaningful disarmament should begin with those countries possessing the technological and economic

means to produce, increase and make more sophisticated their nuclear and conventional arsenals.

36. The second inalienable element of a workable and real disarmament approach deals with a more general topic: the international security system and its various intricacies as related to disarmament. For it is obvious that the lack of progress in the field of disarmament has been to a large extent a response to a world security system that, as a result of its short-comings, helps to perpetuate an international situation fraught with dangers and threats to peace. This understandable yet unfortunate fact has affected nearly all national defence postures and policies. As long as a climate of trust and confidence between States is not created, countries will continue to arm themselves. Global peace, then, has much to do with the level of security or the state of insecurity perceived by States, which in turn influences the level of armaments. Thus, disarmament progress is directly related to an adequate international security system. It is only when nations perceive the growing ability of a world system to maintain security that we can hope to prevent reliance on increasing quantities of armaments. Trust between nations complemented by effective instruments for peaceful settlement of international disputes and well-organized peace-keeping forces is the only alternative to the armaments race.

37. The United Nations, although often hampered in the execution of its essential duties, has a distinct responsibility for disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security. Its peace-making powers and peace-keeping capabilities should be strengthened, and greater attention should be given to the implementation of the various provisions of its Charter.

38. I have just described the two main elements that we believe should serve as pillars for an effective global disarmament policy. However, allow me to dwell for a moment on the realistic and specific issues that will have to be dealt with by this session if our efforts are not to be in vain. Needless to say, there is no shortage of proposals for arms limitations. It is unlikely that any startling new approach will suddenly make disarmament possible. The special session must therefore serve to bring together all the elements of the picture by providing a common approach supported by all the Members of the United Nations. Its first purpose should be to obtain, by their presence and contributions, the unqualified commitment of all Governments to disarmament goals.

39. The special session should also single out measures that have been amply discussed and are ready for agreement, and towards whose implementation the necessary steps can be taken. In addition, it can establish a future perspective in disarmament measures, looking ahead to the next stages of negotiations.

40. Parallel to such efforts, the special session cannot, in its deliberations on disarmament policy, underestimate the potential role of confidence-building measures in facilitating the arms control process and in attaining its goal of general and complete disarmament. Just as past arms control agreements, even though limited, have provided the

international community with incentive and confidence towards arms control ends, new treaties should inspire even greater trust and confidence, particularly in the light of the world consciousness of the need for disarmament that the convening of this session has sought to enhance.

41. Thus the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty, which for two decades has been considered a symbol of the determination of nuclear-weapon States to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race, would be a very positive step towards the re-establishment of a climate of confidence and security.

42. Concurrently, a convention to prohibit the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons should quickly be agreed upon. These inhumane and indiscriminate weapons, while existing in the stockpiles of some States, have not yet become part of their active defence panoply. Let us act swiftly before they too become indispensable and before other countries seek their acquisition. An additional confidence-building measure of significant dimensions could be applied to the ongoing qualitative improvements in war arsenals. In this light, the proposal to prohibit new types of weapons of mass destruction, or systems of such weapons, is certainly one that merits careful study.

43. Nevertheless, the all-important quest to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons looms within all negotiations. If we have been spared nuclear war by the precarious system of mutual deterrence, we have not lived without conflict, especially in non-nuclear areas. Every effort must be made to prevent the introduction of nuclear weapons into these conflicts. The first step in this direction is the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], which remains the most effective brake on nuclear proliferation. Its conclusion, in 1968, represented a serious effort to prevent the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. It also provided for an internationally enclosed setting to facilitate the exchange of scientific and technological knowledge towards the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The further success of the Treaty depends on the development of an atmosphere of growing international confidence and trust. One approach to non-proliferation has been the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

44. As the sponsor of the proposal for such a zone in the Middle East, Iran has actively sought the establishment of one in that area to avert the dangers of rapid and uncontrolled diffusion of nuclear technology and the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the dangerous atmosphere there. The global fear of nuclear weapons proliferation has been heightened in the face of the possibility of peaceful nuclear technology being adopted for military purposes. We believe that additional efforts should be exerted, at regional and international levels, both to facilitate the rational use of nuclear energy and to allay reasonable fears of nuclear arms proliferation.

45. The role of disarmament machinery must also be considered as significant in disarmament exercises. Understandably, there has been some criticism of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Even though it has

been able to make limited progress, we welcome proposals such as the replacement of the Committee's co-chairmanship system in order to bring all the nuclear Powers into the disarmament talks and to lend greater viability to potential disarmament agreements.

46. In the same vein, we would support strongly suggestions for the more extensive involvement of the United Nations in disarmament talks. There is no doubt that the world body should have a larger role in the deliberations in order to ensure that the interests of all Member States are considered. We are also willing to take into consideration the various suggestions concerning the creation of additional United Nations bodies in the disarmament field.

47. Finally, one would be greatly at fault in conceiving and considering problems of international security without linking them duly with the socio-economic realities of today. Disarmament and development have preoccupied the international community constantly since the Second World War. The Members of the United Nations are committed to pursue, on one hand, disarmament and, on the other, development, each in its own right. But the fact of their intricate links must be forcefully registered with the international community, and the necessity to determine those appropriate links in disarmament processes should receive full recognition. If the industrial world continues to allocate enormous resources for military purposes the much-sought new international economic order stands little chance of success. Conversely, international peace and security cannot, in the long run, be preserved in a world where countries and nations are separated by wide and growing gaps.

48. The near-monopoly of the major Powers in military research, development and supply places upon them a special responsibility in the reallocation and transfer of real resources towards global development purposes, and in the formulation and implementation of concrete action towards the goal of general and complete disarmament.

49. To conclude, I want to express the hope that the special session will be able to take a fresh and imaginative look at the underlying causes of the arms race and to explore new approaches towards disarmament. A new strategy for disarmament, based on a thorough assessment of the problems involved, persuasive in concept and workable in application, should be elaborated. The strategy must be comprehensive enough to ensure a fair and equitable response to the concerns of every country, and flexible enough to permit taking realistic and concrete steps in the immediate future, and in the intermediate and final stages of disarmament. In short, we are here to rededicate ourselves to a concerted effort in the direction of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, and to initiate a new process conducive to serious negotiations aimed at forging a consensus towards this end.

50. It is in this spirit that the Iranian delegation is participating in these deliberations, seeking an answer to our common goal: a world free from the menace of war.

51. Mr. KARUHJE (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, your election to the presidency of

this tenth special session of the General Assembly, which is unique in the annals of the Organization, is a tribute to and recognition of your distinguished diplomatic and statesmanlike qualities, qualities to which we had the pleasure of paying a tribute during the thirty-second regular session and also at the eighth and ninth special sessions. It is a record of the confidence which the international community has placed in you.

52. It is also a further act of tribute to your highly respected country, Yugoslavia, whose vast contribution to peace and international security require no further demonstration. Suffice it to recall that the purpose of this session was conceived at Belgrade by the non-aligned countries, of which your country continues to be the standard bearer.

53. Your responsibility is particularly great at this moment in the history of the world when peoples and States are waiting for the international community as a whole to restore a climate of confidence in place of the threat which we all feel looms over us.

54. Our Organization, which was born of the smouldering embers of two world wars, is very well placed to seize an historic occasion such as this in order to open the one-way road to general and complete disarmament. It is only through the action of an international organization like this that the outlawing of arms of mass destruction, such as exist today, can be possible. Humanity is on the brink of total catastrophe; we must halt and about turn in order to find the road to peace and survival.

55. Ever since the signing of the Charter in which "to maintain international peace and security" was proclaimed as the ultimate goal, the Organization has included control of armaments among its priorities, in the hope that the will of the leaders of nations would comply with the demands of reason, that is to say, general and complete disarmament. But, unfortunately, in the name of national security and the security of allies an unbridled arms race has come into being, deliberately ignoring the fact that this amassing of arms is a threat to the peace and security of the peoples. This pretext does not always succeed in concealing ambitions of hegemony.

56. At the point we have reached today we can only wonder whether the accumulated potential for destruction is still in keeping with the reasonable need for security. No, it is the desire for superiority and advantage over one's neighbour, who, on highly subjective grounds, is considered as a threat, which has given rise to this senseless competition for the production of devices, each more lethal than the last which people are afraid to give up today.

57. However, in 1959 the General Assembly, in its resolution 1378 (XIV), unanimously recommended general and complete disarmament. What has been the record in this area since that time?

58. My delegation concedes that partial measures have been taken, particularly through negotiations on the limitation of the arms race and control of nuclear weapons, but

there have been very few concrete results in the field of disarmament, once a balance of force has been achieved which people hoped to preserve—incidentally more by mutual terror than by any kind of moral restraint.

59. This is not the solution hoped for by humanity, confronted by the heavy burden of the world's arsenals, in terms both of their quantity and their quality.

60. Why have the discussions which have taken place and which are still going on, particularly among the major Powers, not yet led to the results expected from them?

61. In the view of my delegation, the often intransigent tone adopted suggests a desire for confrontation rather than for conciliation and tolerance, for conflict of interest rather than the genuine will to co-operate in solving the problem of disarmament. Because, indeed, each party seems to be clinging to his wish to see the other party let go of what he considers to be particularly threatening to himself. Each suspects the other of wishing to deceive, and refuses any treaty which seems unequal. The consequence is that in spite of argument and discussion, extreme viewpoints are maintained.

62. Then again, in certain cases, it is just a matter of a deal between the great Powers, which has no effect on neutral States or on the middle-sized Powers which do not feel committed by treaties or agreements signed bilaterally.

63. We are adrift in a sea of half-truths and incomplete statements and this creates an atmosphere of illusion. My delegation hopes that this special session will serve to clarify this situation so that all States feel morally compelled to accept that the principle of disarmament is universal and that all must respect it without prejudice to their own security.

64. With respect to the problem of security, my delegation feels that every country is itself responsible for its own security. This presupposes the right of each State, whenever the need arises, to have recourse to the assistance of friendly countries if its security is particularly threatened and it is not in a position to stand up to the threat. This right is not subject to any discrimination. Indeed, we do not approve of the formation of alliances and military blocs, particularly in Africa, because this does not serve the cause of peace and peaceful co-existence among States, still less the cause of disarmament.

65. This session gives us a particularly good opportunity for reflection which, after we have sincerely taken stock and searched our souls, will make it possible to start again from scratch on a new basis that will require initiatives and political decisions devoid of false ideas, which are sometimes maintained deliberately, as to the threats posed by our neighbours.

66. If the potential of States in terms of arms immediately evokes absolute catastrophe and the total destruction of our planet, that is not because men have become more bellicose, nor because of the nature of their régimes, nor because the stakes have become higher, but because of the very nature of the arms now available.

67. In this context I wish particularly to mention the stockpiles of weapons now available, the destructive potential of which is such that it could destroy our planet several times over.

68. After the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki the world was entitled to expect a little more wisdom. But nuclear deterrence as a means of prevailing upon an adversary to capitulate unconditionally has become the cornerstone of the foreign policies of the great Powers, to be followed very soon by other Powers. Today even those countries which have an urgent need for so much in terms of resources in order to accelerate their economic and social development are clamouring for entry into the atomic club. A disguised but none the less apparent encouragement of nuclear proliferation is becoming manifest today in the guise of the peaceful use of atomic energy in the form of the distribution of nuclear power stations, and of uranium but only to countries whose friendship is considered unswerving. In itself, this discrimination between those who are worthy of peaceful use of atomic energy and those who are not is symptomatic of a certain strategy of alliances.

69. The distressing example of racist South Africa, which now poses the gravest nuclear threat to the African continent, may spread. How can we be surprised, then, by ominous predictions that in less than 10 years dozens of countries will have achieved nuclear capacity?

70. All this only serves to increase the danger of a nuclear war, even a limited one, as soon as several States possess these weapons, because in the end we always wage the war for which we are preparing even if we hope it will not take place. We have no sound basis for assessing the development of wills, the behaviour of leaders and the vital interests of persons and nations.

71. The only certainty suggested to us by wisdom and reason is the elimination of nuclear weapons in order to avoid the risk of nuclear war.

72. By way of reassurance we are told that a balance of mutual terror has been achieved. According to this argumentation a nuclear war is impossible because there would be mutual total annihilation of the belligerents and no victor or vanquished. But where is this balance which cannot be disturbed? In certain military staffs it is already considered that a non-atomic war is inconceivable in certain parts of the world, particularly in Europe, because a conventional war would not be sufficiently powerful to rebuff an enemy.

73. The technological evolution of ever more sophisticated new weapons is not likely to reassure us either. The development of the neutron bomb, which has given rise and continues to give rise to political controversies, is an illustration. This super-weapon, designed to ensure a decisive advantage for the first party to use it against an enemy, is an insult to mankind. Described as clean and peaceful and something which destroys only human life while preserving property, it is the final renunciation of all the values of the human person which the signers of the

Charter at San Francisco made the centre of the concerns of our Organization. The neutron bomb, like other nuclear weapons, must be banned if we really want to bring about nuclear disarmament.

74. That is the point to which strategic thinking of this kind has led States. Military technology has followed, but today we do not know how political events will develop. If we stop to count the cruise missiles or nuclear submarines or means of delivery which should be kept, it will perhaps be too late to save our world from destruction. Even if there remained only two thermonuclear bombs in the world, there would be two too many.

75. The objective of our Organization is to devote every day to building a new world that will banish war, poverty, ignorance and disease.

76. The accumulation of armaments, conventional or nuclear, not only jeopardizes the peace and security of peoples in the case of war but is also a problem of every-day survival for a thousand million of men, women and children who today are the victims of hunger and await an only too probable early death, while every day a thousand million of dollars are spent to build and stockpile destructive devices.

77. President Eisenhower, who contributed so much to the crushing of Hitlerite fascism through the use of arms, in 1953 issued this moving appeal to the United States and at the same time, I am sure, to the world:

“Every gun that is manufactured, every warship that is launched, every missile that is ignited in the final analysis means robbing those who are hungry and do not have enough food, who are cold and cannot find enough clothing.

“This world which is arming itself is not spending only money, it is also spending the sweat of its workers, the ingenuity of its scientists and the hopes of its children.”

It appears that that warning has not met with the response we should have liked to see, since today we stand petrified as we witness the astronomical cost, unimaginable for poor countries such as my own, of somewhere in the region of \$400 thousand million, while 400,000 highly qualified specialists are busy inventing and manufacturing these death-dealing contrivances.

78. This waste of human and financial resources is disgusting and seriously jeopardizes the possibility of establishing a new international economic order because it helps to perpetuate injustice and inequality between developed and developing countries. How, indeed, can we serve peace and justice in the world while the total aid to development remains below 20 per cent of military expenditures? How can we speak of peace and international security when the equivalent of the annual expenditure on peace-keeping forces in the world is spent in just three hours for military equipment of all kinds to be sent to belligerents in disturbed areas? How can we, indeed, speak sincerely of peace and social justice while military expend-

itures exceed by 8 per cent the annual expenditures of all Governments for the education of a billion children of school age or amount to more than double the world expenditures on health care for two billion people?

79. These figures, which have been mentioned here at least 100 times over the last two weeks, should give food for thought to all Governments involved in this unnatural armaments race and persuade them to take the necessary political decisions to convert these expenditures on death into funds spent on life through development and social policy.

80. Since the beginning of the special session, distinguished statesmen have followed each other to this rostrum to denounce the evil and dangers of armaments and to propose solutions, some more concrete and more acceptable than others. My delegation makes no claim to be announcing any new proposals. But the proposal so keenly awaited, the proposal which, had it been made, would have received the unanimous approval of this Assembly, would have been a solemn undertaking to embark upon disarmament immediately, even progressive disarmament, with no "ifs" or "buts", whether from a large or a small country. That proposal was not forthcoming, but we dare to hope that it will be the end result of all those put forward here so far.

81. This special session is of particular significance because it responds to the wishes of world public opinion, in the small States as well as in the large. That public opinion comprises equally those who have themselves suffered atrociously the effects of armaments, both conventional and nuclear, and distinguished statesmen who cannot be suspected of failing to understand the complexity of the problems.

82. It is therefore imperative to listen and to act, with sincerity and courage. The results of this session will be a test of the political goodwill of all States, particularly the over-armed States, which alone are responsible for the present situation and capable of giving us a guarantee of peace and security.

83. Mr. TALBOYS (New Zealand): Mr. President, I am honoured on behalf of the Government and people of New Zealand to address this special session on disarmament under your distinguished presidency. The attention of the world is focused on this gathering. What happens here during these five weeks will determine the course of the disarmament process for years to come. It is our profound hope, therefore, that the session, under your wise and able guidance, will prove to be a landmark, a turning-point, for mankind.

84. Thirty-three years ago we were brought into the nuclear age with the Los Alamos experiment. Within weeks that new-found power had been put to devastating military use. Since then, mankind has teetered on the brink of nuclear catastrophe, conscious of the possibility of a catastrophic end but unwilling to restrain the menace mankind itself had created. The courageous and far-reaching plans that were designed to lift us above the threat, such as those

of the late 1940s and the early 1960s, foundered on scepticism and mistrust. The limited, partial measures intended to take us down a more realistic road to a common security became ensnared in their own complexities. Thus our achievements have been modest: a partial agreement that prohibits nuclear testing in some environments; another aimed at containing the spread of nuclear weapons on conditions that some of the potential nuclear Powers have been reluctant to accept; another between the two major Powers placing numerical ceilings on strategic force levels; others which prohibit deployment of nuclear weapons in areas of the world where they have not hitherto been deployed or which proscribe esoteric means of warfare of doubtful efficacy. So far, therefore, in the real sense of the term, the first actual disarmament measure has yet to be taken.

85. New Zealand was a sponsor of the resolution convening the special session, sharing the conviction that a fresh approach was required. In this same forum eight months ago, I said that the world community confronted awesome problems which we human beings had created and which—we must believe—we human beings had the intelligence to solve, if we could only summon the will and forge the consensus. That challenge is before us today. Technology is outstripping our traditional institutions and the beliefs on which they were founded. The stability of our world community, our very survival, depends on whether or not we can evolve new systems and ways of achieving international order. The world will not long sustain a situation where peace turns on the avoidance of nuclear war simply because nuclear war is unthinkable. If it is unthinkable, it must be made impossible. That is our task.

86. There are, I believe, some hopeful signs. There is today a more general realization that security is not assured solely by military power—that policies of restraint, of arms control, of confidence-building are now essential to security. My country is small and isolated, with a limited ability to defend itself. We therefore seek our security in co-operation with friends. But we look forward to the day when general and complete disarmament is a realizable objective and security alliances are no longer required. It is important to keep that concept in our sights, as the ultimate stage of a long-term programme. We would welcome signs that the major Powers were reviving their interest in the blueprints discussed in the early 1960s. Meanwhile, we must focus on more immediately attainable goals.

87. Foremost among these is the urgent need to conclude a comprehensive test ban treaty. Not only would this represent an important step towards preventing horizontal and especially vertical proliferation, but its psychological significance—as a display of political will and mutual confidence—would be profound. It is, after the partial test ban treaty and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the next logical step. That is why, in this Assembly and in other forums, my Government has expressed the strong expectation that negotiations would be completed in time for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to submit a draft treaty to this special session. We do not under-rate the problems involved, but it is

a disappointment to us that the three negotiating nuclear-weapon States have not been able to meet this time-table as envisaged in General Assembly resolution 32/78, which all three of them supported. My country shares a very widespread hope that no further time will be lost. At least we are entitled to expect that the three nuclear-weapon States concerned and the Conference will have completed the negotiation of a draft comprehensive test ban treaty this year so that it may come before the General Assembly before the conclusion of the next regular session.

88. We watch with similar anxiety the efforts of the United States and the Soviet Union to reach agreement on measures first to halt, and then to reverse, the strategic arms race. Again, we do not minimize the technical complexity of the negotiations and the difficulties of maintaining parity between two asymmetric strategic forces. We welcome, therefore, the assurances of both the United States [2nd meeting] and the Soviet Union [5th meeting] in this general debate that many of the difficulties have been overcome, that a second agreement on the limitation of strategic arms is in sight and that both countries are willing, after its signature, to proceed to the next and crucial phase to negotiate substantial reductions in their levels of strategic arms as well as stricter qualitative limitations. In this context we commend for their serious consideration the proposal by the Prime Minister of Canada [6th meeting] for an agreement to stop the flight testing of new strategic delivery systems. Such an agreement would go far to pre-empt further qualitative refinements of the arms race.

89. If there are special responsibilities attaching to the foremost nuclear-weapon States, there are others which we all share. Among these is the overriding importance of developing an effective, comprehensive international system of safeguards to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and the emergence of new nuclear-weapon States. Nuclear technology and capability—peaceful nuclear technology—must be shared and disseminated. The Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency reminded us at the 13th meeting that what we must seek to do is ensure that this transfer takes place within a framework of comprehensive safeguards. The non-proliferation treaty may not reflect perfectly every aspect of the collective will of the international community, but it remains the major arms control instrument to which most of the international community is party. We must not set it aside. There is no inherent contradiction between the universal goals of international security and international development. Our non-proliferation objectives must answer equally to both. It is my country's hope that we are now through the most contentious stage of the proliferation debate and that a broader consensus is emerging. The development of stricter, mandatory safeguards at all stages of the fuel cycle will ensure a freer flow of nuclear material and technology. In this event, reservations about the discriminatory aspects of the non-proliferation treaty will diminish. If we are to have an effective non-proliferation régime, all States must co-operate. Is the time now right, then, to formalize the consultative machinery dealing with the proliferation issues: a modification, perhaps, of the nuclear suppliers group to include not only exporters but importers of nuclear materials? Such a development could be helpful in bringing to finality this contentious and drawn-out debate.

90. These are not the only considerations affecting the future of the non-proliferation treaty. Those who have renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons are, in my country's view, entirely justified in seeking assurances that nuclear weapons will not be used against them and that they will not be threatened with their use. Such assurances would contribute significantly to the objective of non-proliferation. My Government welcomes the renewed consideration which nuclear-weapon States are giving to this question and the commitments that they have publicly assumed at this special session. We should also welcome the inclusion of an agreed formulation on this point in the documents that are being prepared for the Assembly's approval at this session.

91. Many non-nuclear-weapon States are actively considering the question of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones as a means of curbing not only horizontal but also vertical proliferation. New Zealand supports the principle of nuclear-weapon-free zones and demonstrated this belief by voting for General Assembly resolution 31/70 in 1976. At the same time, we accept the conclusions of the *Ad Hoc* Group of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that nuclear-weapon-free zones must be capable of adequate verification, compatible with international law, and should not disturb existing security relationships. It is with these considerations in mind that my Government approaches the question of such a zone in the South Pacific region. We have agreed to advance the concept of this zone in a manner compatible with the principle of freedom of the high seas and with existing security arrangements.

92. New Zealand strongly supports the early conclusion of a treaty to prohibit the development and production of chemical weapons. Similarly, we believe that efforts to prohibit the use of inhumane weapons must be sustained.

93. It is idle, however, to believe that reductions or prohibitions of weapons of mass destruction can proceed very far without a commensurate reduction of stocks of conventional weapons, which still absorb by far the greatest part of global military expenditure. The same broad principles attach to both conventional and nuclear arms. We strongly support the Japanese proposal for a study of the transfer of conventional arms [see A/S-10/1, vol. V, document A/AC.187/86]. As with recent exercises undertaken on the reporting of military budgets, such a study does not pre-judge any political decisions: it is intended to facilitate such decisions. New Zealand is also prepared to participate in the pilot test of the standardized reporting instrument designed to measure national military budgets. Similarly, we support the Scandinavian proposal for a study of ways in which economic resources can be diverted from military to peaceful uses [*ibid.*, document A/AC.187/80]. Such studies can be invaluable in disposing of old myths. I am reminded of the 1976 expert report which disproved the damaging belief that the military sector provides more employment opportunities than the same amount of productive resources in the civilian sector. It is not, of course, true. The fact is that progress in disarmament would free enormous material and human resources for productive purposes in all our countries, and particularly in the third world.

94. The effectiveness of this special session will depend very much on the machinery through which future negotiations on disarmament are conducted. New Zealand has criticized in recent years the manner in which the negotiating and treaty-making process has developed. We acknowledge the primary role of the nuclear Powers in disarmament negotiations. But all States have a close and direct interest in disarmament. They should have an opportunity to participate in the negotiating process. That opportunity has, in the past, frequently been denied them. There can be no certainty that in such circumstances States will in future acquiesce in agreements negotiated without their participation. A case in point, as far as New Zealand is concerned, is the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques [*resolution 31/72, annex*]. New Zealand has not signed this treaty. We believe it to be defective in substance, and there was no opportunity for countries such as my own which are not members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to attempt to remedy the flaw which, in our view, seriously reduced its value. How, then, can we prevent a repetition of this experience in other arms control negotiations that hold even greater implications for international security? My Government believes that among the institutional improvements to be made at this session should be the introduction of procedural rules giving States the opportunity to comment on, or propose amendments to, agreements prepared by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in the course of the negotiating process.

95. The record of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament over recent years is not so impressive as to cause one to hesitate to suggest the possibility of improvements in both its composition and its methods of work. That is not to say that reforms need necessarily be drastic. The nuclear-weapon States should certainly have permanent membership, and New Zealand would welcome the inclusion of China and France in the membership of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament or in any new negotiating body. There should also, though, be a reasonable balance of regional representation. We would not dispute the desirability of having as members of the negotiating body on a continuing basis States with a major military capability as well as States which have traditionally taken a leading role in promoting disarmament. But it is also our view that other States, including smaller States, which have an equal interest in the issues at stake and which wish to participate actively in the negotiating

process, should have the opportunity periodically to do so. We would therefore favour a scheme providing for a proportion of the places on the negotiating body to be elective, on an equitable geographical basis, for five or seven years. To facilitate this change, we would find acceptable a limited enlargement of the present size of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, but we should see little value in such an enlargement merely to extend the privilege of permanent membership to a few more States.

96. Real progress towards disarmament will depend on the political will of Governments, and that political will, in turn, on the understanding and support of an informed and concerned public. That is why New Zealand sees value in the opportunities given to non-governmental organizations to play a part in our proceedings. It is our hope that their participation will not only give an added impetus to our efforts but increase public understanding of the difficulties and complexities of the task that lies ahead.

97. This is, in the words of the Secretary-General: "the largest, most representative meeting ever convened to consider the problem of disarmament". [*1st meeting, para. 36.*] It embraces, to our satisfaction, all five nuclear-weapon States and the full membership of the United Nations. This achievement owes much to the initiative of the non-aligned countries, and to them we pay a tribute. We especially welcome the active participation of the People's Republic of China and France in the work of this session, and will certainly study carefully the imaginative proposals put forward by the President of France [*3rd meeting*]. We have the opportunity here to make a constructive, positive start on the process of disarmament, but we shall do that best if at this stage we focus our attention on a realistic short-term programme of action. We can make a start on halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race in both the quantitative and qualitative aspects, but we cannot rid the world of nuclear arms overnight. "The heights by great men reached and kept were not achieved by sudden flight." So it is with disarmament; we cannot move with one giant step to the end of the road. Equally, we dare not stand still. When we convene here again in three or four years' time for a second special session on disarmament we must be able to point to a substantial record of achievement. Unless we can do that, we shall have failed both our nations and mankind as a whole.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.